

Mr. HENSARLING. Would you be happy to tell the citizens of New Jersey who are fleeing the high taxes that they can come to the Lone Star State where we have low taxes and great economic growth? We'd be happy to have them.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I'm sure the gentleman would like to have them. I would like them to stay in the State of New Jersey and just see that our fiscal house is set in order in the State of New Jersey, where the Democrats just raised the sales tax by a penny and corporate taxes as well, and property taxes continue to go through the roof.

But that's a microcosm of the United States of America as well. People are doing what Ronald Reagan once said, and that is they're voting with their feet and leaving the State. Businesses will be doing the exact same thing as we begin to see taxes go up across the board in the United States if those hard decisions are not being made of prioritization.

I believe we're getting near the end of our time here. I will extend a hand to the other side of the aisle, as we continue this debate during the course of the week, to the Blue Dogs or any other Members who came down to the floor during this night or other nights as well who are looking for fiscal responsibility. If we can come to an agreement that the answer is not raising taxes but, rather, reining in spending, I believe it was the RSC a year ago that came up with a list of, correct me if I'm wrong, approximately a half a billion dollars in savings in overall spending by the Federal Government. We'd be glad to share that information with the Democrat majority if they would just take even just less than 5 percent of that to rein in their spending to keep it under the control of where the American public would like to have it.

A NEW VISION FOR OUR ENERGY FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to talk about a great vision for America's clean energy future, and it's very timely that America adopts a new vision for our energy future because we know Americans have some challenges when it comes to energy right now.

We're going to, tonight, talk about a vision for a way to revolutionize how we use and how we generate our energy that will solve some of the problems that Americans are experiencing tonight, and I think there shouldn't be any debate about what those challenges are.

We are paying well over \$3 a gallon for gasoline, with no relief in sight. We've seen it go from, I don't know, \$30

or \$40 a barrel during the start of the Bush administration to now approaching \$100, \$95, \$100 a barrel. Again, fossil fuel costs continue to go up.

We're engaged in a security threat from the Middle East where we are sending about a half a million dollars a minute to the Middle East to the place, to the terrorists who come to attack us, and sending money to the Middle East and have them turn around and attack us as the 22 generals who testified in front of our global warming committee told us is not a very prudent security policy.

We're engaged in a war in the Middle East, the place that there is security concerns because that's where a significant part of the oil is in the world.

So we know we have economic challenges because of rising gas prices. It's hitting us right in the pocketbook every time we go to the pump. We know we have security concerns because of our addiction to the Middle East, and now we know that global warming is an additional threat that we simply have to respond to.

Now that Americans have seen 1 million square miles of the Arctic melt, the size of six Californias simply disappeared, melted in the Arctic this year, together with the melting of the tundra, the changing weather patterns. We've certainly seen it with our rainstorms we had in my State. I represent the State of Washington. We had 10 inches of rain in 24 hours, an unprecedented event. This type of heavy precipitation events are consistent with global warming. We know we have a global warming threat that we've got to deal with.

So we know that we have some challenges when it comes to energy, and we know none of those challenges are going to get better unless we do something about it. This energy problem is not going to get solved by the tooth fairy or simply sort of pleasant wishes for the market to solve the problem. We know we have to act. We know we have to have a plan. We know we have to have a vision. And we know it has to rely on something that we're rich in in America.

And there's one thing I've got some good news tonight we'll talk about at length. We are rich in intellectual talent in America. We are the best innovators, best tinkerers, the best inventors humans have ever seen. And there was a fellow back in May 25, 1961, who really understood that. He came to this Chamber on May 25, 1961, John F. Kennedy, and John F. Kennedy came and stood right behind me in here and said that America was going to accept the challenge of putting a man on the Moon in 10 years and bringing him back safely. Now, that was a President who understood the innate capability of the American people to invent their way to solve any challenge we set our mind to.

And President Kennedy really, that was a gutsy thing to say again. He was ahead of the curve. He was ahead of the

technology. That technology to get to the Moon was hardly even on the back of an envelope at that time. You know, at that moment, our missiles were blowing up on the launch pad. The Russians were way ahead of us in the space race. We'd only put Spam in a can up for 15 minutes. We hadn't even invented Tang yet.

We didn't know how we were going to get to the Moon, but John F. Kennedy knew that we could invent our way to solve this technological challenge and we did it. And we're here tonight to say that Americans have the same level of can-do spirit, the same level of optimism, the same level of technological prowess that we had in the 1960s, and that we can do for clean energy what John F. Kennedy did for space, which is to create a whole new clean energy revolution for the economy of America and grow our economy at the same time.

So I've introduced with some of my colleagues a bill called the New Apollo Energy Act. The New Apollo Energy Act basically uses the word "Apollo" because it's the inspiration for what we know we can do, which is to invent our way to a new clean energy future just like Kennedy in the original Apollo project did for the Moon project.

□ 2200

Well, I have some really good news. The House of Representatives last Thursday, with 235 votes, with some bipartisan support, essentially committed ourselves and accomplished five steps towards this clean energy future, and we are shortly going to take a fifth large leap for mankind in clean energy. So stealing a little bit of the language from the original Apollo 11 project, we now have had five small steps for energy independence and clean energy, and we are now starting to work on one giant leap for America's clean energy revolution.

And I wanted to talk tonight about those five steps that we have taken in the House, and the bill is now over the Senate, and one of the reasons we are here tonight is to encourage the Senate to follow the House's lead to the extent we can and move forward on these clean energy steps. And before I yield to my friend, RON KLEIN, who has been a great leader in the freshmen class on these issues, I want to start with just the first step that we took last Thursday.

Last Thursday the House of Representatives, in a history-making step forward, passed the first improvement in our fuel economy standards in 30 years. For 30 years Americans' efficiency standards have been frozen, locked in stone and haven't made 1-mile-per-gallon improvement since 1983. In fact, and this blows my mind, the cars we drive get less mileage today than they did in 1983. We have mapped the human genome. We have invented the Internet. But the cars we drive get less mileage.

Well, we're doing something about that. After 30 years of Congress being

captured by forces against and in opposition of progress, we have increased by 40 percent the mileage standards by the year 2022 from 25 miles a gallon to 35 miles a gallon. That is a square deal for Americans. It is common sense, and we have done it in a way that protects our domestic manufacturers so that they are not exposed to a flood of new imports from across the seas, and we do that by having what is called the two-fleet rule that has been preserved.

Now, the reason this makes sense and the reason it's going to work is a combination of a couple of factors. First, it is a fact that we have got the best geniuses in the world right here in America when it comes to designing cars, and I know because they are designing some cars that are going to blow this record out of the way. By 2022 we are going to have cars that are way beyond 35 miles a gallon. I want to talk about one of those cars.

One of them is the General Motors Volt. And I have here today a picture of the General Motors Volt, a car that General Motors hopes to have in production 5 years from now. This car exists. I saw it at the Anaheim Electric Car Association Convention last weekend in Anaheim, California. And this car is a miracle because it is what's called a plug-in hybrid car. This car uses new lithium-ion batteries designed by A123 Battery Company in Massachusetts. And this car you plug in. You go home at night and plug it into your garage outlet. You unplug it in the morning. You drive 40 miles with no gasoline at all, free of gasoline from the Mid East or anywhere else, for that matter; 40 miles, zero pollution for 1 to 2 cents a mile. Gasoline costs 9 to 12 cents a mile to run your car for 40 miles. After 40 miles if you want to drive 40 miles, and 40 percent of Americans' average trips are over 40 miles a day, then you use hybrid technology to use a combination of gasoline and someday cellulosic ethanol and electricity like the hybrids now run to run your normal 250-, 300-mile range.

Now, that is a tremendous deal for Americans who get low-priced fuel for 40 miles, zero CO₂. Similar cars that are on the road today get 100 miles a gallon of gasoline today using this combination of electricity. And when we use cellulosic ethanol, we'll get 500 miles a gallon of gasoline using a combination of electricity, a hybrid. Now, this technology is going to blow that CAFE standard away. And after talking to the scientists at this electric car convention, I am very convinced that this is going to happen, and GM has certainly put big money behind this. So I'm very excited about the first step, which is to improve automobile efficiency, to talk about that tonight.

With that I would like to yield to my friend RON KLEIN from Florida, who has been a leader in the freshmen class. Thank goodness this freshmen class has shown up. That's one of the reasons we are making these strides tonight.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I would like to thank my good friend from Wash-

ington, who has been working on these issues and talking and moving toward getting the Congress to act on behalf of the American people on energy issues for 10 years-plus.

And as you and I have talked about this this year, I have learned a lot from you. I know that I personally have had 20 years of my own personal beliefs that Americans can accomplish anything. You've talked to me about the Manhattan Project. We all know about Sputnik. And these were callings of a generation ago to say when America wants to do something, we want to focus our scientists, our education, our entrepreneurs, all the elements that come together so that Americans can accomplish anything, we did it. And this is the moment in time in the national security side in making sure that we never have to make another foreign policy decision based on where the next drop of oil is coming from; the new economy side, and that's the job creation that you are talking about and many people are talking about, the entrepreneurs at home in our communities that are developing the GM Volt and the other car companies and all the entrepreneurs that are developing the alternative means of furnishing energy that are different from fossil fuels; and certainly the environmental side.

And being from Florida and your being from the other corner of our country, we have a great sensitivity to our environment. And I represent a coast of 75 miles at sea level; so we are particularly sensitive that we do everything we can to make sure that our environment is protected, that we don't do things to affect the global temperature, which may, in fact, change the level of the ocean and, of course, do a lot of other damage.

These are very exciting times. And, again, as a member of the freshman class and with Democrats and Republicans in our class, we have all come to that same conclusion that you have come to along with many others and the leadership of this Congress to say this is not a choice of drilling more off the coast of Florida or in Alaska. Those are false choices. When you hear the discussion that we have to drill or we can't become energy independent, that's ridiculous. What we really need to be doing is focusing, as this bill does, on alternative renewable energy sources.

And one of the things that I am very excited about also is the correcting of something that Congress did a year or so ago, and I know you were against this at the time, but it was passed by the leaders at that time in the Congress and the President signed it. The President correctly said a couple of years ago in his State of the Union we are addicted to oil.

So what did Congress do over your objections and others? They basically gave some \$15 billion or some number like that to the oil companies to subsidize them for more oil drilling. Now,

we all believe in a capitalist system. We believe in for-profit and companies prospering. And the oil companies right now are making more money than any company in the history of the United States. So I find it particularly offensive as a taxpayer like everybody in the country to have to add frosting on the cake and give Federal tax subsidies to those oil companies over and above that. That's not right.

And what this bill does, and I know you are going to talk about this, is it redirects that type of incentive, those tax incentives, to change consumer behavior, to incentivize our entrepreneurs and our scientists to come up with the kinds of products that will move us toward energy independence, because it is all about this next generation. And when I speak to kids in school, I know we charge them up and say this is your calling. This is something that we as adults and our children have to really work together to make sure that we do this together.

So I'm very happy to be here in support of what you are doing tonight. And I look forward, when you are done with that, talking about a specific kind of energy alternative that is very exciting that I have been watching in my community. But I appreciate your bringing this up tonight.

Mr. INSLEE. Yes. And I want to dovetail the second step. We've got five steps we're going to talk about tonight. The second step is on the taxes to really level the playing field for new technologies.

I don't think our constituents are very happy about paying \$3-plus for gasoline. They are less happy on top of that to then throw in some serious change, about \$21 billion, with a "b," of the money they send to Uncle Sam on April 15 that is now shelled out to the largest oil companies that are making more profits than any corporation in the history of this solar system. And there is nothing wrong with profits, but there is something wrong with taxing Americans to add to those profits to, frankly, a very mature industry. This is not like this is a new industry that we are helping to get going. They've been around since 1880 or 1890 from the fields of Pennsylvania. This is a very mature, very profitable industry.

So what we have done in this bill is reel back in the misbegotten largesse that has been shelled out to the oil and gas industry to the tune of \$21 billion.

And what we are using that for is to help Americans adopt new clean energy technology. And it's going to be taken away from about five major oil companies, and it is going to be given to 300 million Americans that can use tax breaks when they buy a fuel-efficient car like this plug-in hybrid car or when they weatherize their house and put in more insulation or when they want to buy energy-efficient heating or cooling.

This is like taking from the few, if you will, who never deserved it and giving to the many who need this help

now to adopt their old infrastructure, houses, cars, businesses, to the new clean energy. And it is going to do something for our business community too, and I want to talk about that. And this is Florida-specific. Mr. KLEIN represents Florida. I want to talk about a technology that is a kind of technology that we should be assisting.

This is a picture of technology called solar thermal technology. This is designed by the Ausra Company, A-u-s-r-a. The Ausra Company has developed a way to concentrate the Sun's radiant energy on a pipe. You can't see this very well, but this is a pipe of water that is essentially heated up by the reflected Sun rays. And they have discovered a way to make these mirrors very inexpensively and then heat this water and develop steam and drive a steam turbine and generate electricity. This company just signed a contract for 300 megawatts for a utility in Florida, enough for somewhere between 250,000 and 300,000 homes that they are going to produce electricity for with zero carbon dioxide, zero greenhouse gas emissions in Florida, 177 megawatts in California. And they believe that, within about a decade, once you make enough mirrors so you bring down the cost per unit of mirror, they will be able to compete with coal-based electricity.

Now, what makes sense, and what we have done, with a few Republicans' help, and it's not many but a few, we have reeled back in that \$21 billion from the oil and gas companies and we have redirected some of that assistance to a company like the Ausra Company so they can develop this new technology. Now, that is a proactive action, and I am very happy to report that second small step.

Now, the gentleman wanted to talk about a specific technology. I would like to yield to him to talk about that.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I would like to thank the gentleman for the recognition about solar. Being from Florida, we call ourselves the Sunshine State. It seems like one of the most appropriate places to be one of the founding areas of solar, and yet many other States, including the State of Washington, which has a fairly active solar program, have been developing this further. But I am very excited about this project that you have mentioned in Florida or anywhere in the United States. Of course, we all know about wind power. We have large utilities in the country. We have one in our area, Florida Power and Light, FPL, that is one of the largest wind generators in the country, in Texas and other places, California. There is no one solution here.

The good news is there is a competitive economy out there. There are competitive scientists that are coming up with different ideas. I am going to mention another very interesting one.

Part of what this bill does, as you correctly mentioned, is it provides grants and seed money and challenge grants to new industries and entre-

preneurs that are developing new ideas. The Gulf Stream, we have all heard about the Gulf Stream, it is a current that runs along the eastern United States from the southern part all the way up to the eastern coast of the United States and Nova Scotia. It's a fast-moving current. Billions of gallons per minute pass off the coast of Florida, for example. We have a Centers of Excellence at Florida Atlantic University that has been developing, and there is a program out in Oregon that is doing something similar, where with turbines in the Gulf Stream itself, they can generate enough electricity, they believe, over time, to power one-third of the power needs of the whole State of Florida.

Now, we have 18 million people that live in the State of Florida. Think about that opportunity. And there are other places along the eastern seaboard of the United States that if this technology can be captured and the electricity can be generated, again, as you point out, no greenhouse gas emissions. This is totally 100 percent clean, renewable. They are working through all the environmental issues right now. They believe there will not be any as they continue to develop this.

□ 2215

It is still at midstage testing, but the opportunity is there.

And again, what's exciting now is we're capturing this excitement. The American people understand this is a necessity that we have to do these kinds of things. This is one particular program I'm interested in because I've already seen the potential that it may accomplish.

But along with solar, along with some of the other things that we're going to talk about, there are great opportunities for the United States to become energy independent in a relatively short period of time, no different than Brazil, no different than other countries around the world that have found their own natural resources that can be used, Iceland and other places, that can be used to generate the power needs for growth, for success, for a clean environment. And again, it's just very exciting.

I'm glad to be here to support this bill and encourage not only the Senate, but the President, too, when this bill gets to him, because I'm confident that Congress is going to pass a bill that's going to include most of these items that we're talking about today. When it does pass, we are going to really get the American people behind this. So, Mr. President, I hope that as we get this to you, that you join us in really taking this mission that we have to the American people and our next generation.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I hope that that occurs.

And I'm really excited about power off our coastline as well. We have a little coastline off the Pacific coast which actually has the potential to

generate power from waves. Mr. KLEIN talked about power from currents, where you can have turbines that turn, like a windmill or rotary moving mechanisms, but we also have huge power from waves that simply go up and down that are generated by the wind. And off our coast right now, we have some buoys going into the water, and as they bob up and down, they compress water, and that generates compression that turns the turbine that generates electricity. And this is a technology that is in its infancy, but there is enormous power in our wave power. In a 10x10 mile stretch off the Pacific coast, there is enough electricity for all the electrical needs of California, for instance. So, here's another technology.

I want to compare this technology to wind power. I've got a picture here of the largest wind farm in the western hemisphere, it's in southeastern Washington, in my State. These are, I think, almost three-quarters to one megawatt. That's enough for 1,000 homes, each one of these turbines. They are somewhere between 250 and 300 feet high. And what that power represents now is absolutely clean power, which today is the least expensive power that we can buy in the Pacific Northwest. If you want to get the cheapest power you can buy right now, this is the cheapest power essentially that you can buy, cheaper compared to even coal fire, or as cheap as a coal fire plant. That's why there is huge demand for these turbines. Actually, the pricing has gone up because there is so much demand for them, people want to buy them.

The reason I mention wind in conjunction with wave power and tidal power is a lot of people think that wave power and tidal power is sort of where the wind industry was about 20 to 25 years ago, in its infancy. When this started, people laughed at it. They thought it was like a big tinker toy with a bunch of folks living in a teepee that were dreaming up. And for a long time it was ahead of its time. Now it is commercially viable, it is supporting thousands of jobs. The Speaker's State of Pennsylvania has a company called Gamesa that is manufacturing these turbines. In Iowa, the Clipper Turbine Company is manufacturing. We want to make these and put them out to the world.

That's why the third step, we've talked about the first two, the auto efficiency standards, the tax fairness provisions, and now the third step we've taken is what we call the renewable electricity standard, which requires 15 percent of our electricity to come from a combination of renewable energy, clean energy sources, wind, solar, wave, enhanced geothermal, and efficiency. And we believe if we simply create those demands for these technologies, if you demand it, they will come. And these technologies will take off once we have these demands.

So, this is an important part of the package. Some of our colleagues across

the Chamber and in the Senate are balking at this. If we don't get this through now, we will next time. We will make some adjustments to it and get it through, because once people find out about these technologies, they're ready to rock and roll.

I yield to Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. If I can just add something to the gentleman's thoughts about that.

Part of what we're doing here is creating market. That is the exciting part. Obviously entrepreneurs are going to invest and make the capital investments if they know that they can sell the product. As you said with the windmills, the turbines, a market has been created. It has now justified itself to the point where the price is actually going up because the demand is there, which is great. That's great news. And some of these technologies that are being developed are at different stages. But the whole notion of creating an obligation to have 15 percent of the electricity we generate, instead of from fossil fuels, coming from these renewable energy sources will, again, move in a way which are your public utilities will come together and find ways to enhance and encourage companies to come forward and provide these products.

We are behind the curve in Europe. Europe is way ahead of us on this. Most European countries already generate a much larger percentage of their energy from renewable energy sources. And they have recognized and they've taken it upon themselves to do this, by law, voluntarily, or otherwise.

The whole notion of the environmental impacts of global warming and things like that, these are not limited to anybody's border. They're not limited to the United States' borders. They're not limited to any State. They're not limited to China. It's a worldwide issue. But Europe, in fact, has shown some good leadership here. And I think that the United States, and I know that Americans, as I said before, are very innovative people who respect their environment, that we can all work together. And this notion in this bill of making the 15 percent obligation is good because it not only makes the statement, but it creates the market which will in turn create the jobs and the new economy that will sustain and build these types of products, which is very exciting.

Mr. INSLEE. And what we have found, the genius of this, like you said, once the demand is created for these renewable energy prices, there is a very, very tried and tested rule that kicks in, which is, they become cheaper over time. And people say, well, gee, some of these things cost more than coal right now or oil and gas. Well, that's true right now, but look at what the experience has been over the last two decades. These are graphs from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory of the renewable energy cost trends over the last 25, 27 years, and there is remarkable consistency.

Wind energy started out in 1980 about 30 cents, 32 cents a kilowatt hour. It came down dramatically, until now it's down to in the range of 6 to 8 cents in this graph, that actually might be a little optimistic, in the year 2000. Look at this enormous reduction over the last 20 years because of improvements in technology, and the fact that once you have scales of economy, you manufacture more of these, they cost less.

Same thing with solar thermal technology, that type of technology I showed earlier with the mirrors, heating up the water, started out at 60 cents a kilowatt hour in 1990, gone down to about 8 cents a kilowatt hour now in the year 2000. Again, these are, frankly, a little optimistic. These charts are a little less than the numbers I've heard quoted, but you get the general trend that it's incredibly down.

Photovoltaic solar energy, that's the kind most of us are familiar with, which you have a silicone panel, and it just takes the sun's energy and spins off an electron and creates an electrical current, started at 100 cents a kilowatt hour, now it's down to 22, 24 cents a kilowatt hour.

And what we find in these charts, in almost all these technologies there is almost this kind of law, I don't know if it's got a name yet, when you increase by a factor of 10 the number of units of these renewable sources, the price comes down 20 cents. Now, what does that tell us? We know two things for sure; the cost of fossil fuels is going up, and it isn't coming down. China is coming on like gang busters. They're demanding. They want to start buying the oil for their cars, too. And as their economy grows, that demand is going up. And we know we're not producing, we're not keeping up with the pace of demand for the increase in our oil production, so fossil fuel is going up over time.

We know these renewable sources are coming down over time, including geothermal, which is coming down dramatically again, from 1 dollar in 1980 down to about 26, 28 cents now. So, we know these are coming down. These lines are going to cross. And if we're going to hitch our economic star to some technology, let's hitch our star to the technologies that are getting cheaper, not the ones that are getting more expensive over time. And that's what this bill has done.

I yield to Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. And to further your point, the supply is indefinite. It's infinite. It's perpetual. It's forever. Oil is not. And it's not a question of whether there is going to be enough oil on the ground for the next generation; it's the question of the people that are supplying the oil are not reliable sources, they're not necessarily friends of the United States. We're at their whim. We've seen the statistic, when President Bush was sworn into office in 2000, oil was at \$28 a barrel. It is now \$90 to \$100 a barrel, depending on what day is going on here. OPEC, we have no

control over that. This is a cartel of people that are not acting in our best interests at best, and at worst, in some cases, some of these organizations, these countries are financing people who are out to harm the United States. So, we are totally off in the wrong direction in terms of oil, and that has obviously been a mainstay.

Now, oil will continue to be part of our source, and that's fine. But in terms of our future, as you correctly said, where do we want to put our efforts, our resources, our energy? It should be in these renewable resources because they are coming to the point where there is going to be a crossover, and the sooner we have total control over our energy destiny, the better off we're going to be from a national security point, from an economic growth point, and everything else.

Mr. INSLEE. I would now like to turn to the fourth small step that we've taken, and the fourth step that we've taken is to embrace what we call the first fuel of clean energy. And the first fuel of clean energy is not wasting it. What we have found, and I've done a lot of research in this field, almost always the cheapest energy and the most effective energy you can get is the energy you don't waste. The efficient use of energy is the first place we've got to look.

Our bill in many ways demanded more efficiency for Americans. It demands that our lighting industry produce lighting that is 40 to 60 percent more energy efficient. It demands that our air conditioning units become much more efficient, that our buildings become much more efficient. There is a provision in there that we want to create model building codes, that when we build our buildings they won't waste as much energy as they do.

Many people believe that probably 30 to 40 percent of the road we have to travel we will get there simply by not wasting energy. And I want to go to exhibits A and B on that, show you a picture of a couple of folks in Redmond, Washington, Mike and Meg Town. They're standing in their doorway here. Mike is a science teacher at Redmond High School. It's a rainy environment out northeast of Seattle. And a few years ago when he was teaching his kids about clean energy, one of his kids said, Hey, Mr. Town, if you think this is so hot, why don't you build a house like this? And he said, I think I'll do just that.

So he basically set out to build a zero electrical net usage home by using efficiency, conservation, and a little bit of photovoltaic, and he did it. And here is a picture of his home. It didn't cost much of anything more than a normal home of this site. I think you'll agree it's a nice-looking place. It's in a rainy environment, but he managed to make it zero net electrical usage by doing some commonsense things. He used a little additional insulation. He used energy-efficient windows. He designed a home that uses a little bit of what's

called passive solar heating, so the solar rays, when we get them in Seattle, which is twice a year, I think, on August 12th and 13th, heats the inside of the home. And he did some photovoltaic array. He put on himself these darker panels up here on the roof that he actually put on.

And now Mike says one of the great joys is, first off, he uses about half as much energy as a normal home. And when he does use it, he's producing it largely with his PV system. And when he's generating more than he uses, his meter runs backwards. And he says there is nothing more fun than going out and watching your meter run backwards as you're feeding electricity back into the grid.

So, Meg and Mike Town are sort of walking examples of what our bill is going to do, which is to help Americans weatherize their homes, make sure their businesses are using energy-efficient appliances, and when we do that, we're going to use this first fuel. That's kind of a commonsense thing to do.

So, I want to move to the fifth step now. And the fifth step that we took is we adopted what's called a renewable fuel standard. In a renewable fuel standard, we guaranteed that we will have 32 billion gallons of biofuels that will be homegrown in the United States in the next 20 years. And the reason we said that is we think it makes more sense to get our energy from middle western farmers rather than Middle Eastern sheiks. And it doesn't make a lot of sense to take our subsidized agricultural products, export them, take the money from the international buyers, and then just ship it to Saudi Arabia. It's just kind of a shell game with money. Let's cut out the middle man and grow our own.

For those who doubt we can do that, I want to refer them to a little company in Grays Harbor, Washington, and I like to tell a little story about this company.

□ 2230

This is a picture of the Imperium Biofuels biodiesel plant in Grays Harbor, Washington. It is on the coast of Washington State. Imperium Biofuels is the largest biodiesel plant in the world, and it is in Washington State. It produces 100 million gallons of biodiesel, principally using canola oil, some additional oils that they are using, soybean and a couple of others. This company started from a guy in Seattle, Washington, who was a pilot, who got tired of flying airplanes, he got bored of flying airplanes and decided he would start an energy company. He started brewing up biodiesel in his garage. And the part of this story I like is he went to the Rainier Brewing Company and he got two old brewing vats from the Rainier Brewing Company, and he started brewing up biodiesel. What a great can-do story. He went out and raised some capital and now built the largest biodiesel plant in the world, and plans on building 10 or 20 more of these.

Now, with the capacity of biodiesel and with advanced forms of ethanol, and I am talking about advanced forms of ethanol, we have the capacity to provide 25 to 30 percent of all our transportation fuels from homegrown United States crops without jeopardizing our food chain, without jeopardizing the production of our domestic food supplies. And the reason for this is, and if you talk to John Plaza he will tell you about this, we have the capability of using whole new types of biofuels. We know we use corn ethanol now. But we only use the seed of the corn. We only use the kernel. We are now going to have cellulosic ethanol which uses the whole plant, all of the carbohydrates, from the stalk, the stem, what they call the corn stover, from wheat chaff that is now left on the ground. There is a company called Iogen in Idaho that is planning to bale it up and make that into cellulosic ethanol. When we do this, we will be able to produce a significant part of our transportation fuel.

So this is our fifth step. It is common sense. It is home grown. And for those who have heard a lot of controversy about corn ethanol, I have been talking to the scientists on this. You will be blown away by what is coming. There are crops now in development, one called miscanthus by a company called Mendel Biotechnology in Hayward, California. It is a crop they have developed that is four to five times more productive than corn per acre of ethanol. Now when farmers can start selling four to five times more ethanol per acre than they are today, we will decrease the pressure on our land. This crop uses less fertilizer and less water than corn today. So we look at corn ethanol as sort of the DC-3 of biofuels. It is a start. We are going to move forward to the Boeing 787, which is cellulosic ethanol.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I am going to add another form of ethanol out there that I think people around the world are familiar with in Brazil, which is a very large country, it is a fully industrialized country. They decided a generation ago to move towards energy independence for the same reasons we are having these discussions here today in this country. And they have oil. They have lots of other things, but they use sugar-based ethanol, a different type of ethanol based on a sugar product, and it is cellulosic based.

I have heard and some of the research that has been done, well, it is not as efficient, and there are food-chain issues and everything else. As far as I am concerned, and I know that many Members of Congress and most Americans believe, where there's a will there is a way. If there are any technological limitations to anything we have talked about tonight, they can be overcome. I think this entire conversation needs to be about how can we move forward in all these areas. If there is a limitation, let's figure out how to overcome that.

Again, sugar-based ethanol in Brazil, their ethanol that is a big part of their

production. The cost is slightly different from here, but, again, let's figure it out. It could be a question of production; it could be a question of greater efficiency of production of sugar cane, where in Florida we have a very large production of sugar cane, and obviously most of it is used for production of food. In other parts of the country, sugar beet and other things are used to produce sugar.

But the point of all this, and I think the part that is so interesting, is that various types of alternative or renewable energy sources are already in production as you have in Washington in different stages. And we are allowing every one of these to compete. That is the greatest thing about our economy. It is a system where the great ideas, the great science will move forward and whatever is most efficient over time, it could be any combination of ways that we are going to achieve energy independence in this next generation, we will do it. So when I hear people, the naysayers, the people who say, oh, we can't do this, there is this problem, there is that problem, we can do it. We are going to do it. We will do it. It is going to require everybody to partner together, consumers to drive this, industry to drive it, education and scientists to drive it, government partnering with the private sector to drive it. It is going to happen.

Again, I am so proud to be part of a Congress that recognizes this and is moving this notion forward, and I'm proud the American people are finally coming together and saying, hey, this is something that is all about who we are, how we define ourselves, we being the great leaders in the world; and science and other things are going to use our scientists and our technology to achieve these great goals. It is exciting to see a plant like that with all the silos and all the great things going on there. They are already the largest in the world. That is pretty exciting.

Mr. INSLEE. What is neat about this is a lot of these things are happening in areas that have previously been quite depressed. This is an area that has really been hurt when the timber industry has had some tough times. And now we have got this, and there are two other very green industries that have developed in Grays Harbor, Washington.

You look around the Midwest where the ethanol plants have gone up, these communities have really revitalized. A lot of them have been using co-ops. This is not all money from Wall Street. These are co-ops where people have banded together and built their own industry. It is a very unifying experience when these communities do this.

We see this happening in the inner city where we are developing green collar jobs, where we are improving the efficiency of older buildings. When you have a green collar job to rebuild a building to make it energy efficient, that job doesn't get shipped to China.

It is right here. It is a local green collar job. That is why we are excited about that.

We talked about the five steps we took last Thursday: number one, auto efficiency, which we are calling for; number two, commonsense tax fairness to move some of these things away from oil and gas to these new businesses and consumers to help them; number three, the renewable energy standards so we can have clean energy electricity; number four, the efficiency standards that Mike and Meg Town used to such effect to allow your home to be efficient; and, number five, the renewable fuels standard where we are calling for advanced fuels.

And by the way, our renewable fuels standard requires these advanced biofuels. It requires about two-thirds of this to be from these advanced forms, not just corn ethanol, but advanced forms of ethanol in the future. So those are five significant steps.

Just to note how significant they are, there has been an independent group that evaluates energy policy that has evaluated a very similar plan to this and concluded that when this plan is implemented, it will save more carbon dioxide from going into the atmosphere, the principal global warming gas, than all of our cars and trucks are putting into the atmosphere today. This is a big, big deal. We know we have to reduce our carbon dioxide by probably 80 percent by the year 2050 to prevent carbon dioxide from going over twice preindustrial levels. This is about maybe 35 or more percent of the way we need to go. So it is a very significant first five steps on that path.

For those who are interested in this subject, I want to congratulate Vice President Al Gore for winning the Nobel Peace Prize. I read his acceptance speech, which anyone who is interested in the subject I would recommend it to them. It is available on some Web site somewhere. It is a brilliant statement of the planetary emergency we now have, and I would encourage people to take a look at it because it will give you a sense of urgency that we have.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I am going to give you a plug because not only did Al Gore obviously earn the Nobel Prize for what he did, but Mr. INSLEE you have also taken upon yourself not only to work in this Congress, but you also have independently written about this subject and you have brought forward a publication called "Apollo's Fire." I don't know if you talked about it in the very beginning. I am going to give you a little plug because I have had a chance to take a look at it. It is an inspirational book that talks about what we have talked about tonight and where the country is going.

I will read one quote which I thought was very self-descriptive, and this is a quote out of your book. It says: "A new Apollo Project for energy is really a mission to rebuild our economy. Smart energy policy is, in fact, good economic

policy. The two are inextricably intertwined. Done right, solving our crisis of climate change and oil dependence can create tremendous opportunity for America and the world, not only by avoiding the severe economic harm of climate disruption, but also by driving new investment into local and metropolitan economies, increasing social justice and reducing economic disparity by creating new career ladders and skilled domestic jobs across the economic spectrum."

And I think in that quote you have captured a lot of what America is interested in: the environmental issues, the impact on our whole society and the job opportunities that go on. It doesn't touch the national security issues because I think people clearly already know it is a bad deal for us to depend on other countries. But the internal things that operate inside the United States, our economy, our daily lives, our jobs, the fact you are spending \$60 for a tank of gas on something that is creating problems in the economy, in the environment, and instead we can go in a totally different direction. The book you have entitled "Apollo's Fire" I think lays it out very nicely. And I just wanted to mention that because I commend you and I recommend the Members of this body to take a look at that because I think it lays it out very clearly in a very simple fashion so that Americans can take that charge and move forward with it.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, this is why this is something that can unify us, because it is an economic growth plan, it is something that can unify us, red State, blue State, urban, rural, all of us can get behind economic development. And we have seen instances of that tonight when we have talked about that. I think the bill that we have promoted ought to be able to promote that economic development in rural and urban areas, red and blue States. I really think it is a unifying message.

We mentioned these five steps, but there is a giant leap for mankind that will be on our plate when we return in January, that is, we have to find a way to limit the amount of carbon dioxide that is going into the atmosphere. And the ultimate way to do that is what we call a cap-and-trade system, which we hope to embrace and pass in this House next year.

A cap-and-trade system does two things. First, it caps the amount of total carbon that goes into the atmosphere, the total amount of pollution, the total amounts of carbon dioxide and methane that contribute to global climate change. And we have done this in a variety of pollutants, particularly sulfur dioxide, which we have a cap on. Previous Congresses have put a cap on sulfur dioxide. But we have a giant loophole in that there is no cap today for carbon dioxide and some of these other global warming gases.

So next year, we will be working on a plan to cap the total amount of these global warming gases that go into the

atmosphere and give the Americans the confidence and the security to know that their grandkids aren't going to be exposed to runaway climate change associated with global warming. And then we are going to insist that polluting industries that put that pollution in the air have to pay for that. They can't do it for free any more.

Essentially, they have been using the atmosphere like a private garbage dump, like they back their truck full of junk and dump it into your county park. We don't let them do that, dump their junk in our county park, and we are not going to let them dump their CO₂ in the atmosphere any more with zero cost.

So there will be a charge associated with that and that will be tradable amongst industries to make it efficient. So when we adopt this cap-and-trade system, we will truly have the ultimate incentive for the geniuses of America to create these technologies, and we will be looking for people's input on this. We hope to have a bipartisan bill to do this, because there is no Republican or Democrat, or shouldn't be in this debate. We want to have something that all our kids can have a future on and we hope to do that. So, Mr. KLEIN, I wonder if you have any final comments.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue forward and allowing us to discuss this in the Congress. I certainly am going to recommend to our colleagues here in the Congress, the House and the Senate, while we go home and have a chance to have some working days at home during the holidays, to speak to our business entrepreneurs in our local communities, speak to our universities, speak to the scientists, speak to consumers.

I think, number one, that people are excited about these ideas; but as you are suggesting, this is just the first step. Whatever law we pass ultimately you can pass all the laws you want and it is up to Americans to say, this is our priority. This is something we are going to embrace. And this is something we are going to follow through. The private sector ultimately is going to drive this. We encourage our businesses. We encourage our academics to work together and come up with new ideas, express those ideas to the extent that government can partner, if there are things we can do to eliminate regulation or change policy to make things easier to move it in a direction where businesses and homeowners can do things to create more environmentally friendly pieces of property improvements, things like that and industry. It is good for all of us.

So I look forward to working with you and the rest of the Members of Congress and moving our country forward on this very important topic.

□ 2245

Mr. INSLEE. Well, we have a ways to go, but we have made five maybe not-

so-small steps for a few people here in Congress and in America. We have one giant leap for mankind to come. But we have got a great start, and this is going to help Americans, both their environment, their security and their economy, and that is three bold steps.

Thanks for your participation, Mr. KLEIN.

THE GROWING AND DISTURBING TREND OF FOOD AND CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY RECALLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor tonight and discuss a growing problem that we seem to be seeing, a disturbing trend in food and consumer product safety recalls.

Mr. Speaker, the danger is very real. It has been widely documented, discussed in the media, in committee hearings, and around the water cooler at work. We have just come through a summer of recall after recall after recall after recall.

What is the upshot of this, Mr. Speaker? The upshot is that parents are afraid. Parents are afraid that their children are playing with lead-tainted toys. Parents are afraid that magnets in toys or charms may cause internal damage if a child accidentally swallows them. Families are afraid that the food they feed their pets may actually have little bits of plastic in it and poison their beloved pet. People are afraid that their toothpaste may contain antifreeze and poison them. People are afraid that the fish they serve to their families may have dangerous levels of antibiotics contained within them.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about specific concerns, but generally people are afraid. They are afraid about the source of these products and dangers, and rightfully so.

Mr. Speaker, people are afraid about defective products being imported into our country, and it seems like almost all of those imports come from a single source, a single country, the People's Republic of China.

Consumers' health and well-being are being endangered on two fronts; in the food we eat and the goods we use. I want to use some time tonight to talk about both fronts and what we in Congress are doing, what we have done, and what we should be doing to protect American families from harmful products.

Let's first consider the issue of consumer product safety recalls. It seems like the Nation has also turned its attention to this issue. Every time you turn on the TV, every time you open up a newspaper, you learn about yet another consumer product safety recall. While people are concerned generally about the issue of recalls, many people, many people, myself included, are concerned with the source of the recall.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I stress, it appears that the majority of recalled products originate in and from the People's Republic of China.

Now, I have signed up for e-mail notification for recalled products through the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission, and I seem to get almost daily e-mails announcing the latest recalls. And, yes, most of the recalled products were manufactured in China.

As a parent, as a physician, one recall that was announced last month was extremely disturbing. I am referring to the infamous recall that literally had a child's product, the Spin Master Aqua Dots, laced with the chemicals that are contained in the drug Rohypnol, the infamous date rape drug.

Mr. Speaker, it is an innocent enough looking product, an innocent enough looking toy, a little bit interesting. I bet if my daughters were still little, they would have loved this. However, while it may look innocent, this product is actually a wolf in sheep's clothing.

In the recall notification, and I encourage everyone to sign up for the recall notification at CPSC.Gov, the Consumer Product Safety Commission listed the injuries that these beads caused, these beads that were available just a few weeks ago on the shelf of any store that any of us could go to in our communities back home.

"The Consumer Product Safety Commission has received two reports over the last several days of children swallowing Aqua Dots. A 20-month-old child swallowed several dozen beads. He became dizzy and vomited several times before slipping into a comatose state for a period of time."

Well, that is a pretty serious situation. A 20-months-old child? It doesn't say how long the comatose state lasted, but I submit to you any length of time that a 20-month-old child spends in a comatose state is alarming, frightening, disturbing and upsetting to the parents. And to think it was caused by a toy that they bought to amuse their child, well, it is almost unthinkable, unthinkable as a parent, that that could happen.

A second child also ingested some dots, vomited and slipped into a comatose state and was hospitalized for 5 days.

Mr. Speaker, according to a report on ABC News, quoting here, "Scientists say a chemical coating on the beads, when ingested, metabolizes into the so-called date rape drug gamma hydroxy butyrate. When eaten, the compound, made from common and easily available ingredients, can induce unconsciousness, seizures, drowsiness, coma and death."

While it is not yet clear how the chemical wound up in the child's product, it is clear, it is very clear, where this product was manufactured. It was manufactured in the People's Republic of China.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are here working away trying to finish up our business, because Christmas is right around the corner, and with the Christmas season upon us, I cannot help but think there has to be a huge market in this country for something that not only doesn't say "made in the People's Republic of China," but says "made in America," "made in America" on the toy, on the goods that we buy. Wouldn't that be something?

I encourage retailers to stock as many "made in America" products as they can. Since the majority of products that are being recalled this year were made in China, this year, this year my family and I have made the personal decision to try not to buy anything with the "made in China" label. Given all of the circumstances, it seems like the right thing to do for my family. And I am certain that other American families have come to a very similar conclusion. You can't turn on the television at night without hearing Lou Dobbs talk about this, and I bet his family is one of those families as well.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at just a few of the products that have been recalled, shall we? The concern about these imported products is real and it has been substantiated with real data. The United States Consumer Product Safety Commission, which is tasked with the job of trying to safeguard our society from unreasonable risk of injury and death associated with consumer products, informed me in that in fiscal year 2007 there were a record-breaking 472 consumer product safety recalls. Of the 472 recalls, more than 60 percent, over half, were manufactured in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, more than 60 percent of all recalled products this past year were made in China.

Furthermore, of the 472 total consumer product recalls, 61 of those recalls affected our most innocent and vulnerable members of society, our children. Sixty-one consumer product recalls were toys. And how many of those products were manufactured in the People's Republic of China, you might ask? Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad you did. That figure is even more staggering. In the United States, the Consumer Product Safety Commission estimated that over 90 percent of the toy recalls originated in the country of China. It is clearly now becoming a common business practice for Chinese toys.

So here is the question: Does the label "made in China" translate into "this product may be hazardous to your health or to your child's health?" Here they are, just a few of the products. This poster was actually made a little bit earlier, it was close to Halloween and you see some Halloween type motifs here, but products that any child would delight in owning. But these are products that have been found to be unsafe and recalls have been issued by the Consumer Product Safety Commission.