Florida, in regular session, duly assembled, that said Board hereby supports the adoption of legislation by the United States Congress to create a reasonably priced national reinsurance program that will help Americans find private insurance protection from natural catastrophes for their homes while reducing the demand on governmental resources to assist victims after an event occurs.

Done and Resolved this 8th day of May, 2007.

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

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

UNANTICIPATED GOOD RESULTS (WHEN WE LEAVE)

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss the irrationality of our current foreign policy and the expected concrete benefits of changing that policy.

First, we need to look at the inconsistent and counterproductive way we currently treat other nations. We reward and respect nations with nuclear weapons. Look at how we treat Russia, China, Pakistan, India and North Korea. Our policies serve as an incentive for rogue nations to achieve a nuclear capability. Saddam Hussein was so convinced of this that he pretended he was on the verge of getting a nuclear weapon. Iran is now doing the same thing, yet our CIA assures us they have quite a ways to go before they have a nuclear capability.

Without our ''remaking'' the Middle East, Iran would have less incentive to develop a weapon. And under the NPT, Iran has a right to pursue peaceful use of nuclear power.

The foolishness of our foreign policy has us spending money in Pakistan, a military dictatorship with nuclear weapons, which is harboring Osama Bin Laden. The irony that taxpayers are paying to help protect Osama Bin Laden is astounding. For all the so-called reasons we threaten Iran, the same logic could apply to Pakistan many fold and, for that matter, even to Saudi Arabia, from where 15 of the 19 hijackers came.

A changed policy in the region would greatly diffuse the boiling conflict now brewing with Iran. Just an announcement, if they believed us, of a move toward diplomacy and plans to move our troops and Navy out of this region may well lead to a sharp drop in oil prices.

But credibility is the key. If no one believes we're sincere in altering our foreign policy of militarism to that of peaceful relationships with all who desire it, it won't work.

Credibility would depend on us discontinuing building permanent bases in Iraq. We don't need a single base in the entire Middle East to protect U.S. security. Having bases there only jeopardizes our security.

The embassy we're building in Iraq, the largest in the world, a virtual fortress, nearly the size of the Vatican, should be donated to some Iraqi organization that might make good use of it. A small office with a few personnel would send a signal of our intent not to rule the Middle East for decades to come.

The economic benefits of a foreign policy of nonintervention are extraordinary. The wars that result from meddling in the internal affairs of other nations cause much greater economic harm than most people imagine. The cliche that war is a stimulus to economic growth is blatantly false.

The billions of dollars saved just in the last decade if we weren't in the Middle East could have been spent here at home improving the conditions of all Americans, or would have prevented our huge national and foreign debt from exploding to historic records.

Inflation, though denied by our government as being a serious problem, would be greatly reduced. We shouldn't forget, the big inflation of prices from our spendthrift ways for this war is yet to come.

Without a war going on in the Middle East, we can rebuild our Armed Forces, now run down from this prolonged war. This would certainly help the National Guard and our Reserves to rebuild and re-equip.

It's estimated that 90 percent of our Army and National Guard is poorly equipped. A new policy would return our National Guard to the States to be available when an emergency comes, no longer leaving the States high and dry because these troops are in Iraq.

Some of these dollars saved and personnel brought home could be redirected toward border protection here in this country. The border guards sent off to Iraq to train Iraqis in border control could return to their proper function here in the United States.

The constant and growing dissent here in the United States over the war would disappear. Though not as bad as in the 1960s, it's a growing problem that can't be ignored.

The threat of terrorism would be greatly reduced, as the evidence is overwhelming that our foreign policy of intervention, occupation, bombing and sanctions is the main incentive for radical insurgents to commit suicide terrorism.

Those who misled us into the war in Iraq continually claim that, yes, that's true. Mistakes were made. But now the reason we must stay is to clean up the mess we created, while never admitting that the mess gets worse and the costs go up the longer we stay.

The time has come for a change. A message that our diplomatic doors are open and the preemptive war option is off the table would be a powerful message of peace and hope, not only to the Middle East but to the entire world.

The nay-saying warmongers who preach inevitable and long-lasting conflicts must be marginalized. The time for change is now.

□ 1815

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

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

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

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

GLOBAL WARMING

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 as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor this evening with Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri, and perhaps others will join us, with a message of optimism in the face of a great challenge that our country faces. And we have faced many challenges, but one of the more pressing for ourselves and our grandchildren is the issue of global warming, this concern that our increased carbon dioxide and other gasses is going to result in significant climactic shifts. And the science, of course, has been very disturbing recently about this threat.

But we have come to talk about a message of optimism that our country ought to have in our ability to solve this problem. And it is a large problem. It is perhaps certainly more global than we have ever had outside of war. But we today want to talk about why we believe America is ready to face that challenge, why we believe America is capable of succeeding in beating global warming, and why we believe the effort to defeat global warming will ultimately benefit the United States economy by allowing us to lead the world in new clean energy technologies.

And I would like to, in preface to our comments today, just set the stage about what the challenge is and why we believe the solution is one that Americans are fully capable of obtaining.

First, the challenge. The challenge, of course, is that we have created a condition where we may double the concentration of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere by about 2050, twice as high as carbon dioxide has ever been since before pre-industrial times. And, of course, all of the scientists in the

world agree that carbon dioxide is a global warming gas, and it does stand to reason that if you double the amount of this global warming gas, you could have problems in your climate. And, unfortunately, the evidence has become more and more disturbing.

Just last week, the Goddard Space Science Department at NASA came out with a new report authored by lead author James Hansen that said, ''If global emissions of carbon dioxide continue to rise at the rate of the past decade, this research shows that there will be disastrous effects, including the increasingly rapid sea level rise, increased frequency of droughts and floods, and increased stress on wildlife and plants due to rapidly shifting climate zones.''

This is not a quote from some fellow living in a tepee. This is NASA. The agency that sent an American to the moon has been looking at what is happening right here at home on Earth and has concluded that, indeed, we have trouble; and what is very disturbing is that the most recent science has been more disturbing.

We were briefed by Dr. John Schellenhuller, who is the lead scientist in Europe on this subject, last week, who told us about the increasing melt in the Arctic that has increased in severity, about the melting tundra. The rate of the melt of the tundra is melting much more rapidly than was anticipated even a year ago; and, of course, that can release methane gas, which is even 16 times worse for global warming than even carbon dioxide. My local scientists at the University of Washington in Seattle have confirmed these findings.

So, basically, we have got an issue that we have got to deal with. And right now there really is a race going on in the world of tipping points. These scientists have told us that we are approaching tipping points where the climate can tip into regimes where we would have uncontrollable global warming and that that could happen in as short as shortly after the next decade.

But we have another tipping point which we believe we are about to cross over here in Congress, and that is a tipping point where the U.S. Congress will tip from sort of an approach of the ostrich, where we had our head in the sand, to tip over to the approach of the American eagle, where we will have a new vision about a new clean energy technological future for this country.

So we are here tonight to say that that new approach of optimism is one that will prevail starting next Wednesday when the Energy Subcommittee in the U.S. Congress will start discussions about a new clean energy future for this country.

I will be introducing a bill in about a week called the New Apollo Energy Act, which will come forth with a whole suite of ideas about how to adopt new clean energy solutions. And, of course, we call it the New Apollo Energy Act because we think what Kennedy believed about America, which was that we were the greatest innovation country in the world, is something that we have got going for us. So we should use our technological genius just like we did when we went to the moon.

So before I yield to Mr. CLEAVER, I want to talk about why I have optimism about our ability to skin this cat, why I believe we can dramatically reduce our carbon dioxide emissions and dramatically tell our grandchildren that we are going to use our know-how to solve this problem. And the reason I am confident about this is that in the last year I have been doing a rather intensive review of the technology that we hope to bring to bear on this subject and I have been getting to know the Americans really across the country who tonight are inventing new technological solutions so we can move forward on clean energy. I just want to mention a few of them.

First, there is a company in Massachusetts called the A123 Battery Company. I love the number. A123 Battery Company. And they have developed a lithium ion battery which is so powerful that basically in the size of about two or three shoe boxes you could put it in your car, which they are prepared to do this fall, and turn your hybrid car into a plug-in hybrid car. And I drove one actually, a converted plug-in hybrid that I drove around the capital a few weeks ago. This battery is so powerful that you will be able to plug in your car, drive it for 20 to 40 miles just on electricity, no gasoline. Then after 40 miles you use gasoline and you will get over 150 miles a gallon on either your ethanol, eventually, once it is a flex-fuel, plug-in hybrid, or your gasoline. Now, that is a heck of a deal for Americans for your first 40 miles to have zero carbon dioxide coming out your tailpipe. A123 Battery Company.

The second company called Nanosolar. Nanosolar is a new company in California that has developed a photovoltaic cell, a solar cell, which uses nanotechnology to dramatically decrease the manufacturing costs and the costs of solar energy. And they are going to make a solar cell that is 1/50 as thick as the current silicone-based solar cells. It is called thin cell technology.

A third company, Ausra Company, a former Australian company that has been moved to the United States that has breakthrough technology on solar thermal where you use parabolic mirrors to concentrate the sun's rays to heat gas to 1,100 degrees and turn a turbine, again, dramatically potentially reducing the cost of solar energy.

So I wanted to first start our discussion with the context of great Americans doing great things in energy, and here are three companies moving forward. And to continue this discussion, I want to yield to Mr. CLEAVER, who has been a great leader on these energy issues fresh in Congress. I would like to yield to him for his perspective on our ability to move forward in global warming and clean energy.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for all the work that he has done on this very important issue.

I agree with Mr. INSLEE that this problem we face is not irreversible. However, time is not on our side. Almost exactly 7 days ago, I was in Greenland, and on the front page of today's Washington Post is a picture of a harbor at Illulissat, Greenland. This is about 170 miles north of the Arctic circle. And for those who might want to go to the Washington Post Web site or if you have a Washington Post, you will see blue waters.

Now, on the surface, pardon the pun, it would appear that this is normal. However, the Greenlanders explained to our delegation, which was led by Speaker PELOSI, that under normal circumstances at this time of the year this area is completely frozen. In fact, they say that their ancestors at this time of the year would get on the water, which was, of course, frozen solid, and go to Canada to get lumber to bring back to build houses. And they would travel on the water that is frozen with their dogs pulling their sleighs.

Now, I went out in a boat out to an iceberg which was melting. There are 53,000 people who live in Greenland. I did not have the opportunity to speak with 53,000, but I can tell you with no fear of contradiction that every person we spoke with from Greenland spoke to us about their fear of what is happening to their native land. These are not politicians. These are not scientists. These are not college professors. All they know is that never during their lifetime have they seen the kinds of things that they are witnessing now.

For example, they speak now of the fact that their animals can actually graze longer. Now, I never saw a tree in the entire country of Greenland, but at a very short period of time during the summer grass does grow. Greenery does appear on the landscape. And what the natives are telling us, the Greenlanders, is that their animals can graze much longer today than their ancestors and the ancestors before them had ever reported. So this means that something dramatic has happened to the climate.

I was told that just 15 or 20 years ago at this time of the year people who had automobiles could drive out into the harbor and drive around to other villages along the coast of Greenland. Today, it is blue water. This is blue water.

Well, maybe to people who are watching they are saying, well, so the water is blue around Greenland. Well, the danger, of course, is that the fact that we are seeing a melting down of the Greenland ice sheet means that the sea levels would inevitably, unavoidably,

predictably rise; and when that happens, it means that coastal areas, including the United States, are jeopardized.

Now, to the Greenlanders, it means a lot of other things, all of them bad. For example, they are noticing fish coming into the waters around Greenland that are not native there. In fact, many of the people who have never left Greenland, they were born there, they fished there, they killed whales. They also, by the way, wanted to make sure that they told us that they never killed whales or caught fish for sport, that when they killed whales they did it in order to eat and survive.

□ 1830

But they say that now they are noticing large numbers of cod coming into the waters. What does that mean? It means that they are running away from the area, fish that are native to that area, because of course they are also predators. So we are finding that the entire environment is now being altered because of global warming.

As I mentioned earlier, they know nothing about the debate that's going on in the United States. They know nothing about the charges that this is some kind of hoax. All they know is that it's getting warmer.

One of the most amazing things I saw in Greenland was a fly. Now, remember that the temperature where we were was in the 20s. This is Greenland. And my wife and I go to the window and look out, and there is a fly trying to get outside. Now, as I reported that to others, they certainly shrugged their shoulders and said, yeah, that's another example of what is happening. Twenty degree weather, which means it's warmer than usual, and flies are coming around.

And so, Mr. INSLEE, I am very pleased that you brought this matter to the floor because of its significance. And if we experience any kind of jolt to the Gulf Stream, it can alter weather throughout the Northern Hemisphere.

I think that all Americans should be concerned. Because it is clear from what I saw that people all over the world are concerned, perhaps much more so than we are here. People in Greenland are concerned. The 27 Nations of the EU are very concerned.

I was in Brussels, and they were having a presidential legislation. And as I was asking questions about the election, I was told, Mr. Speaker, that the person who won the election would be the one who convinced the public that he was greener because of the significance of this issue. If you are running for president, you've got to convince the voting public that you are aware of the climate change and that you are willing to do something about it. Unfortunately and tragically and embarrassingly, we can't say that here at home.

Mr. INSLEE. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CLEAVER. I will yield.

Mr. INSLEE. We are hopeful. I actually gave a speech in response to Prime Minister Tony Blair last week in Berlin. I was asked to present sort of an American response to the Prime Minister's ideas about global warming. One of the things he talked about is what the Europeans have learned is that we need some action, some policies to drive investment into these clean energy technologies that can produce the clean energy to avoid the kind of problems you are describing in Greenland. And of course the President is right now in Germany today at the G8 Summit.

We are hopeful, although probably not that optimistic, that the President would propound some ideas where we will guarantee our grandchildren that we are going to reduce our CO_2 emissions. Now, one way or another, Congress needs to do that, because we've got an obligation to American grandkids to do it.

I want to just note a couple of things. It's not just Greenland that is experiencing it. It's the good ole U.S. of A.

I got to know some people in Alaska in a little town called Shishmaref that sits on the Arctic Ocean. That is the first city in America that is having to be relocated due to global warming because they live right on the coastline, and the tundra that supports their houses is melting, and the seas are encroaching, and it has actually eaten some of their houses already. They are actually going to have to move their entire city. They've already voted to do it. They are going to move it 13 miles inland to a little place called Fish Camp.

It will be the first American city to have to relocate its first victim of global warming. That's a sad day when you think Americans already have to relocate their cities. So this is not something that's 50 years in the future. It's here today.

Now, we have experienced off the coast of Washington and Oregon the same issues you've talked about, about new species of fish coming in. And our ranchers down in the western United States are having unprecedented drought they are having to deal with. This is something Americans are suffering today. And that is why, starting next Wednesday, we hope to have an aggressive congressional response to help these clean air technologies move forward. So I appreciate your observations of Greenland.

I wonder if I could maybe yield to Mr. UDALL, who has joined us here this evening, who has been a leader and certainly has a long tradition in his particular family in leading environmental issues.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Thank you very much. And I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Let me say, first of all, to Congressman CLEAVER, you told a story that I think we hear over and over again about the effects around the world. You told it for Greenland. You took a trip up there that I think is going to go down in history as a turning point.

The Speaker of the House, you were with the Speaker, NANCY PELOSI. She takes this trip to Greenland, she sees this ice cap, sees what's going on and has said to the United States House of Representatives that she is going to do something about this, put it on the schedule and move it forward. So all of us, I think, Representative INSLEE, are very gratified by that because we feel that there has been a sea change here in the House. We have gone from just a few short years ago ignoring this issue to now where the Speaker says we are going to do something about this, and that is very gratifying.

I would like to point out, too, I think that ice cap is in some places two miles thick. And so people should realize when we are talking about a two-mile thick ice cap, if that thing melts, it raises the oceans, and many of our costal areas in America would be under water.

But, JAY INSLEE, I agree with you very much. We don't want to paint doom and gloom. This is about optimism. And you have been an incredible leader on energy. I hope you will a little bit later explain to everybody your new Apollo Energy Act, because that is one of the areas that you have led out in particular. I know you are writing a book on energy. You have done so many things here in the Congress in terms of leading on this issue.

The one point I wanted to jump off on, you mentioned new technology. I don't have any doubt that we are going to be able to unleash unbelievable new technological solutions to energy. I also believe that there are a lot of things that we can do right now that we could, as a Congress, and I think you are going to see this in the energy package that the Speaker puts forward in July and calls up, things that we can do right now to make a real difference on CO_2, on pollution, and on energy efficiency. And let me just tick off a list here.

Fuel efficiency of automobiles. I think easily today we could end up doubling, it is technologically feasible, doubling the fuel efficiency of the fleet, going from about 24 miles per gallon now up to close to 50, and we could do that very easily.

On wind energy. New Mexico is one of the places in the United States of America which has the benefit of having a constant wind, and we have already ramped up from zero to 10 percent in the last 5 years. So 10 percent of our last electrical base is wind. There are many other places in the Nation that can do that.

And people are now starting to purchase, as Representative INSLEE knows, people are starting to purchase, on their electric bills they can sign up and say I want clean energy, and many times that is hydro, which JAY has up in the Northwest, solar, which many of us have in the Southwest, or wind or some other form.

Conservation. There is an awful lot we can do there. We know that in the European countries they use half what we do. And so there is a lot of waste going on out there.

The one little simple thing I marvel out in European countries, and all of us who travel, is that when you go to a European country and you stay in a hotel, when you go out of the room, they have a button at the door that shuts off all the lights. You just punch one button and all the lights are shut off. As you know, in almost every American hotel or motel, you have to go around individually and shut out every light. And they have done that technological thing, JAY, to try to look for ways to do savings and make it easier for people to do it.

Energy efficient bill. Once again, I think that we can do a lot there. This is a huge contributor in terms of CO_2, energy efficient, more efficient appliances, air conditioners, things like that, and a new energy portfolio for our power companies, where we take a mandate and say to power companies you will produce by 2020 20 percent of your power from renewable sources.

So I think those are some things we can do now, and I hope we will talk in a little bit about some of the things specifically we would do on carbon dioxide emissions.

I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. I really appreciate Mr. UDALL talking about efficiency, because I think we need to look at it as the first fuel. Before you start generating excess energy, if we could figure out how to use it more efficiently and not waste it, that's what I look at as like finding money in the street, it's the first fuel. And Europe has had tremendous success. England has increased their gross domestic product by 70 percent in the last 20 years, but their use of electricity has remained flat. That is a tremendous improvement of efficiency. You don't waste it.

But it is not just the English. We have something to brag about here, too. California has increased their gross economic activity by 50 percent in the last 10 years, and their per capita use of electricity has remained flat. They have done it through measures such decoupling utilities with the rate of growth of electricity so utilities now can make money by selling less energy by selling efficiency. And it has been effective.

In my city of Seattle, in my neck of the woods, the same thing has happened by doing some of the commonsense things we have talked about.

There are some amazing technologies coming in in efficiency. I went and talked to an organization called SIPs, Structural Integrated Panels, last week. They had their national convention. These are panels that are sort of a foam core with a wood fiber sandwich on both sides that are a structural panel you can build a house with so you don't need studs. You build these things, and you can get 20 to 30 percent less heating cost for your home. This is an invention of folks in America, and we can build part of the construction industry by doing that. So I really appreciate your focus on efficiency.

I want you to know, you mentioned wind. I remember talking to, in the course of writing this book Mr. UDALL referred to, I fell across a story out of Missouri, Mr. CLEAVER's State. And there was a quote by this farmer that said something to the effect like, Man, there is nothing better than sitting there watching that turbine go around, and I just count the money every time the blade goes around. Because they get paid by the utility to put the turbine in the field. That's a good way to do it.

So I would like to yield to Mr. CLEAVER for his observations.

Mr. CLEAVER. There is a great deal of movement toward wind energy in Missouri and in the State of Kansas. In fact, one of our colleagues who is serving here with distinction, Mr. CARNAHAN, has a brother, Tom Carnahan, who does this full time. He actually has a windmill farm not far outside of Kansas City, Missouri.

One of the things I think is extremely worth noting, particularly as the three of us speak about this subject, is that some people are nervous about discussions that we are having with regards to the changes that need to be made in this country. They falsely believe that we are going to reduce the quality of life, that we are going to damage industry. And what I have said is that if we will unleash this incredibly creative American creativity and ingenuity, that we will be able to transform our energy use in a way that we would create new jobs.

For example, there is a plant in China that produces most of the highly efficient light bulbs. They don't use them in China. We buy them here. And there is not a single plant in the United States that manufactures this particular light bulb. So I think we have the capacity to make alterations without damaging our economy, by not even causing a dent.

Let me just say that, in having had the opportunity to meet with some of the MPs in London, I found out that a bill was introduced March 13, 2007, to the Parliament.

□ 1845

Members from three of the parties were in the dialogue. They said, without any reservations, the bill is going to pass. There is no question. It is going to pass. Now, these are people who don't agree about much else. They agree on one thing, that we are in the midst of climate change, and, number two, they have to do something about it.

So the bill that was introduced is aimed at moving the United Kingdom to a low carbon economy. It would require a mandatory 60 percent cut in the UK's carbon emissions by 2050 compared to the base level, which was 1990, with an intermediate target of 26 to 32 percent by the year 2020.

The EU has also agreed to cut by 20 percent emissions by the year 2020 and by 30 percent if it is a part of an overall agreement that will include the United States. I will just say what we heard over and over again was, what is the United States going to do? The United States is the leader.

In Parliament, as we were talking about the need for us to work together, one of the members of Parliament became quite agitated and said to us, well, it is good you guys are coming over here talking to us about this, but we had a meeting with a Member of Congress. I am not going to call the Member's name. It is not that important. But he said, we had a meeting with a Member of the United States Congress who told us that this was a hoax. Of course, we sat there, and Speaker PELOSI, as she did throughout the trip, made sure that they understood that we were a delegation, it was a bipartisan delegation, that we were not there to cast aspersions on any of our colleagues, that we do have a deliberative body, that there are some people who have not quite caught on yet to what the rest of the world seems to have caught on to. But it is my hope, it is my prayer, that this body will realize what the rest of the world already realizes, that there is climate change and that there is no need to debate the science, only what we are going to do as a result of it.

Mr. INSLEE. That is an important point. I think the good news we can share with Americans is that there are a lot less people in this Congress than there used to be who believe it is a hoax, and that is, in part, because they have read the science. People are seeing it with their own eyes. Now they are hearing from their constituents, frankly, and they are hearing from their own scientists.

I just want to read this NASA report that just came out last week, and it talked about the urgency. Mr. CLEAVER, you said, we don't have a lot of time to deal with this; we don't have 50 years to deal with this.

This report said that basically there are two ways we can go. We can go the business as usual approach, or we can have a second approach, an alternative approach to reduce our CO_2. Basically this report said that with another decade of business as usual, it becomes impractical to achieve the alternative scenario because of the energy infrastructure that would be in place. This was a quote from Mr. Hansen of NASA, basically meaning we have about 10 years to change course here a little bit to have more essential efficiencies, to have more clean energy, to put our minds together to figure out how to have a cleaner energy future. So we don't have the luxury of a lot of time.

But again I want to come back to this idea of optimism, why I am optimistic about it. Mr. CLEAVER mentioned Mr. CARNAHAN started a wind

turbine farm that is doing great. They are earning farmers a lot of money. They are earning construction crews a lot of money to build these things. They are generating revenues in Missouri. This is happening all over the country, that tremendous growth, 15, 20 percent growth a year in this wind turbine wind energy.

I want to tell one little story that I think is typical of what we are going to see in America. A fellow in Seattle, Washington, named John Plaza who is an airline pilot. He was a good airline pilot, but he sort of got tired of reading books while he was flying back and forth. That is what they do in the cockpits, a dirty little secret we can share.

He decided he wanted to do something entrepreneurial. He started looking around for an idea that he could advance to create a new, value-added business, and he started to think about energy. He started thinking, is there a way that I could sort of develop a clean energy resource and make some money as well? He started to focus on biodiesel.

So this fellow, who was not an engineer, not a chemical engineer, not a mechanical engineer, didn't have an MBA, he literally went home and started to tinker in his home about how to make biodiesel out of various vegetable products. He hit on a way to make biodiesel that he thought was as good or better than anybody else.

He went out and raised a few dollars, rented a little tiny room in an old warehouse and bought the old beer vats from the Rainier brewery in Seattle, Washington. The Rainier brewery used to be the iconic beer in Seattle, Washington. He bought the old vats they used to brew beer in and he started to brew up biodiesel.

John Plaza is now CEO or CFO of a company in Grace Harbor, Washington, that is going to be the largest biodiesel plant probably in the world, or at least in the Western Hemisphere. They are under construction. They are going to be open for business some time next year, over a million gallons a year.

This is a product that reduces carbon dioxide, uses products we make, either canola seed or perhaps palm oilseed or perhaps soybean oilseed they are starting to bring in.

But the point is, here is an American success story of a fellow with an idea who wanted to find a way to maximize clean energy. We just need a way in Congress to help drive investment to those new clean energy sources.

I want to mention one thing about how Congress can help people like John Plaza to develop these new businesses.

One of the things we can do is next Wednesday we will be hopefully passing what is called a low carbon fuel standard. A low carbon fuel standard will basically say that the fuels we burn in America every 5 years will get 3 percent cleaner when it comes to carbon dioxide. And when we pass that low carbon fuel standard, it will create an incentive for investment to go to these businesses to develop these new higher, cleaner forms of biofuels.

You know we are using corn ethanol right now, but it is really just sort of the first generation. I liken it to the Wright brothers Flyer of aviation. It is just the first craft we can get in the air. But we need cellulosic ethanol and advanced forms of biodiesel that will produce a lot more product per acre and a lot more CO_2 savings, and we believe we can do this.

So here is one thing Congress can do, and I know there are many others.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Representative INSLEE, your optimism and Representative CLEAVER's optimism is what should imbue this entire debate because there are many, many things we can do.

Just to give you another example, in New Mexico, when I was back going to town hall meetings several months ago, I visited an area outside Taos, New Mexico, and this small, little operation was set up to collect all of the fast-food oils in town. They would go to the various hamburger joints and others and collect these excess oils that were basically being thrown away. They were having to pay companies for somebody to come and take them.

These individuals were taking them, and they said, we will just take them off your hands. You don't need to pay us. And they went out and they set up an operation with just a couple of tanks. They put the oils in there. They put a little bit of lye in. They mixed it up. They had a chemical process. And I rode around that day in a diesel truck where they pumped the fuel right from these tanks, and that was biodiesel.

They told me that from their testing and everything that they had understood, is that this was completely clean fuel. In fact, it took them a while to convince the City of Taos to run the city bus on this fuel, because the mechanic was very worried. He said, this is new. And this is going to cause a problem.

Well, it ended up they said, we will do it for a trial period. They did it for 6 months in the city bus. The mechanic took the engine apart to retool it, and he said it looked like the engine hadn't even been operating over that 6 months. It was so clean.

So there are wonderful things that we can do. There are great success stories out there. We need to get out that word, and we need to move in a clean energy future. I mean that is the real key to things.

I would like to talk just a minute about how do we get there? Because the people are probably asking, they are watching us and they are saying, why is it that the American people, by 70 and 80 percent say we should move to clean energy, we should do all the things we have been talking about this evening. Why aren't we doing that?

Well, the reason is because the rules of the game right now are set up to favor the established industries that are there. The laws, the regulations, the subsidies, the tax credits, for the most part, are emphasized and pushing us towards fossil fuels as we know.

All these laws and regulations and subsidies kind of shape the energy market. As many of us know, this energy bill we recently passed, I think in 2005, most of the subsidies in that bill went to major, mature industries; oil, gas, nuclear, coal.

So one of the things we have to do, and I know Representative INSLEE has been working on this, he is going to be doing this in his committee come this summer, is how do we change the rules of the game? How do we put a price on carbon dioxide emissions to change the whole marketplace? I think that is what we are going to be doing this year when we start getting into energy.

I have a bill, Congressman WAXMAN has a bill, Representative INSLEE is on a variety of bills, Senator MCCAIN over in the Senate has a bill. But the basic theme of these bills is, put a price on carbon dioxide and start moving us in a new direction.

Mr. INSLEE. The gentleman is entirely correct. Later this year the House will consider what is called a cap-and-trade system. Americans are probably going to hear that term a lot. A cap-and-trade system basically means that we will set a cap, a limit, a total ceiling on the amount of carbon dioxide that will be a pollutant going into the air a year in the United States of America. That is not too much to ask for our grandkids to say we are going to have a total amount of pollution that we put into the air.

Now we have done it for sulfur dioxide. We have done it for nitrogen oxide. We have done it for particulates. But there is this giant loophole you can drive a Sherman tank through for carbon dioxide.

So it is interesting. We have all these laws that set ceilings for the amount of pollutants that go into the air, but the granddaddy of all, the most dangerous pollutant there is in the world right now, carbon dioxide, there is no limit whatsoever. So Congress owes to ourselves and our grandkids to set some limit, a cap, on the total amount of CO_2 that is going into the air.

So then the question comes down, how do you allocate who is going to put the pollution in the air? Well, there are a couple of ways to do it. Congress can just hand permits out and we decide. But there is a better way, which is basically a trading system where these permits originally are allocated, but then businesses are allowed to trade them amongst themselves and establish a market for carbon.

Europe has done this. I have spent a week looking at how that system worked last week, and I can report that it has been successful to the extent that it has established a cap and a price on carbon. And once you establish a price on carbon, well, what do businesses do? They start figuring out

ways to not waste energy and how not to put more pollution into the air.

Importantly, this cap-and-trade system is the most economically efficient way to distribute this resource. I got brainwashed by economics when I went to school at the University of Washington. Basically what we learned is that having a trading system, you end up having the most efficient way to find out how to drive economies and efficiencies in your system.

So later this year we will be considering a cap-and-trade system. We will set a limit, and it will be the first step in this road to really a clean energy economy.

Now I want to note something about a cap-and-trade system, and this is one thing I learned in Europe last week, it is not enough. It is only one tool in the toolbox. This is really important, because next week we will have before us in the Energy Committee a host of issues of ways to drive this clean energy future forward not waiting for this cap-and-trade system, issues like this renewable portfolio standard, where we tell people 15 percent of our electricity comes from clean standards, a green building standard, so that we require new building codes to have energy efficient buildings, a low carbon fuel standard so we use low carbon fuels, a whole host of measures like that. Those are very important. A cap-and-trade system is not enough.

In fact, it is interesting, in England, we met with a minister who basically they told us they might have had 15 million tons of savings in carbon dioxide from their cap-and-trade system, but they had 100 million tons savings in carbon dioxide by this combination of measures to have more efficiency in their industries.

So next week we will be taking some first steps in the road to a clean energy future that are very, very important, that are going to help these businesses grow.

□ 1900

Mr. CLEAVER. Well, I am wondering whether or not either of you, and I don't know if you are into horror movies, and there is enough horror going on without having to watch it on television, but there is a movie starring Kurt Russell, and I imagine the movie is 15 years old, maybe older. The movie is called ''The Thing.'' It is a movie about a group of scientists and military people out in Greenland at a facility. At the end, of course, they kill this thing that has been frozen under the ice for perhaps a millennium, and the movie ends with all is well.

The movie was actually based on the Swiss camp which is a real camp that is out in the middle of Greenland where scientists stay out all year long measuring temperatures, measuring the melting snow. They have concluded that the temperature has risen 11 degrees over the last 10 years.

What happens is many of the natives who used to make money by taking tourists out on 12-day excursions on the ice can no longer do that because the ice is melting. You might go somewhere you have routinely gone, and now the ice is cracking and your dogs fall into the water, so that doesn't happen.

I always believe there is a solution, and I think there are a number of things, as Mr. INSLEE has mentioned, with regard to capping trade, which I think is, as he said, a part of the solution. There are probably going to be a potpourri of things that we change and implement in order to bring the CO_2 level down.

But it occurred to me, because I am a United Methodist pastor in my real life, that if people believe it is the government prodding them, pushing them, maybe even beating them into changing, there will be some resistance. But if, on the other hand, they understand that one of the responsibilities of the human race is to be good stewards of the world that God made for them, then it is easier for them to look at their activities, their actions, and make modifications.

In the book of Genesis, we are told that the Earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, and then God says to mankind, humankind, go out and subdue it. Now he did not say go out and undo it, but rather subdue it.

If you look at the word ''subdue,'' break it down, it actually means taking care of. So we have to take care of it. The good news is on this Thursday evening there is a growing phalanx of legislators in this House who believe that a change is not only necessary but that it is going to come.

One final thing on this, although it is not really all that related.

I have a mobile Fifth District office that we use in my district in and around Kansas City, Missouri. It runs on grease, and the technology is probably not as good as it will be because sometimes, if you stay in it all day, you do smell like a Big Mac. However, it is demonstrating that we can make changes and that the Congress must show the way. As opposed to having one of those big gas guzzlers, we, with great intentionality, had a van designed to use grease.

I have a bill which will require, if approved, that all Members of Congress who lease automobiles with taxpayer money must lease an energy efficient car. I think, as Ghandi said, we must be the changes we preach. I think Congress can show the way; and, in fact, I think Congress is showing the way.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. CLEAVER, I appreciate your comments, especially sharing the idea that I think all faiths share about this idea of responsibility to the creation and to our grandkids. I appreciate you bringing us back to that fundamental truth.

I want to address the issue of Greenland. Greenland is changing dramatically. I have had some people ask me isn't it true that Greenland has changed in the past as far as their weather and why is this a problem now. It is true during Erik the Red's time, Greenland did have more green involved in it. They had some agriculture in Greenland when you had this little warm period during the time of Erik the Red.

But what the scientists tell us is there is a huge difference between that situation because now we are going to drive carbon dioxide levels by 2050 twice what they have ever been for tens and hundreds of thousands of years and that those carbon dioxide layers trap energy and heat. It is going to make the days of Erik the Red look like the Ice Age.

So even though there have been wide fluctuations in the Earth's climate before, what the scientists tell us is the rate of change is unprecedented ever in the historical record and that we will go into a period that really is unprecedented as far as we know pretty much in global history. So the things you are seeing in Greenland are very much of concern, and I hope we are going to start working to move that forward.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. INSLEE, one of the things that you mentioned early on, and I think we are being held back. You were in England and you talked to Tony Blair and Tony Blair's minister. The G8 countries are meeting. There is no doubt in these G8 countries, the meeting going on right now, they want to set for these industrialized countries a specific cut in CO_2 emissions. They want to commit to a specific cut. They came into the G8 meeting saying let's have a specific cut on CO_2 emissions; and our President went over and sidetracked that and derailed that and basically said, no, we don't want to commit to that.

I think the big debate here is are we going to have voluntary measures or are we going to move towards some mandates and a cap in trade system and a regulatory system so we can get ahold of this.

Mr. INSLEE. I think you have put your finger right on the nub of the issue. The President says he now, finally, and I suppose this is a small ray of happiness, he now finally recognizes there is a problem of global warming. But he expects volunteerism to solve this problem.

Well, I can tell you one thing we all know, you can run a bake sale on volunteerism, and maybe you can run a boy scout troop on volunteerism, but you cannot run a war on global warming on volunteerism. Think about this for a second. Here is what the President proposes. He thinks that he can just send a letter, nicely handwritten, to the CEOs of the oil and gas companies, would you kindly think about not polluting anymore.

Well, that would be just about as effective, if he simply tries to run that on a volunteer basis, to just rely on the good graces, and I have nothing against the executives of these companies, they

are fine people, but just relying on them to volunteer would be just as effective as relying on consumers to volunteer whether you are going to pay at the pump when you pump gas.

Now you can just see the executives with their tin cup and their tithing cup out there trying to collect money from the pump. It doesn't work that way. You have to have some requirement that we both pay for gasoline and you have some measure to require these companies to reduce their pollution. That is a fair statement. It is required. It is the only way we are going to solve this problem.

Most importantly, it is the only way we are going to drive investment to companies like A123 Battery and Finavera Renewables which is going to have the first wave-powered buoy off the coast of Oregon in this next year to produce electricity from waves bobbing up and down.

So, Mr. UDALL, you are correct. We have a responsibility in Congress to create these limits on CO_2 pollution. We are going to do that; and, when we do that, we are going to unleash the innovative power that Americans have. The same genius that got us to the moon is going to get us to a clean energy future, and our grandkids will not have to deal with global warming.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) on an unrelated subject.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION PENDING IN THE SENATE

Mr. BACA. Thank you, Mr. INSLEE, for allowing me this time to speak on the comprehensive immigration legislation that is pending on the Senate side.

I appeal to the Members of the Senate on a bipartisan basis to vote on allowing for the cloture of the legislation to move forward on behalf of the 12 million and some undocumented here in the United States. Undocumented means there are people, not only Hispanics, Irish, Italians, Asians, African American. It impacts a variety of different individuals.

Without allowing cloture, we will not be allowed an opportunity to fix the immigration legislation as it stands right now and will allow the continued abuse that exists. We need to protect American families and working families. We need to make sure that we allow this legislation to move forward.

On behalf of democracy, I appeal to all of the Members on a bipartisan basis to allow this legislation, to allow the debate to continue. It is important that all of the Senators tonight, those individuals that can, and I would like to commend Senator REID, Senator SALAZAR, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator KENNEDY, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator GRAHAM and some of the other individuals who have taken a stand in support of a comprehensive legislation. We need you to allow this process to continue.

If this process does not continue, America will lose. The taxpayers will lose. It is our responsibility.

When we talk about national security, we need this legislation to allow the process to continue. When we talk about protecting, and I know some of us don't like the legislation. There are individuals that say I don't like provisions of the guest worker program or the border aspects or the enforcements. I think we will be able to fine-tune it and work on it to allow the process to where we can fix the legislation.

On behalf of working families and on behalf of protecting the American people, we need this process. We need this legislation on behalf of humanitarian issues. We should not have people living in fear, not knowing whether they are going to be here for the next couple of years or what is going to happen to the 12 million and some. It is important.

Senators on your side of the aisle, please allow this process to continue to happen. Vote for the cloture. Then you can vote on provisions, whether you like or dislike other portions of the bill. But allow us to continue to have the debate in order to make sure that we continue to protect the American people and we continue to protect working families and we end illegal immigration as it is right now and fix it. It is important.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN WILEY MAYNE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to have the privilege to make some remarks tonight about the life of a former colleague for some of the Members here in Congress and one of the real stars in the Sioux City area that I have the privilege to represent today, and that is the life of former Congressman Wiley Mayne who passed away a little over a week ago at St. Luke's Hospital in Sioux City, Iowa.

Late Congressman Mayne represented the 6th Congressional District of Iowa for 8 years here in this Congress. That was during a time when this country experienced great turmoil. He came from Sioux City and represented much of the northwest Iowa area. He was elected to Congress in 1966 and was sworn in here on this floor in 1967 and served until the early days of 1975.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the '60s and the '70s were tumultuous years for America. But despite the challenges before him, Congressman Mayne accepted an appointment to the Judiciary Committee. Serving on the Judiciary Committee, I appreciate what that means. Only a few years later, he participated in that panel's hearings on the impeachment of President Nixon. That was in the wake of the Watergate break-ins but actually before the Nation heard the tapes that confirmed what actually happened. For his service to America during this tense time, he will be long remembered; and to a significant extent it defined his political career.

Tonight, we are here to celebrate a man whose service and accomplishments went well beyond the work of any congressional committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have much to say about the gentleman whom I have had the great privilege to represent, former Congressman Wiley Mayne.

□ 1915

But I inherited that representation from the gentleman next to me, who also represented the Sioux City area for, I believe, 8 years prior to my privilege to represent them, and that's the gentleman to my left, Congressman LATHAM, who now represents the north central regions of Iowa, and I would at this time yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much Congressman KING for the time.

It is very difficult for me to talk about someone that I admired so much as Wiley Mayne, the idea of him having passed this earth. Wiley was born back in 1917. He passed away on May 27 of this year. He was born in a little town of Sanborn up in O'Brien County, and what a great area up there, a lot of the good Dutch men, and grew up, went to school there.

And you think about someone coming from Sanborn, Iowa, then going off to Harvard to college, and he got his bachelor of science degree, continued studying law at Harvard, came back to Iowa and finished his law degree at the Iowa Law School.

In 1941, he joined the FBI and had his career there. And then, during the Second World War, from 1941 to 1943, he served in the United States Navy and escorted destroyers through the Mediterranean, the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific and served his Nation extraordinarily well at that time.

He came back to Sioux City, practiced law for a couple decades, then became the president of the Iowa Bar Association and obviously was so admired and respected by his peers to have an honor bestowed on him like that.

Like the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) said, Congressman Mayne was elected to this Congress in 1966 in the 90th Congress, served in that Congress and the three following Congresses and served his people extraordinarily well. He was someone who was dedicated to his constituents, someone that cared all the time about his constituents.

And you talk to people who were around him at that time, and that's the thing that you will hear over and over, was his concern, his great job of representing his constituents. In my mind, in this job, that is our highest calling is to try and represent to the best of our abilities the people that we are honored to serve in this great body.