

BALART, FL-21); Ms. Dodie Kasper and Ms. Maria Arena (JOHNSON, TX-3); Mr. Jeffrey Boogaard (ANDREWS, NJ-1); Mr. Christopher Moreno (LOWEY, NY-18); Ms. Latasha Jones (ENGEL, NY-17); Mr. Eric Major (COSTELLO, IL-12); Ms. Mollie Huber and Ms. Yvonne Jackson Pittman (PAUL, TX-14).

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in thanking the Office of the Historian for sponsoring this program. Thanks to Dr. Robert Remini and Dr. Fred Beuttler for their outstanding leadership, and Dr. Thomas Rushford, Dr. Charles Flanagan, Mr. Anthony Wallis and Mr. Benjamin Hayes for providing the crucial staff support. Thank you also to the Office of the Historian interns: Mr. Maurice Robinson, Mr. Parker Williams, Ms. Kaitlin Utz and Ms. Debbie Kobrin.

HONORING THE JUNIOR MATRONS OF MORRISTOWN, NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2009

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Junior Matrons of Morristown, New Jersey who are celebrating their 50 Anniversary this year.

The Junior Matrons of Morristown was started in 1959 by a motivated group of young African American women. They concentrated their time and energy on addressing the lack of young African American high school graduates pursuing post secondary education. For the past 50 years the Junior Matrons have focused on fulfilling their motto, "Service through Scholarship". This has been done through providing financial assistance to over 3,000 high school students, totaling over \$2 million over the past half century. The beneficial and residual impact of this assistance cannot be over-estimated.

The Junior Matrons sponsor an annual Graduation Ball and Cotillion. The purpose of this night is threefold. First, it helps to raise awareness among the African American community about how a college education can provide an avenue to economic, political and social advantage. Second, it recognizes and rewards those who have been committed to achieving their first major educational milestone. And finally, it generates the funds necessary for a high school graduate's dream of college to become a reality. This single evening can be summed up in a statement that these women pride themselves on, "There were a lot of things we didn't know were impossible so we just went ahead and did them."

The passion and energy behind the founding of the Junior Matrons has continued unabated for these last 50 years, and is a credit to the collective vision of twelve charter members: the late Sue Graddick, Harriet Britt, the late Frances Younginer, my dear friend Dr. Felicia B. Jamison, Emma L. Martin, Mattie Drew, Muriel Hiller, Nadine Alston, the late Emanueline Smith, Natalie Holmes, the late Marie Davis, the late Natalie Thurmond Lattimore and Cecelia Dowdy.

Over the years the Junior Matrons have been honored by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Urban League, among many others.

Although a few of the original group are no longer with us, new leaders have taken on the mantle and are endowed with the same zeal and vision.

Madam Speaker, I am quite certain that the Junior Matrons will continue to promote the cause quality education and help provide opportunities for our young people to pursue college degrees and productive, fulfilling careers. I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Junior Matrons of Morristown as they celebrate 50 dedicated years of serving our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2009

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for several votes on Tuesday, June 23, 2009 due to a personal situation I needed to attend to in Texas. Nevertheless, I would request that the record indicate that I would have voted "yes" on each of the bills considered in the House had I been present. Specifically, S. 407, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2009; H.R. 1016, the Veterans Health Care Budget Reform and Transparency Act of 2009; H.R. 1211, the Women Veterans Health Care Improvement Act; and H.R. 1172 are each common sense reforms that will improve the health and education benefits provided by the Veterans Administration. Our veterans and their families sacrifice so much on our behalf, it is important that Congress continue to do all it can to ensure that they receive the respect and support they deserve.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK T. McHENRY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2009

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, had I been present to vote on S. 407 "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2009" my vote would have been cast in support of this bill. In addition, had I been present I would have cast my vote in support of the following bills, H.R. 1016 "Veterans Health Care Budget Reform and Transparency Act of 2009", H.R. 1211 "Women Veterans Health Care Improvement Act", H.R. 1172 "To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include on the Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs a list of organizations that provide scholarships to veterans and their survivors" and H.R. 1777 "Making technical corrections to the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended".

IN OPPOSITION TO CAP-ON-A-TAX LEGISLATION

HON. TODD TIAHRT

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2009

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I heard of a climatologist who went to apply for a job re-

cently. During his interview, he was asked, "What do you predict will happen with the earth's climate next year?" He immediately replied, "Whatever you want me to predict."

Unfortunately, this joke seems to hit a little too close to home, when we are considering global warming legislation. Rather than responding to serious questions with serious answers, Congress is replying with what we think people want to hear. Rather than considering all angles before offering a solution, Congress is rushing through legislation in hopes to score points with voters back home. And instead of basing a bill on sound scientific data, we will be considering legislation that is devoid of input from this side of the aisle.

I rise today to express my strong opposition to Waxman-Markey "cap and tax" bill. I believe there are three interrelated problems with this misguided legislation. I am concerned with the process by which we have arrived at the point we are today. I am concerned with the political showmanship that has gone on as the bill was written. And I am concerned with the policy itself, which bears the tragic scars of both the process and the politics.

Madam Speaker, from the beginning of the 111th Congress to the present, the cap-and-tax bill has been subjected to unfortunate abuses of the legislative process. In April, the Energy and Commerce Committee held four days of hearings, with the intention of, according to the Committee's website, "examine the views of the Administration and a broad range of stakeholders," on a discussion draft of Chairman WAXMAN's bill. However, these hearings reflected only the Chairman's perspective. Only four of the twenty-one witnesses called before the Committee expressed any opposition to cap-and-tax, despite a petition signed by more than thirty thousand meteorologists, climatologists, and other scientists stating their skepticism about the evidence of man-made greenhouse gases being responsible for increases in the earth's temperature. Contrary to claims made by the Committee, and witnesses at the hearing, there is no "overwhelming consensus" in favor of the hypothesis of human-caused global warming.

The bill was drafted without input from our side of the aisle. At no point was any Republican consulted regarding the contents of the bill. In the rush to get the legislation passed through Committee, it seems no one had time to read the entire bill, or figure out what it means. Committee members repeatedly asked questions regarding the potential cost of particular provisions or amendments, but received no answers.

All of this raises the question, "why"? Why was the bill rushed through the Committee, with hardly enough time to read it, let alone determine the impact that it would have on American taxpayers, farms, and businesses? The only answer I can come up with is the desire on the part of some in this body to score points with their voters back home.

What I see happening here is similar to what happened at the end of World War II. When American soldiers first reached Nazi extermination camps, they found men, women and children that were gaunt, emaciated, and starving. A few soldiers offered children chocolate bars, not realizing that the very thing they thought would be helpful actually ended up killing the children, because their digestive systems were unable to handle the chocolate. The same sort of thing is happening here. In

order to look like a hero to one part of their constituency, this cap and tax bill is being pushed through Congress, and forced on the American people, much to their detriment.

Which brings me to the third problem with Chairman WAXMAN's cap and tax bill—it's just bad policy. Earlier this week, *Investor's Business Daily* had a front page article about the failures of Europe's program, called the Emissions Trading Scheme, or ETS. The article cites numerous studies finding that the ETS has significantly increased energy prices, "with 'uncertain' effects on greenhouse gas emissions." That hardly sounds like a model of success that we should be emulating here in the United States.

Proponents of the cap and tax bill claim that they have learned from Europe's mistakes, but I disagree, Madam Speaker. The article identifies the giving away of the program's carbon allowances as the largest reason for the program's failure. This bill follows that same model, giving away roughly 85 percent of the emissions allowances.

The entire idea of a cap and trade program fails in practice. We are told, "The cost of polluting will be paid by the polluters." And believe me, the authors of this bill expect them to pay a hefty price. In fact, President Obama's budget assumes that even with the sale of only 15 percent of the total emissions permits, the federal government will still take in more than \$650 billion. As the cap gets lower, and there are fewer permits available, the cost for "polluters" is going to grow ever higher. But that is exactly what the authors want. President Obama recently stated that the only way for a cap-and-trade system to work is for energy prices to "skyrocket."

There is nothing in the bill to keep the "polluters" from passing those skyrocketing costs on to the consumers. In fact, they will be forced to so. Any business that cannot pass the costs on to consumers runs the risk of being driven out of business. In the end, it will be the American taxpayer that foots the bill for this program, in the form of higher prices at the pump, higher home energy bills, and lost economic growth. But don't just take my word for it. Even the director of the Congressional Budget Office has said that, "under a cap-and-trade program, consumers would ultimately bear most of the costs of emission reductions."

One analysis of this bill found that if the standards within the bill are met, by 2035 Americans will see gas prices rise 74 percent, electricity prices increase by 90 percent, and a loss of at least 850,000 jobs every year. The average American household will see its annual energy bill go up by nearly \$1,500. For my home state of Kansas in particular, we are going to have to purchase an estimated \$206.8 million worth of carbon credits. That is \$206 million more that Kansans are going to have to pay in energy costs every year. My district will be particularly hard-hit, as estimates show my district standing to lose nearly half a billion dollars of production in 2012, and more than 5,000 non-agriculture jobs. It's this kind of economic pain that advocates are counting on to force a reduction in carbon emissions.

The European system proves this idea doesn't work. With no signs of a reduction in carbon emissions, Europeans have seen their household energy costs rise by 16 percent, and the industrial energy costs increase by 32 percent.

Spain is an especially poignant example of the failure of the European system. They committed to reaching the benchmarks set out by the Kyoto Protocol, with renewable energy standards, so-called green-collar jobs, and a commitment to reduce their carbon emission levels. But the high cost of energy in Spain has destroyed their economy, which is currently facing a 17.5 percent unemployment rate. Proponents of this bill say that we will be creating new, green jobs. But most of these jobs are temporary construction jobs that go away once facilities, like wind farms for example, are built. In Spain, for every 4 jobs that were created, 9 were lost due to the higher cost of doing business under the Emissions Scheme. We should avoid going down this same path.

There is huge potential for exploitation of the system, on multiple levels. Especially with permits being given out, rather than auctioned, government officials are in a prime position to divert additional credits towards industries or companies of their choice. There is also the possibility that utilities here in the United States could follow the lead of one European company that immediately raised their rate by 70 percent, explaining to customers that the rate hike was necessary to cover the costs of cap-and-trade. But this utility company was given more credits than it needed, and sold them on the open market.

Tack on a renewables standard to this bill, and we have the perfect recipe for failure. No place that has implemented a renewable standard has ever been able to meet the required levels. And there is little to indicate that a federal standard would be any different. As a 2008 article in the *Energy Law Journal* stated, "The DOE has little, if any, experience in administering a program on the scale of a national RPS, and has shown no indication that enforcement of a major program is within the agency's capabilities...[this is] an area in which the DOE has already failed to show effective leadership."

So what we have here is a bill that has been rammed through with no minority input, to create a system that is ripe for abuse, costs the American taxpayer thousands of dollars, cripples our businesses, and in the end, has no measureable result. This is a bill I cannot support, and urge my colleagues to reject as well. Instead, I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the American Energy Act, a comprehensive energy bill that increases access to domestic energy sources, encourages conservation, and promotes the increased use of renewable sources of energy.

Across this country, we are, once again, seeing gas prices rise. Since the beginning of the year, gas prices are up 60 cents, and crude oil has raised more than \$20 a barrel, with no end in sight. Just last week, Russian oil executives predicted that crude prices could reach \$250 per barrel.

It is possible for us to relieve some of this pressure by tapping into our own vast resources. The Department of Energy estimates that nearly 20 billion barrels of recoverable oil lie offshore beneath restricted waters, the equivalent to nearly 30 years worth of current imports from Saudi Arabia. Substantial offshore natural gas reserves are also restricted. Even though longstanding restrictions on offshore energy production were lifted last year, the process of leasing these areas falls under

the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Unfortunately, new Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar refuses to allow additional drilling permits, dredging up every excuse not to produce energy in these areas. The Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge, reported to hold more than 10 billion barrels of oil continues to remain off-limits. He has also sought to block progress on oil shale, a promising source of oil trapped in rock under parts of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. The Department of the Interior has even cancelled some existing oil and gas leases.

Often, environmental concerns are cited as the reason for opposing additional drilling. However, technological advances have greatly increased the safety of drilling. During hurricanes Rita and Katrina, less than one cup of oil was spilled in the Gulf of Mexico, despite damage to more than 120 drilling platforms. There is absolutely no reason why permits for additional drilling should be denied. Furthermore, revenue generated by these oil leases will be invested in the development of cleaner, alternative sources of energy. The end result is a reduced dependency on foreign oil, lower levels of pollution, and new jobs for Americans, all without crippling our economy.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, the American Energy Act includes one key source that could provide clean energy without emissions—nuclear power. The Department of Energy has stated that the best way for energy companies to reduce their carbon emissions is to increase their use of nuclear energy. Despite encouragement from DoE, and the fact that that it has been proven safe by countries like France, where more than 80 percent of their electricity is generated by nuclear power, the Waxman-Markey bill does nothing to encourage nuclear power.

Instead, this administration has begun to walk away from the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on the nuclear storage facility at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. The American Energy Act would provide the Nuclear Regulatory Commission authority to complete its review of the Yucca Mountain facility, repeal the limitations on Yucca's Mountain's storage capacity, and establishes a method for recycling spent nuclear fuel in the U.S. Furthermore, it would reduce the bureaucratic hoops and length of time required to receive a permit for the construction of new nuclear plants.

In conclusion, let me again encourage my colleagues to join me in rejecting the Waxman-Markey cap-and-tax bill that would cripple our economy, without addressing their environmental concerns. Instead, let's support the American Energy Act, which provides real solutions for our energy problems in an economically, and environmentally sound manner.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2009

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information for regarding the earmark I secured as part of H.R. 2892, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010.