

Nor did it keep him from competing in the Trans-Pacific Yacht Race from Los Angeles to Honolulu three times.

But it's on Ventura County's land that Jack's impact will be felt for generations to come. Rancho Guadalupe, the Mexican land grant Jack's family purchased in 1880, sits adjacent to what is now California State University, Channel Islands. A private man, Jack tried to make a \$5 million anonymous donation to establish a library at the university in 1999—one of the largest in Ventura County history. He was persuaded to go public only after trustees argued that his donation would spur others. It did. The university named the library after him.

Jack also was an original initiator and supporter of Casa Pacifica, a home for neglected, abused and emotionally disturbed children; founder of the Conejo Savings and Loan Association; chairman of the Ventura County Harbor Commission; chairman of the Camarillo State Hospital Board of Trustees (where the university is now sited); and member of the boards for Pepperdine University and the House Ear Institute in Los Angeles, among others.

Madam Speaker, I know my colleagues will join Janice and me in offering our condolences to Patricia, his wife of more than 60 years; to their children, John Jr., Elizabeth and Ann; their eight grandchildren, and all who knew him, called him a friend and benefited from his spirit and generosity.

Godspeed, Jack.

BIPARTISAN IRAN DIPLOMATIC ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 2009

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, the U.N. Security Council has voted five times highlighting the violations of Iran, a party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, for its uranium enrichment activities.

According to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as of January 31, 2009, Iran has produced more than 1,000 kilograms of low-enriched uranium hexafluoride, which is 30 percent higher than previous IAEA estimates.

If we are serious about stopping the emergence of a nuclear Iran, our window for effective diplomacy is starting to close.

Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright is a strong proponent of "enhanced diplomacy." History teaches that negotiations in the absence of effective sanctions are likely to fail. Negotiations following effective sanctions are likely to succeed.

When it comes to Iran, we already know the most effective sanction: a gasoline restriction.

A close look at Iran's economy reveals a significant weakness. This top OPEC nation lacks the required refining capacity to meet domestic demand for fuel and must import some 40 percent of its gasoline.

That's right: Iran depends on foreign gasoline.

Nearly all of Iran's imported gasoline is provided by just five European companies—the Swiss firm Vitol, the Swiss/Dutch firm Trafigura, the French firm Total, the Swiss firm Glencore, and British Petroleum. The majority

of tankers carrying gasoline to Iran are insured by Lloyds of London. An interruption in the supply of gasoline to Iran would considerably impact the Iranian economy and significantly bolster diplomatic initiatives.

Just last year, then-Senator Obama suggested "banning the export of refined petroleum to Iran," and said such a restriction "starts changing their cost benefit analysis" and "starts putting the squeeze on them."

That is why I am joining with Congressman BRAD SHERMAN in introducing the bipartisan Iran Diplomatic Enhancement Act of 2009, which would extend current sanctions to any activity—including production, brokerage, insurance, and tanker delivery services—that contributes to Iran's ability to import gasoline or refine petroleum domestically.

Only from a position of strength can we expect diplomacy to succeed. A restriction of gasoline deliveries to Iran offers the best chance to stop Iran's uranium enrichment program using the soft power of the United States and our allies.

CELEBRATING THE GRAND OPENING OF THE ILLINOIS HOLOCAUST MUSEUM AND EDUCATION CENTER

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 2009

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, April 19th, over 10,000 people gathered in Skokie, Illinois, joining special guests President Bill Clinton, Elie Wiesel, and Governor Pat Quinn to celebrate the grand opening of the new Illinois Holocaust Museum and Education Center. President Obama personally offered his congratulations on a recorded video. I had the great opportunity to participate in the opening of this beautiful new museum, which will share the history of the Holocaust and teach the importance of combating hatred, indifference, and genocide to current and future generations across the Midwest.

Skokie, located in my district, is a community that knows the importance of preserving memories and teaching history. In the wake of World War II, the community offered an attractive haven to Jewish families, including Holocaust survivors searching for a new life in America. Between 1945 and 1955, an estimated 3,000 Jewish families came to Skokie, building a vibrant Jewish community.

Children who grew up in Skokie during this time recall daily life carrying an underpinning of trauma. They share stories of parents unable to sleep, panicking when their children returned home late, and refusing to take showers. However, while they describe seeing tattooed numbers on arms as commonplace, the Holocaust wasn't something survivors wanted to talk about. Many Skokie Jews remember not knowing which of their friends had survived gas chambers.

That changed in the mid-1970s. In 1976, neo-Nazi Frank Collin threatened to march in the town, distributing fliers proclaiming "we are coming" and telling the Chicago Sun-Times, "I hope they're terrified." Survivors, who had worked for decades to rebuild a sense of personal security, suddenly found themselves threatened once again.

The people of Skokie, led by the survivor community, fought back against Collin. The case ultimately went to court and, after uproar from around the world, the march was held elsewhere.

In the wake of those events, Chicago-area survivors founded the Holocaust Memorial Foundation of Illinois, a group dedicated to fighting hatred through education. The group has educated school and community groups since 1981, and the first museum was opened in 1985. In large part due to the organization and advocacy of the survivor community, in 1990 Illinois became the first state where Holocaust education is mandatory.

Today, there are an estimated 7,000 Holocaust survivors still living in the Chicago area, and as many as 1,000–2,000 of them currently live in Skokie. Most are now in their 70s, 80s, or 90s. Like the town of Skokie itself, the Illinois Holocaust Museum and Education Center would not have been possible without their active involvement and input. Its permanent exhibits show hundreds of artifacts, many which have been collected in recent years from local residents. The museum will also present thousands of video interviews with survivors, conducted and donated by Steven Spielberg and his Shoah Foundation.

Madam Speaker, the Illinois Holocaust Museum and Education Center may be one of the last Holocaust museums to be built in collaboration with survivors. The new 65,000-square foot museum will have the capacity to serve over 250,000 annual visitors, and will teach countless people, young and old, the importance of actively fighting hatred and prejudice. In a world where genocide continues, despite decades of pledging "never again," these are priceless lessons.

SCRAP IRON

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 2009

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is that time of year again; backyards and ballparks are back in swing. I remember when it only cost a few bucks to go to a ball game. Recent news reports show that it costs nearly \$200 for a family of four to go to a major league baseball game these days—that is if you want to park your car, eat a hot dog, drink a Coke and maybe buy your kids a baseball cap.

I remember going to the Houston Buff's games over on the Gulf Freeway, where Finger's is now, and to Colt Stadium to watch the Colt 45s. When the wind blew, the wooden bleachers at Colt Stadium would sway. It was a big deal back then to go to a game. Most of the time, we listened to the broadcast on a transistor radio. (Are there any of those left?) Okay, now I am sounding really old, but there's still nothing better than listening to a game on the radio.

I will never forget the first game in the Eighth Wonder of the World—the Astrodome. I was there, as a high school student, on April 9, 1965, to see the Astros beat the Yankees, 2–1 in 12 innings. Governor John Connally threw out the first pitch and President Lyndon B. Johnson and First Lady Lady Bird joined Astros President Roy Hofheinz in his suite.

There were so many flashes going off it was blinding. It was a marvel to the world, the ushering in of indoor baseball.

I've got to say, there was nothing else like the Dome. I remember the players would stand in centerfield and hit balls straight up to see if they could hit the roof. And who could forget the gun slinging cowboy on the scoreboard? It was the best.

My kids remember going to the games, wearing Nolan Ryan's number 34, and cheering for players like Terry Puhl, Joe Niekro, Craig Reynolds, Alan Ashby, Billy Doran and yelling out Jose Cruni-u-u-u-u-z. Of course we have had many greats along the way, including Biggio, Bagwell and Berkman—the Killer B's. But one of my all-time favorite players happens to be none other than Kingwood's own, "Scrap-Iron" Phil Garner. You may not have known it, but we have been living amongst a legend right here in our own backyard.

Phil Garner was known for his hard-nosed style of baseball. His defense as an infielder, playing both second and third base in his career, earned him the nickname "Scrap-Iron." He was known for breaking up double plays, diving for balls, and always playing tough. He left it all on the field every play, every game. He didn't start his career in Texas, but like I say about all great transplants—he got here as fast as he could. And lucky for us he did.

As a two-time All-American for the Tennessee Volunteers, he was drafted by Oakland in 1971. Ten years, three All-Star appearances and a .500 average in a World Series victory with the Pirates later, he landed in Houston. After hanging up his cleats, he hired on as an assistant coach under then Astros Manager Art Howe. He went on to later become manager for the Detroit Tigers and Milwaukee Brewers before coming back to Houston. And like I said, lucky for us he did.

As Skipper for the Astros, Garner led the team to greater success than any other manager in franchise history. Among the many successes the team had under his leadership, nothing was greater than the team's first and only World Series appearance. Even though I lost the bet with a Chicago Congressman and had to send them some real Texas barbecue from the "Tin Roof" Bar-B-Q when the White Sox beat the Astros, I went down swinging with "Scrap Iron."

I have known Phil and his family for many years. His example and character has had a tremendous impact on my son, Kurt, as well as many other young people that have had the pleasure of knowing him. The Astros, and the entire city of Houston, are lucky to call him one of our own.

The great thing about baseball is everyone can enjoy the game. You don't have to be the biggest or the fastest to play. And if you don't want to take out a loan to go to a major league game, there's still plenty of ball to be seen. You will be hard pressed not to find a little league, high school or college game just about any day of the week and I can assure you our local talent won't disappoint and won't break the bank.

I can't wait to start baseball all over again—this time as a grandfather and take my grandsons and granddaughters to the "National Pastime." I wish all the area youth leagues, high schools, colleges and of course, the 'Stros the best of luck this season. Now, let's play ball!

And that's just the way it is.

AN ACCURATE ESTIMATE OF THE COST OF A CAP AND TRADE PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 2009

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I would like to bring attention to a letter sent by John M. Reilly, of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, to Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER. During the debate on the FY10 Budget Resolution, the cost of a cap and trade program became a major point of contention. Mr. Reilly, in this letter, clearly explains the methodology used by MIT to determine the approximate cost to an average family of a cap and trade proposal. As the letter makes evident, the actual cost to the average American family will likely be far less than estimated by our friends on the other side of aisle.

JOINT PROGRAM ON THE SCIENCE AND POLICY OF GLOBAL CHANGE, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,

Cambridge, MA, April 1, 2009.

Representative JOHN BOEHNER (R-OH),
Office of the House Republican Leader, Washington, DC.

It has come to my attention that an analysis we conducted examining proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, Report No. 146, Assessment of U.S. Cap-and-Trade Proposals, has been misrepresented in recent press releases distributed by the National Republican Congressional Committee. The press release claims our report estimates an average cost per family of a carbon cap and trade program that would meet targets now being discussed in Congress to be over \$3,000, but that is nearly 10 times the correct estimate which is approximately \$340. Since the issue of legislation to control greenhouse gases is now under consideration, I wanted to take an opportunity to clear up any misunderstanding created by this press release and to avoid further confusion.

Why is this amount so different? As far as I can tell the \$3,000+ is based on the potential auction revenue the government could collect by auctioning the allowances over the period through 2050 where a simple average over all years from 2015 to 2050 was computed. The tax revenue collected through such an auction, the costs of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and the average impact on a household are very different concepts. Thus, there are several things wrong with this calculation. First, the auction revenue is determined by the CO₂ price and how many allowances are issued—allowances tell us how many tons of CO₂ (or more broadly greenhouse gases) will continue to be emitted. The cost of reducing emissions depends on how much emissions are reduced not on how much continues to be emitted. Second, the CO₂ price reflects the cost of the last ton of emissions reduced but there are many options that cost much less than avoiding the last ton and so using the CO₂ price multiplied by the number of tons (either reduced or emitted) is also wrong. Third, the average cost to a household depends on how allowances or the allowance revenues are distributed. Fourth, the costs are borne over time and it is wrong to produce a simple average of such costs as that does not take account of the time value of money.

We assumed in the analysis we did that the revenue is returned to households. From data in the report we can calculate the economic cost in each year (percentage loss times the base welfare level in each year), and divide this by the U.S. population, and then multiply this amount by four to estimate the cost for a representative family of four. We further apply an economic discount rate of 4 percent to get the Net Present Value (NPV) cost in each year in the future. Doing this we find that the NPV cost per family of four starts at about \$75 in 2015, rises to nearly \$510 by 2025, and then falls to \$205 by 2050. We can calculate the average annual NPV cost per family by summing over all years and dividing by the number of years, and this shows the average annual net present value cost to be about \$340—only a part of which would be actual energy bill increases. This \$340 includes the direct effects of higher energy prices, the cost of measures to reduce energy use such as adding insulation to homes, the higher price of goods that are produced using energy, and impacts on wages and returns on capital. The cost per household will vary from our hypothetical average family of four depending on the household's circumstances. Those households with large heating and cooling bills because of the climate in which they live or who drive more than average will face higher costs. Those with smaller homes who live in benign climates will have lower costs. The higher energy prices encourage reductions in energy use by increasing the payback on improvements in energy efficiency, and through such investments households can avoid paying more for energy. Jobs and wages in fossil fuel industries are likely to decline but job opportunities will increase in industries that produce alternative energy sources or that provide ways to save energy.

While the \$340 average annual cost we estimate for a family is just one tenth of the \$3000+ cited in the misleading press release, Congress should address the costs of this transition for middle and lower income families while developing Cap-and-Trade legislation. In another paper (Report 160, Analysis of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Tax Proposals) we make some calculations on the burdens of a GHG tax on families at different income levels. Our Report 160 shows that the costs on lower and middle income households can be completely offset by returning allowance revenue to these households.

Climate change poses severe risks for the U.S. and the world. It will take efforts in the U.S. and abroad to reduce emissions substantially to avoid the most serious risks of climate change. One of the perplexing aspects of the problem is that the solution involves using cleaner energy sources that are more costly than conventional fossil fuels. And the higher energy prices needed to cover the higher costs will fall disproportionately on the poorer members of society in the U.S. and in the world. However, the less wealthy members of our economy also stand to suffer most from climate change—whether it is through the risks of increased food prices if climate change disrupts crops, the lack of access to air conditioning under extreme heat, or vulnerability to other extreme weather and storm events such as hurricanes which may increase with climate change. Many of the proposals currently being considered by Congress and as proposed by the Administration have been designed to offset the energy cost impacts on middle and lower income households and so it is simplistic and misleading to only look at