Agriculture is one of the Nation’s most energy-intensive industries and will be negatively impacted by this legislation. Even a small increase in operating costs could devastate rural farmers and ranchers, and this bill could prove to be a huge burden on our agricultural producers. U.S. farmers would also be at a severe disadvantage compared to farmers in nations which do not have cap-and-trade systems with the correspondingly high input costs.

It is simply not appropriate for allowances to be set aside for other industries heard by the cap-and-trade bill, but agriculture is left out.

PUBLIC HEALTH INSURANCE OPTION

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I hope today we are going to pass a transformational climate bill that will not only grow jobs in this country but will make us truly energy independent.

And when we get back from our break, it is time to turn our attention to health care. There is a lot of controversy around these issues, but out in the American public, there is no controversy over their desire to see a public health insurance option be part of health care reform: 69 percent support in a recent Kaiser Foundation poll; 72 percent in a CBS/New York Times poll; 76 percent by the President as Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, this letter serves as my intent to resign from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Hon. Nancy Pelosi,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC,

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Given my nomination by the President as Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, this letter serves as my intent to resign from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, effective today.

Sincerely,

Ellen O. Tauscher,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2454, AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2009

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 587 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 587
Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order in the House the bill (H.R. 2454) to create clean energy jobs, achieve energy independence, reduce global warming pollution and transition to a clean energy economy. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as waived.

The resolution provides for 3 hours of general debate with 2½ hours controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Madam Speaker, from coast to coast we are seeing the effects of our changing climate. Just last week, experts from 13 government agencies and seven universities issued a report on global climate change impacts in the United States. Their analysis was clear: global warming is caused by human-induced emissions.

It is also already having visible impacts in the United States. We are seeing these effects throughout our country, from increases in heavy storms to rising sea levels. From earlier snow melt to alterations in river flows.

Climate change will combine with other air pollution, population growth,
overuse of resources, and social, economic, and environmental stresses to create larger impacts that will be felt around the world and here at home. For my constituents, this threat is very real and very urgent.

California’s Department of Water Resources projects that the Sierra Nevada snowpack will experience a 25 to 40 percent reduction by 2050. These are not empty numbers. As California’s climate warms, more of the Sierra Nevada’s watershed will continue to peak storm runoff. High-frequency flood events are projected to increase as a result. We have no choice but to adapt to these changing realities.

In Sacramento, we live at the confluence of two great rivers, the Sacramento and the American. As global warming intensifies, scientists predict greater storm intensity that could forever change these rivers’ flow patterns. This means that my district will have to cope with more direct runoff and more flooding.

I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN and Chairman MARKEY for working with me to ensure that this bill addresses water needs in the context of climate change. Allowances are distributed to States for urgent projects to help fight extreme weather and flooding. These resources are vital as we work to adapt to changing climates and more intense weather patterns.

In order to deal with these issues and with others that confront us all, the Energy and Commerce Committee has held countless hearings on energy and climate change policy over the past 2 1/2 years. This year alone we have convened over a dozen hearings and heard from numerous experts, as well as national and international leaders. In total, the committee has held over 40 days of hearings on energy and climate change policy over the past two Congresses. During these deliberations, over 300 witnesses testified, including 130 in this year alone.

What we have all agreed with Chairman WAXMAN and Chairman MARKEY on the issue of global warming, and I personally do, we should all applaud the work these two chairmen have done to get us here today.

This bill is not only an achievement for the American people but also for our children and grandchildren. By spurring a new era of clean energy jobs, this bill puts our economy on a new trajectory. Because of this investment, our children and grandchildren will live in a country that is more sustainable, more economically viable, and more efficient than the country we live in today.

The legislation will create millions of new clean energy jobs, enhance America’s energy independence, and protect the environment. Specifically, it requires electric utilities to meet 20 percent of the electricity demand through renewable and energy sources and energy efficiency by 2020. It also invests in new clean energy technologies and energy efficiencies, including energy efficiency and renewable energy carbon capture and sequestration, and basic scientific research and development.

It mandates new energy-saving standards for buildings, appliances, and industries, and it reduces carbon emissions from major U.S. sources by 17 percent by 2020 and over 80 percent by 2050. These are the nationwide impacts of this groundbreaking legislation.

Part of the brilliance of this bill before us today, though, is that it also gives local communities the tools they need to create clean energy jobs that demand American skills and that put our country in a strong position to compete internationally. And because of this investment, our children and our grandchildren. By 2020, we will live in a country that is more sustainable, more economically viable, and more efficient than the country we live in today.

I appreciate working with the committee on section 222, which seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive transportation efficiency and land-use planning. The way we plan our communities and transportation systems has a real effect on how well we reduce emissions from transportation. This legislation also protects consumers from energy price increases.

According to estimates from the EPA, the reductions in carbon pollution required by the legislation will cost American families only 22 to 30 cents per day. But fighting global warming is not just about preserving our current way of life; it is also about creating a cleaner, stronger economy that will power the United States toward a clean energy future.

EPA analysis shows that the Nation’s gross domestic product would grow from $13 trillion in 2008 to over $22 trillion in 2030 while deploying clean energy technologies and reducing global warming pollution. And consumption, an economic measure of a household’s purchasing potential, would grow by 8 to 10 percent from 2010 to 2015, and 23 percent to 28 percent by 2030.

With the American Clean Energy and Security Act, we are making smart investments. We are giving entrepreneurs the tools they need to create clean energy jobs that demand American skills and that put our country in a strong position to compete internationally.

Madam Speaker, with the American Clean Energy and Security Act, we will show the rest of the world that America is back and we are ready to lead again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to, on behalf of my Republican colleagues, congratulate you for your vision and your courage in this legislation that you will have at the State Department, and congratulations on your Senate confirmation yesterday.

Mr. UPTON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UPTON. I, too, extend my congratulations, as I understand it, in the Senate. I think this is a particularly worthy day that you have this job still, as a Member of Congress, until the end of the day, because you’re going to need to repair a lot of arms on that side of the aisle after this vote is over.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman, but congratulations very much, Ellen.

At the very top, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to the gentlewoman from California if we could extend the time of debate. I am inundated with the amount of requests and would like to ask that we extend it 30 minutes, extending both sides an additional 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Ms. MATSUI. No, we will not agree to that. We object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection is heard.

Mr. SESSIONS. You do object. I would like to ask the gentlewoman if we could extend the time on both sides by 5 minutes then.

Ms. MATSUI. We object. There are 3 hours on the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to see if we could extend by 1 minute this debate on both sides.

Ms. MATSUI. We object.

Mr. SESSIONS. You object. Okay.

Ms. MATSUI. Good morning. I yield myself such time as I may consume. And I appreciate the gentlewoman extending me these few minutes that she has given us to debate this very important bill.

I rise in opposition to this lockdown rule and the underlying legislation which, if passed, The Wall Street Journal correctly notes will become the “biggest tax in American history.”

After limited committee hearings and only one markup on this 1,200-plus page bill, the negotiations that have brought this bill to the floor have completely excluded Republicans and ignored our good ideas on how to stop the most economically devastating and job-killing parts of this bill.

For example, during the bill’s brief deliberation in committee, Republicans offered three commonsense amendments, one to suspend the program if gas prices hit $5 a gallon, one to suspend the program if electricity prices rise 10 percent over 2009, and one to suspend the program if unemployment rates hit 15 percent. But, unfortunately, the committee’s Democrats defeated them all.

To make matters worse, for the past 2 weeks, despite numerous contrary positions by our Democrat colleagues and to the American people, Speaker PELOSI and her handpicked lieutenants on the Rules Committee have limited
open debate and, once again, are here on the floor, debate to talk about this unprecedented bill that is before the American people.

While this behavior is undemocratic and mildly irritating when dealing with a myriad of issues—parental leave, employee leave, Parental Leave Act of 2009, it is simply unacceptable when it comes to legislation of such great importance to the future of American jobs and families.

So once again, early this morning in the Rules Committee, after—and by the way, this was about 2:30 this morning—after being handed a brand new 309-page revision of the bill, this unacceptable behavior continued.

My Republican colleagues and I offered numerous good ideas and improvements to this brand-new bill this morning, which not one Member has even read. As a matter of fact, we even joked about that as we walked in at 2 o’clock this morning about, sure everyone had a chance to read the bill, that’s why we were up late last night. This legislation that Republicans proposed would have provided commonsense relief for farmers and small businesses that drive our economy.

Unsurprisingly, each of these good ideas were rejected by our Demo- crat colleagues along party lines.

Whether or not to impose the biggest tax increase in American history is a very serious issue, and one that affects every American family, legislation that punishes producers $646 billion over 10 years. American manufacturers and energy providers $846 billion over 10 years. Three weeks later, the administration’s top economic advisers disagreed with this lowball figure, suggesting that cap-and-trade system electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. Then on February 26, 2009, the President’s own budget estimates that the climate revenue generated by this legislation to pay for Washington bureaucrat-run health care and a jobless stimulus package would cost American manufacturers and energy producers $946 billion over 10 years.

As recently as this week, Congress- man Gene Green of Texas stated in an op-ed: “Instituting a cap on nationwide greenhouse emissions will raise the price of energy for consumers and businesses alike.”

Madam Speaker, I’m confused. Why on this Earth would my friends on your side of the aisle want to impose such a big tax on all American families and businesses during a time that a recession is so serious? Why are we rushing to do this with a $1 trillion spending plan that will have such a large impact on the American people, killing jobs and making it more difficult for us to come out of this recession?

On June 15, I received a letter from the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts stating that the current plan to impose such a cap-and-trade would weigh far more heavily on Texas than any other region in the country. It goes on to note that “based on rising fuel prices as a result of the cap-and-trade provisions of this bill, Texas could see 135,000 to 277,000 fewer jobs in 2012, the first year of the bill.”

Madam Speaker, Texas leads this country in jobs, and people are coming to Texas from all over the United States just to have jobs. Why would we go and diminish the opportunities for the American people to get their jobs that were available to help their families?

Madam Speaker, families all over Texas are already hurting; and with all the other troubles plaguing the economy, they simply cannot afford the additional and completely avoidable eco- nomic assault that the new Democrat majority is placing on the American people.

Perhaps worst of all, Madam Speaker, is the side container created by this legislation actually favors foreign companies over American ones. China, the number one emitter of greenhouse gases, and India, who is set to expand its emissions, will not be required to modify their behavior at all. That means that this new Democrat majority is taking the astonishing position of asking American small businesses and consumers to carry the global load for the world’s carbon consumption because, as everyone understands, if only Americans tax their manufacturing and productions, then only Americans will be losing out while China, India and other countries gain an advantage over our domestic manufacturers, business- es, jobs and future generations.

Every Member of this Chamber understands that in an era of rising en- ergy costs, Congress must and should be doing everything in its power to en- sure that domestic production of clean energy is available at the cheapest price. However, I recently received a letter from the American Petroleum Institute expressing concern that this legislation could add as much as 77 cents to every gallon of gasoline.

Very simply, this legislation means that every American business and con- sumer will pay more to fuel their vehi- cles, heat their homes, and purchase everyday goods.

The facts are clear: Nancy Pelosi’s new energy tax will kill American jobs, will raise prices on hardworking Americans, and do little to clean up our environment.

I encourage a “no” vote on this lockdown rule and a “no” vote on the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the bal- ance of my time.

Ms. Matsui. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, my colleague, Mr. McGov- ern.

Mr. McGovern. I thank the gentle- lady from California for yielding to me. Madam Speaker, I stand here today in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

I want to thank Speaker Pelosi, Leader Hooyer, Chairman Waxman, and my Massachusetts colleague, Ed Mar- key, for crafting and shepherding through this tremendously important legislation.

This bill will reduce the release of greenhouse gases into our atmosphere, reduce global warming, and concur- rently will spur the creation of mil- lions of clean-energy jobs in the United States.

Specifically, I would like to thank the chairman for including funding for domestic and international adaptation and clean technology transfer. While I supported greater dedication for adap- tation funding, this represents a nec- essary first step in U.S. commitment.

By dedicating a portion of the allow- ances to international adaptation fi- nancing, we can ensure that those poorest of countries who have already been and will continue to be dispropor- tionately impacted by climate change will receive crucial funding to help them save their farmlands, sources of water, and oftentimes their homes.
As a co-Chair of the Congressional Hunger Caucus, I am particularly concerned with the impacts of climate change upon the hungeriest in the world. By investing in sustaining agriculture technology and practices, adaptation financing will help in this fight to end hunger.

For many island nations and equatorial countries, the harmful impacts of climate change have already taken their toll. Sea level rise, caused by rising global temperatures, has forced more than 100,000 people to leave their homelands in the last 20 years alone due to climate change impacts, the U.S. is now experiencing a boon in job creation and innovation solutions such as efficient water systems and irrigation technology can create jobs here while solving problems abroad.

Madam Speaker, to echo what Speaker Pelosi has emphasized consistently, there is a moral imperative to be good stewards of this Earth. And as we look toward the negotiations in Copenhagen this December, the world is seeking for leadership from the United States for global solutions to this global problem. And by leading the way on clean-energy technology and services to help the poorest nations build resistance to climate impacts, the U.S. can truly help solve a problem of some nations.

As a co-Chair of the Congressional Hunger Caucus, I am particularly concerned with the impacts of climate change upon the hungeriest in the world. By investing in sustaining agriculture technology and practices, adaptation financing will help in this fight to end hunger.

For many island nations and equatorial countries, the harmful impacts of climate change have already taken their toll. Sea level rise, caused by rising global temperatures, has forced more than 100,000 people to leave their homelands in the last 20 years alone due to climate change impacts, the U.S. is now experiencing a boon in job creation and innovation solutions such as efficient water systems and irrigation technology can create jobs here while solving problems abroad.

Madam Speaker, to echo what Speaker Pelosi has emphasized consistently, there is a moral imperative to be good stewards of this Earth. And as we look toward the negotiations in Copenhagen this December, the world is seeking for leadership from the United States for global solutions to this global problem. And by leading the way on clean-energy technology and services to help the poorest nations build resistance to climate impacts, the U.S. can truly help solve a problem of some nations.

Madam Speaker, to echo what Speaker Pelosi has emphasized consistently, there is a moral imperative to be good stewards of this Earth. And as we look toward the negotiations in Copenhagen this December, the world is seeking for leadership from the United States for global solutions to this global problem. And by leading the way on clean-energy technology and services to help the poorest nations build resistance to climate impacts, the U.S. can truly help solve a problem of some nations.

The world is hungry.

The unprecedented global financial crisis is plummeting more people into poverty. Nearly 1 billion worldwide go hungry, according to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization. Our conscience tells us this is morally reprehensible; our intellect reminds us that we can breed crop failure and civil unrest that jeopardize the peace for us all.

This human calamity—with far-reaching consequences for us all—is a signal to the world that the U.S. is ready to lead in combating global climate change.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

It would like to insert in the record a column by Ken Hackett, the president of Catholic Relief Services, entitled, “Combat Hunger By Investing in Agricultural Development.”

To cure the malady of hunger, we must invest today in agricultural development, to secure our future and to end hunger.

We need to move toward more holistic approaches to rural development that reflect the needs of the poor themselves and build up our ability to engage the help of the private sector. These approaches are starting to take root among the world’s poorest countries through the efforts of smart development-assistance programs.

The U.S. Government’s Millennium Challenge Corp., for example, is investing in every facet of the agricultural value chain. Millennium Challenge grants are training farmers, including women who make up the majority of farmers throughout the developing world, to solve the problems they need to get their crops to market; and bolstering a sound policy environment that secures land rights for farmers or expands the financial services agribusinesses need to flourish. Innovative approaches like the sesame project in Niger are rather small, but Millennium Challenge grants can replicate them on a larger scale.

I applaud the Obama administration for the steps it has taken so far in the fight against global hunger and poverty, specifically in its commitment to increased funding for food security and for demonstrating its support of the Millennium Challenge Corp in the current fiscal year. I urge the administration and Congress to continue America’s commitment to assisting the world’s poor in the face of fiscal stress and other priorities.

To cure the malady of hunger, we must invest today in agriculture’s long-term sustainability. We need models of development assistance that are working toward this goal for the world’s poor. If we are truly committed to ending global hunger, we must deepen our support for the solutions these models are delivering.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of Energy and Commerce from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, this is the most important economic bill before this House in the last 30 years, and we have under this rule, 3 1/2 hours of debate, equally divided. I can almost say we have debated the entire bill over this rule, 3 1/2 hours of debate, equally divided. I can almost say we have debated the entire bill over this rule, 3 1/2 hours of debate, equally divided.

Let me give you just two or three reasons to vote against the rule. Four hundred pages of this bill have never been seen before. They were literally hot off the Xerox machine when they were handed into the Rules Committee at approximately sometime between 2 and 3 a.m. this morning. That’s one reason to vote “no” on the rule.

Another provision in this revised bill on derivatives that the chairman of the Ag Committee and the chairman of the Financial Services Committee have already said needs to be repealed. But they have agreed to vote “no” on the rule. That’s another reason to vote against the rule.

There are so many new provisions that have never been seen. Provisions that Chairman Peterson and Chairman Waxman negotiated on agriculture have never been the focus of a hearing or even a public debate. It is a debatable proposition whether the provisions that Chairman Peterson had negotiated have any value at all since the EPA Administrator still retains the ultimate authority under the bill to regulate any man-made greenhouse gas.

This bill needs to be pulled today. And if we vote against the rule, it will be given a bill to the floor sometime in July or September and then bring the revised bill to the floor sometime in July or September and then bring the revised bill to the floor sometime in July or September and then bring the revised bill to the floor sometime in July or September.

Two hundred amendments were presented to the Rules Committee last night. One was made in order, one of 224.

This is a bad rule. It is a closed rule. This is a bad rule. It is a closed rule. This is a bad rule. It is a closed rule.

The easiest thing to do is vote “no” on the rule and then let’s do work together to come up with a more reasonable bill sometime in July or September.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada, a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and Education and Labor Committee (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Titus-Giffords-Heinrich amendment, which the manager’s amendment incorporates into the American Clean Energy and Security Act.

Our amendment will create clean-energy jobs, promote deployment of renewable energy technology, and put the Federal Government in a position to lead by example. Our amendment extends the limit for the Federal Government to 20 years on a contract for the acquisition of electricity generated from a renewable energy resource, often referred to as a power purchase agreement. This provision will encourage wide-scale deployment of renewable energy technologies at federal buildings, BLM land, and Superfund sites. Additionally, it will allow agencies to plan for more sustainable and
affordable energy use over an extended period of time. This small change will open the door to government investments in cleaner, more sustainable, and ultimately more cost-beneficial energy technologies.

Our amendment also establishes a Renewable Electricity Standard for Federal agencies. This RES will ensure that the Federal Government meets 20 percent of its electricity demands through renewable energy by 2020. It will drive demand for new, clean-energy technologies and help create clean, energy jobs. Indeed, we will be leading by example.

I’m proud to have joined my fellow members of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, chaired by Jay Inslee and Steve Israel, on this provision. I would like to thank Chairman Waxman for his assistance on this important amendment.

I too will miss you, Madam Speaker. Mr. Hensarling understands. I appreciate the gentlewoman’s coming down and speaking this morning. There’s an estimate that in her congressional district, there will be 5,334 jobs that will be lost in the first year of this new law.

Madam Speaker, at 3 o’clock, 2:30 this morning, we received the manager’s amendment, 309 pages, brand new. And this is the text of the ideas that Chairman Barton was talking about that were completely ignored by the Democratic majority last night in the Rules Committee. The Members had come up to speak plainly about their ideas. Completely ignored. Completely ignored.

At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. Upton.

Mr. Upton. Madam Speaker, this bill is an energy bill. This bill will turn around the energy policy of America. You know, there was a chance that we were going to have a bipartisan bill. But that chance melted away when the subcommittee failed to mark up a bill and we went right to full committee. We thought we might have a chance on the House floor. And I can remember when Speaker Hastert was in his chair, Madam Speaker, because 4 years ago we had an energy bill on the floor and there were more than 50 amendments offered under Chairman Dreyer and the Rules Committee, many of them Democratic amendments. We spent a number of days on this. And at the end of the day, both Mr. Dingell, the former chairman, and Joe Barton, the then-chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, were able to vote for a bill because, in fact, it was bipartisan.

Yesterday more than 200 amendments were filed up at the Rules Committee, many of them Republican, many of them bipartisan. Mr. Hill, Democrat from Indiana, and I offered a bipartisan amendment on nuclear. Nuclear is one issue that is absent from this bill. Don’t ask me why. There are no greenhouse gas emissions from nuclear. It really is a jobs bill. I’ve got two nuclear plants in my congressional district. When they were both brought online, 85 percent of the components were made in America. Today, for a new nuclear plant, 85 percent is going to come from somewhere else because we turned the light from green to red on nuclear the last 20, 25 years. Yet no amendment on nuclear in this bill and in this rule.

I woke up this morning and saw my friend and colleague Mr. Inslee speaking on C-span. He said this bill was going to cost only a postage stamp. I looked at the paper this morning and I saw a full-page ad: gasoline costs will only go up 2 cents a gallon.

You know, I hope they’re true. But I don’t think that those statements are going to be true. We had amendments on a gas tax in case they’re going to go up. The CBO and the American Petroleum Institute say that gas prices are going to go up 77 cents a gallon, diesel prices 88 cents a gallon. Some energy costs could go up by 40 to 50 percent. We had amendments that said, hey, if gas goes up to 5 bucks a gallon, we’re going to take off this cap-and-trade. If electricity prices go up more than 10 percent, we’ll take off cap-and-trade. If unemployment reaches 15 percent, and it’s almost there already in Michigan, we’ll take off those job-killing provisions. Were those amendments allowed? No.

Then we’ve got the whole issue of India and China, jobs going somewhere else. The bill-page ad: gas prices will go up to 5 bucks a gallon, we’re going to drive the development of new, clean-energy jobs that pay well and cannot be outsourced.

People are fed up with the wild swings in gas prices and tired of watching America’s economy rise and fall along with the price of a barrel of oil. So we’re going to commit ourselves to a new energy future.

Clean Energy Act has special significance to my home State of Florida because alone in the continental United States, my state is surrounded on three sides by water. If we do not act to address carbon pollution, it is possible that my State in future decades will no longer be habitable. We must act now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. Matsui. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. Castor of Florida. I thank my colleague.

Scientists tell us that if carbon pollution is not addressed, the seas could rise and the coastal areas we hold dear. Florida has already seen increasing droughts and saltwater intrusion of our aquifers. What happens if we do not act? Property insurance rates are already out of sight. What if the scientists are right that warmer waters increase the intensity of hurricanes?

So for those that say that it’s not time to build on a new energy economy or that environmental changes can be ignored, you are on the wrong side of history. We are speaking on the promise to future generations of Americans and break our dependence on foreign oil and create the clean-energy jobs that will revitalize America’s economy in the coming century.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Florida’s coming down. A vote for this bill will lose 3,500 jobs in her congressional district in the year 2012, the first year of its implementation.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Fifth Congressional District of Texas (Mr. Hensarling).
Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, since the Democrats have taken control of Congress, we have seen their idea to increase the deficit tenfold. We’ve seen their idea to triple the national debt in 10 years. We’ve seen their idea to bail out AIG, GM, Fannie and Freddie, and the list goes on. And today’s new idea, a national energy tax costing every American family $1,500 to $3,000 a year, but only if they choose to turn on a light, cook a meal, or drive their children to school.

Don’t be for it. Listen to the President of the United States, who said that under his plan, electricity rates would “necessarily skyrocket.” That’s from our President. Estimates are our gas prices will go up about 77 cents a gallon at the pump.

Now, all of this is due to global warming concerns, and, Madam Speaker, these are legitimate concerns. We have a right to be concerned, and man-made activity does contribute. But is this a “perfect bill”? You know, if India and China don’t participate, it is for naught. Even our own Federal Government estimates, at best over a course of a hundred years, this may impact global temperatures 3% of 1 degree. Frankly, that variance occurs naturally on a yearly basis.

Think about the severe job loss, millions and millions of jobs lost due to the competitive disadvantage we have.

There are smarter ways to deal with global warming, but we hear nothing about nuclear from the one side. We hear nothing about clean coal from the other side. Now, all of this is due to global warming concerns, and, Madam Speaker, this is a smart policy? You know, if India and China don’t participate, is it a smart policy? As an enormous consumer of energy, particularly the Department of Defense, the Federal Government can have a significant positive impact by modifying its procurement process to support emerging technologies in this way.

This bill, Madam Speaker, is not a perfect bill, but it’s an important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman, the chairman of the Republican Conference, Mr. PENCE.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, this bill is a difficult time in the life of our Nation and the life of our Nation’s economy and that of families and small businesses.

Remarkably, today, with an embarrassingly brief amount of debate and discussion and amendment, the Democrat majority is poised to bring to the floor of the Congress what amounts to the largest tax increase in American history under the guise of climate change legislation.

Now, there is a lot of debate about what this bill will cost the average American household from hundreds of dollars to thousands of dollars, but there actually is no debate over the fact that this legislation will cost millions of American jobs. On that point there is no discussion.

The bill, itself, actually includes funds that will provide resources for Americans who lose their jobs if cap-and-trade becomes law, and there are news reports this morning, although I am yet to confirm them, that there may be new trade restrictions in this legislation, because the expectation, and it is reasonable, is by raising the cost of energy for every American business, that we will see businesses flee overseas, taking jobs abroad in these difficult economic times. It is extraordinary, to say the least.

But there is another aspect to the issue, this bill is coming to the floor ought to be disturbing to every American, Republican, Democrat and Independent that’s looking in. Last night, at 3:09 a.m., House Democrats filed a 309-page amendment and denied Republican and Democrat amendments to the tune of the 224 that were submitted.

Three hours of debate, one amendment, at 3:09 in the morning that’s 309 pages. And I would ask the Democrat majority and the Speaker respectfully, what’s the hurry? What are we hiding here that we can’t afford more time for the American people and their elected representatives to examine what’s in this bill?

I mean, is there more corporate welfare, more deals for special interests. Were Members that were on the fence placated with special provisions for industries in their districts? We are hurrying to find out, and we have to hurry, because the majority just recently denied us one additional minute of debate.

You know, the term “Congress,” Madam Speaker, actually is an ancient word and means the intercourse between men and women in ideas and philosophies. This is not Congress. I don’t know what this is; 3 o’clock in the morning, 300 pages, one amendment is a travesty.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield ¼ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my colleague. Madam Speaker, a confident nation acknowledges the challenges it faces. It doesn’t ignore them. A confident people, when faced with the challenge, rolls up their sleeves and addresses the problems before them.

Madam Speaker, today, Congress has two questions. The first is will it acknowledge the challenge of global warming that it is real, that it is urgent, and that demands attention now.

And second, will Congress, by this flimsy token of passing this legislation, unleash the power of America to take that step towards American energy independence; to unleash the brilliance of our scientists and engineers to develop alternative and renewable energy; to unleash the competitiveness of our entrepreneurs to bring to market energy-saving devices and to create jobs in America; the frugality and thriftiness of our homeowners and business owners who have buildings to be able to retrofit and make them more energy efficient and use the skills of our plumbers, masons, electricians and carpenters to go to work making our buildings more energy independent.

Madam Speaker, every generation faces its challenge, and what we have seen across America is that young people have taken this on, and our question is whether we are going to—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MATSUI. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. The question we face as Congress is simply this: Will we put to
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work those young Americans, those scientists, those entrepreneurs, and allow them to make America energy independent?

The questions we face can be solved. We have to give permission and authority for people to act. So it’s important as we listen to our Houston, hardworking Americans. And I represent the city of energy capital of the country, so I am voting for the rule, and I am well aware of the hard task that willing who want to see a new vision. I want to give my personal congratulations to Congresswoman TAUSCHER, and I just look for great things out of you. Congratulations.

I rise to speak against this rule. This rule is blatantly unfair to the American people. It is quashed. It is. It has prevented good amendments to be introduced on this floor and to have the proper debate that we should have over something that is extremely important, as this bill is. We have just gotten this, but let me tell what you this bill is. Madam Speaker. This bill is going to kill millions of jobs in America. People are going to be put out of work because of this bill.

Now, we hear all the time about global warming. Actually, we have had flat-line global for the last 8 years. Scientists all over this world say that the idea of human-induced global climate change is one of the greatest hoaxes perpetrated out of the scientific community. It is. There is no scientific consensus. There are billions of dollars for green energy job training in this bill. I am looking to offer amendments that focus on making sure that any dip in job positions will be monitored by the Labor Department and, in fact, that resources be available for all Americans. But what we are trying to do here is to build a new culture and work with what we have, to build the seamless resources that we have across the country and guide the carbons out of the air and make our quality of life better and at the same time give us a new vision for how we handle the energy needs of our Nation.

And so it is important that we recognize that there is a structure to capture that carbon. There is a response to those who are, in essence, impacted. There are credits that are going to be given.

At the same time, I was concerned about the labeling of different buildings, and we are working on language that would allow those buildings that won’t have to participate in the assessment of whether your building is energy efficient. It will be for new construction.

So we are making our way because, in fact, this is a beginning. We will be working with the Senate. We will be working with the President. We will be working on behalf of the American people.

We have to get started. We have to be innovative. We have to make sure the 1.7 million jobs that this bill will create. I think America wants us to do that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, could you please advise us how much time remains on both sides?

Mr. WEININGER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to convey my personal congratulations to Congresswoman TAUSCHER, and I just look for great things out of you. Congratulations.

I rise today in support of this rule, which includes an amendment I worked to draft with my colleagues, Ms. TITUS of Nevada and Ms. GIFFORDS of Arizona.

This amendment will make sure that the Federal Government leads by example on clean energy. In my district, Kirtland Air Force Base has tried for a number of years to contract with local clean-energy producers to purchase electricity to help power the base, but there are several Federal policies that stand in the way of these kinds of projects.

New Mexico is second in the Nation for solar energy potential, and we have a thriving clean-energy industry in Albuquerque, creating jobs today. So this is a natural partnership. However, many Federal agencies have discovered that the 10-year limit on Federal power purchase agreements made these kinds of agreements uneconomic for their private sector partners in the solar industry.

Our amendment will extend the length of these contracts to 20 years, allowing more Federal agencies to sign agreements with clean-energy producers. This will put Americans to
work and ensure the Federal Government leads by example in the use of clean energy.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, if I can get my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California, in an effort to get our time back to an even balance, if she could have one of her speakers up at this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATHYS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, the bill today that Chairman WAXMAN has so carefully shepherded to the floor today is a landmark achievement for this body. For the first time as a Nation we are moving towards energy independence, creating millions of new clean jobs, and confronting the threat that global warming poses to the Earth.

As parents, we all struggle to provide our children with a better life. Without the strong action embodied in this bill, the world that we bequeath to our children will be diminished by continued reliance on Middle Eastern oil, byexporting hard-earned American dollars to petrod dictatorships, and by a warming Earth.

America has been at her best during her greatest struggles and, as before, her industry and entrepreneurial spirit will rise to the occasion. The green technology industry is booming across the country, with new factories built and new companies formed every day.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government itself has not been able to fully utilize renewable energy. Many renewable energy installations have large up-front costs, which then have to be recovered in the form of cheap energy over the course of many years. But the Federal Government has been restricting new long-term contracts for energy, so affordable renewable energy has been unavailable to thousands of government offices around the country.

The rule for this bill inserts an important provision that I authored as independent legislation earlier this year and that I worked with many colleagues to include. It loosens the restrictions on energy purchases by the government, and that will spur local green energy development in every State in the Nation.

I hope that we can support this measure, this rule, this bill and fulfill the promise that we have given to our constituents, that we will serve this country not only today and during this Congress but for the long haul, that we will make not only the easy decisions, but the hard ones.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and the bill. I offered five bipartisan, commonsense amendments to the bill with the support of other Members. Not one of these was made in order.

I offered an amendment to strike the section that mandates national building codes. Because my amendment was rejected, and local governments don’t comply with these new national mandates, homeowners today who are struggling to meet ends meet could be charged $100 a day for not being in compliance. A new tax on American homeowners is the wrong direction.

I had another amendment to strike from this bill the new tax on all trans-actions cleared via any U.S. regulated derivatives clearing organization. This bill then will have very chilling consequences. It will punish those using U.S.-regulated clearing organizations, discourage the use of central clearing organizations, and reduce transparency and liquidity and encourage legitimate business activities to move to unregulated foreign markets.

Another amendment would revise the Nuclear Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative to set a policy for clean, safe nuclear energy. I oppose this rule and the bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. It’s interesting, earlier today someone asked me: How can you vote for this measure, because global warming is a hoax. My answer was: Because you need to remove the blinders there that exist with some of my colleagues who think that global warming is a hoax. I remind them that there are zero peer-reviewed scientific studies that say global warming is a hoax.

There are hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific studies that say global warming is real and that man’s actions contribute greatly to that increase in temperature.

We are often asked: What is our legacy here? What really matters about what we do? And I’d like to think it’s how our children and our grandchildren will react to what we did and what we left behind.

So let’s face reality and do what is right for our children and our children’s children.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time I would yield a grand total of 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Ms. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do rise to oppose this rule. Many of my constituents see this as a government regulation of the very air you breathe. They know that this is a liberal’s dream, and that indeed many think that the Democrats have become the party of punishment. We are the party of “no.” We want people to know what is in this bill.

I offered in committee an amendment that would require disclosure of what this legislation would cost consumers on their electric bills, at the gas pump, and on the products that they buy.

In Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to require every transaction that FERC makes on these allocations and offsets to be listed in a database that is searchable by the public so they will know what is in this. They were voted down.

I encourage all to oppose this rule and this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 5 1/2 minutes. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MATSUI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. If I could, Madam Speaker, is the gentlewoman through with her speakers now? We still have some disparity in the little bit of time that was given. I would like for there to be some parity.

Ms. MATSUI. I have additional speakers coming.

Mr. ROE. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation. I’ve only been here 6 months, but this is the worst piece of legislation that has come out of the House yet. It defies logic that at a time of economic recession we would impose a regressive national energy tax that many have predicted will result in a net job loss. Supporters of this legislation only want to talk about the so-called “green” jobs that will be created, but they conveniently ignore that some studies indicate that for every one job created, two are eliminated.

Worse, we are creating a costly, confusing program of carbon credits. Let me make one prediction: the only certainty under this bill is Wall Street traders sophisticated enough to understand how these credits are traded will make millions.

I offered an amendment yesterday at the Rules Committee stating that at least bring it to a level playing field between the U.S., China, and India. My feeling is that if Congress is going to pass this legislation, we should require India and China—two enormous and growing resources of greenhouse emissions—to abide by the same standards.

My amendment would have required the U.S. to come to agreement with these two countries on emission reductions before implementing any provision within this bill.

This rule is a sham. It pales in comparison to how awful the bill is. I urge the Members to demand a return to the democratic process and defeat this bill that will certainly exacerbate our economic recession.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).
Mr. SCALISE. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this rule. This is a massive energy tax on the backs of the American people all across this country. All estimates show millions of jobs will be lost by this cap-and-trade energy tax. Every household family will see an increase in their utility bills. And we brought amendments last night to protect American jobs. They ruled every one of those amendments out of order. We brought amendments to protect American families having their utility bills increased. They ruled every one of those amendments out of order.

What is Speaker PELOSI and this liberal leadership trying to hide from the American people? We should have an open, honest debate on this bill. It’s a bad bill and a bad rule. I urge rejection of the rule.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Luján).

Mr. Luján. Our country’s dependence on foreign oil threatens our economy and security. We need to take bold steps to increase energy independence by growing a new energy economy. Comprehensive energy reform will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, making us more secure as a Nation.

The energy bill we consider today will create clean-energy jobs, inspiring a new economy. A former utility commissioner, I saw firsthand the positive impact energy reform had on my State of New Mexico. We instituted a renewable energy standard that incentivized the creation of renewables. We encouraged energy efficiency to reduce costs for homes and businesses. And it’s now time to see these steps at a national level.

For too long we have accepted the status quo on energy, and now, with the American Clean Energy and Security Act, we can put America on a path to energy independence, make America the global leader in energy technology, cut our dependence on foreign oil, create new jobs, and save billions in the long run.

I support this rule and urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this rule and this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. Dreier).

Mr. Dreier. I thank my friend for his thoughtful remarks. The American people are hurting. We know that very, very well. We hear it daily. Jobs are being lost, people are losing their businesses, people are losing their homes. They don’t want to see another tax burden imposed on them, which is exactly what this bill is going to do. Everyone recognizes that there is going to be an increase in the burden on the American people.

Unfortunately, as we pursue green technology, we have not been given an opportunity to do that. My friend from Ohio has been very thoughtful on this issue. He had an idea—several ideas that I offered before the committee.

One of the things I believe we should do, Madam Speaker, is allow for the free flow of green technology globally. I’m working with my friend from Ohio in a bipartisan way on that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Dreier. I’d be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUCINICH. I believe the choices we are being offered in this bill are insufficient to address the immediate real threat of global warming. We can take market-based approaches that protect the planet, respect nature through incentivizing the mass production and worldwide distribution of American-made wind and solar microtechnologies, lowering our carbon footprint, lowering our energy costs, and rallying the American people to join in a great economic and social cause of creating a greener future. We can do that. We can still do that.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. Let me say that I totally agree with the statement of my friend. Here’s a demonstration of bipartisanship. It’s not often that Mr. Kucinich and I work together on the exact same issue. We believe that the free flow of tremendous green technology around the world will, in fact, dramatically improve our economy and the standard of living and quality of life for the American people and for the rest of the world.

Defeat this rule, so that we can bring back some of the 224 brilliant ideas that were offered but totally denied by this majority.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. Matsui. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. Dreier) yields the floor.

Ms. Matsui. The rule before us today is a fair rule. It allows us to highlight our current energy policy challenges and a vision for a better tomorrow.

The bill contains expedited procedures for consideration of a joint resolution of approval related to an international reserve allowance program. Such procedures are within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, and it is the Speaker’s understanding that the procedures are placeholder language that will be finalized as the legislation moves forward. The Rules Committee looks forward to working with the other committees of jurisdiction on this provision.

From water, to energy, to transportation, agriculture and public health, climate change is a defining environmental challenge of our time. The action we take today will impact our country in a positive way for generations.

Today, it is this Congress’ responsibility to pass comprehensive energy policy that charts a new course towards a clean energy economy. The underlying bill, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, takes huge steps to create jobs, help end our dangerous dependence on foreign oil and fight global warming.

There are many colleagues who recognize the urgent nature of the challenge before us today. If we do not act, we face disastrous consequences. Nearly every scientific society around the world has warned of the cost of inaction.

On the other hand, if we do act here today, we make our planet more sustainable, more economically viable and more efficient than the world we live in today. We will make a positive impact, not only on the billions of people who live on the Earth today, but for generations into the future.

Madam Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule.

The Rule also prohibits a debate on other commonsense amendments. My fellow Illinoisan, Representative JUDY BIGGERT, had a responsible amendment to strike the International Climate Change Adaptation program and the allocation of emission allowances to this program. We don’t need to establish yet another foreign assistance program that is not only redundant but will actually hurt American manufacturers.

This legislation calls for the U.S. to transfer to developing nations a portion of America’s emission allowances so that these nations can continue to pollute. By giving away additional allowances this legislation will put America’s manufacturers at an unfortunate competitive footing more so than ever before. This is another incentive to encourage American manufacturers to leave this country.

And, this initiative will not reduce emissions. According to an article in yesterday’s Washington Times, David Bookbinder, chief climate counsel to the Sierra Club, said, “emissions could actually stay the same or increase domestically because companies could choose to buy permits instead of investing in technology to make their operations cleaner.” I ask unanimous consent to insert the full article into the RECORD.

Plus, this Rule prohibits a debate on other commonsense amendments. My fellow Illinoisan, Representative JUDY BIGGERT, had a responsible amendment to strike the federalization of local building codes and replace it with positive incentives to encourage federal, state, and local governments to move towards green building codes. Even the liberal Washington Post editorialized against this provision in the bill. I ask unanimous consent to strike the previous question and on the rule.

The Rule also prohibits a debate on an amendment offered by Representative DAVID ROE of Tennessee to waive this bill until the U.S. reaches an agreement with China and India on greenhouse gas reductions. Again, this sensible amendment was defeated by a vote of 3 to 7 in the Rules Committee last night.

The Rule also prohibits a debate on an amendment offered by Representative DAVID ROE of Tennessee to waive this bill until the U.S. reaches an agreement with China and India on greenhouse gas reductions. Again, this sensible amendment was defeated by a vote of 3 to 7 in the Rules Committee last night. This is atrocious. We are only fooling ourselves if we think we’re doing something to save the planet when all we’re doing is transferring our manufacturing jobs and pollution problems to China, India, and other developing nations. This bill will not lower global emissions of greenhouse gasses. The Roe
amendment would have prevented this mistake.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and “no” on the final “cap and tax” bill.

[From the Washington Times, June 23, 2009]

CLIMATE BILL GIVES BILLIONS TO FOREIGN PROJECTS

(BY AMANDA DÉHARD)

If a tree falls in Brazil, it will, in fact, be heard in the U.S.—at least if a little-noticed provision in the pending climate-change bill in Congress becomes law.

As part of the far-reaching climate bill, the House is set to vote Friday on a plan to pay companies billions of dollars not to chop down trees around the world, as a way to reduce global warming.

The provision, called “offsets,” has been attacked by both environmentalists and business groups as insufficient and poorly designed. Critics contend it would send scarce federal dollars overseas to plant trees when subsidies are needed at home, while the purported ecological benefits would be difficult to quantify.

The offsets would be a transfer of wealth overseas,” said William Kovacs, vice president for environmental affairs at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the oft-malignedkeeper on Capitol Hill, has not offered an estimate on how much the offset plan would cost, but the liberal Center for American Progress says it will be pricey.

“The international offsets market is not a huge or cheap market,” said Joseph Romm, a climate expert at the center. “By 2020, the U.S. could be spending $4 billion on international offsets.”

Supporters of the legislation counter that the plan recognizes the need to reduce greenhouse gases to curb global warming—"in the United States and beyond. Supporting ways to keep trees alive or plant new trees, wherever those trees are located, helps the effort, they say.

Under the program, the government would reward domestic and international companies that perform approved “green” actions with certificates, called permits.

Those companies could, in turn, sell the permits to other companies that emit greenhouse gases. The permits would be, in effect, licenses to pollute—and potentially very valuable.

The heart of the climate plan would require companies to purchase the permits if they want to pollute above a certain level, controlling overall emissions through a market that is called “cap-and-trade.”

Under the provision to be voted on in the House, the “green” companies could sell their offset permits to companies that need them because they are unable to, reduce their own emissions as fast as the government would like.

But critics from both the political left and right see problems.

“You have to ask yourself, what is the purpose of this provision? Because it won’t actually reduce emissions,” said David Bookbinder, chief climate counsel to the Sierra Club, the environmental advocacy group.

Mr. Bookbinder said emissions could actually stay the same or increase domestically because if those in the U.S. choose to buy permits instead of invest in technology to make their operations cleaner.

Kenneth P. Green, a climate specialist at the conservative American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, said keeping track of which projects would be eligible for inclusion is another flaw in the plan.

“Where is there a fire that burns down a [green] project? Will those just wasted offsets?” he asked.

Mr. Green and others say the bill’s offset provisions, are too vague and leave unanswered too many questions about which projects will qualify for the offsets and how many in many offsets would be offered for a given project.

“The key with offsets is ensuring that they generate creditable reductions,” said Evan Juskia, North America senior policy manager for the Climate Group, which advises governments and business how to move to a low-carbon economy.

Mr. Juskia said the bill, as written, “leaves much of it to be determined by the administrator after the program is enacted.”

While tree stands are a large absorber of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, they may not be the only projects that qualify for offsets. Companies that erect wind farms, install solar panels, or use devices that trap methane gas in landfills, use less fertilizer, or upgrade equipment at their refineries and power plants might also be eligible for offsets.

The bill would only allow 2 billion tons, or about 30 percent, of carbon-dioxide emissions to be offset a year through the so-called “green” actions.

Half of the qualifying projects must be domestic and half must be overseas, but the bill includes a prohibition of offsets from international projects if not enough domestic projects are available.

The CBO projects that the thousands of firms subject to the program would utilize 230 million tons of domestic offsets and 190 million tons of international offsets in 2012, the year the legislation is proposed to take effect, instead of reducing their emissions levels.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 2009]

BURY CODE

The running joke in Washington is that nobody has read the 900-plus-page energy bill sponsored by Reps. Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif.) and Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), which the House will consider in coming weeks. What you hear from its backers is that its cap-and-trade provisions would create a market-based program to reduce greenhouse gases emissions—which should mean that a simple, systemwide incentive encourages polluters to make the easiest reductions first and greenhouse gases continue to contribute to the costs of fighting global warming to a minimum. In fact, the bill also contains regulations on everything from light bulb standards to the efficiency of electrical appliances.

The purpose of the climate plan is to direct more taxpayer dollars to the government coffers. The results are unacceptable: a average tax increase of $3100 for families;

additional regulatory and administrative costs on small businesses; higher energy expenses for all—especially those in rural areas; and significant job loss.

When will enough be enough? I offered two common sense amendments to H.R. 2454—rejected by the Rules Committee—whose aim is to address climate change, unsuccessfully I might add, while its actual goal is to direct more taxpayer dollars to the government coffers. The results are unacceptable: an average tax increase of $3100 for families;

Today I strongly urge my colleagues to stand with me. It is irresponsible of Congress to use taxation as an answer to our challenges. Voting against this bill and the underlying legislation will demonstrate your willingness to work together towards real energy solutions for our future and our children’s future.

President Obama, in commenting on the American Clean Energy and Security Act earlier this week, cited that this legislation “will keep the door to a better future for this nation.”

I strongly agree with President Obama, but I must also stress our responsibility to ensure all individuals will be provided the opportunity to participate in the new green economy.

This is why I offered the Lee Amendment to this legislation, which would have authorized an academy I have introduced in the House entitled the Metro Economies Green Act, or...
MEGA, in order to establish targeted grant programs to support green economic development, job training and creation. Inclusion of the Lee Amendment to H.R. 2454 would have provided valuable opportunities for those who can benefit from good paying green collar jobs the most—urban youth of color, the unemployed, and those among our neighbors who have just faced incredible hardships in life. Unfortunately the Lee Amendment was not made in order. However, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future to expand access to high-paying, career-term green jobs that represent a much needed pathway out of poverty for millions of individuals across this country.

Mr. MATSUI. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of S. Con. Res. 31 will be followed by 5-minute votes on any pending question on H. Res. 587 and adoption of H. Res. 587, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing for a conditional adjournment of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair laid before the House the following privileged concurrence resolution:

S. CON. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate adjourns or adjourns on any day from Thursday, June 25, 2009 through Sunday, June 28, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrence resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 29, 2009, such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrence resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, June 25, 2009, through Sunday, June 28, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrence resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 7, 2009, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrence resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The Speaker pro tempore.