

school of higher learning. His staff, it is reported, requested that the Catholic university cover up the image of Christ on the cross before President Obama would give his speech at Georgetown. I don't know that any previous President, Mr. Speaker, has ever made such a request.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if President Abraham Lincoln, one of President Obama's heroes, would have said overseas that he believed America was a Nation of secularists, or would President Abraham Lincoln have said, America is a Nation which tolerates all faiths, but which is populated primarily by Christians.

President Lincoln felt quite differently than President Obama. Rather than proclaiming the United States a Nation of secularists, President Lincoln warned the people of America to not forget God. In fact, it was on May 30, 1863, that President Abraham Lincoln said, as part of his proclamation for a National Day of Prayer and Fasting, and I quote, Mr. Speaker: "We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven. We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power, as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own . . . It behooves us then," said President Lincoln, "to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

And, Mr. Speaker, likewise, as President Obama insisted a Catholic university cover the image of Christ during the Easter season while he spoke at that school, George Washington, our first President, demonstrated that he was not offended by the image of the risen Christ. In fact, our Nation's first President let his views be known quite clearly on his inauguration by a prayer which George Washington himself gave at his inauguration. He said, and I quote, Mr. Speaker: "Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And finally, that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Mr. Speaker, our first President, George Washington, insisted on his inauguration day as the first President of this great country, that unless the citizens of our country imitate the example of Jesus Christ, that we would not be a happy Nation. What a clear contrast between our first President and our current President.

And with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I think it's so important, on behalf of the Prayer Caucus of this Congress that, as the National Day of Prayer approaches, that all American citizens do what our first President prayed in his inaugural prayer, and what President Lincoln prayed as well in his address and in his proclamation, that we would do well to imitate the life and example of Jesus Christ, and we would do well to humbly not forget God, but to humble ourselves before an Almighty God and not expect that it is we ourselves that have created these blessings for our country, but that it is a gracious heavenly God who holds our Nation in His hands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.)

CAP-AND-TRADE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight with an issue of enormous importance before the American people on my mind. And I'll be joined in just a few moments by distinguished colleagues from around the country who share my profound concern about legislation that has come to be known as cap-and-trade legislation. It is an effort that is under way here on Capitol Hill and from the Obama administration that could well result in an increase in energy cost for the average American household of more than \$3,000 per year.

□ 2045

Now we want to talk about the facts and the data here because, even in newspapers and in wire services tonight, that number, which is the calculation of a study done by MIT, is the subject of some dispute and of some debate. I want to concede the point that the impact on the average American household, if the President and the majority's cap-and-trade bill were to become law, could actually be much higher than that. In fact, it would be President Obama, himself, as a candidate in January 2008, who spoke these words in a meeting with the editorial board of the San Francisco Chronicle, and I

would say to any of our citizens who are looking in and who are Internet savvy: Don't take my word for it. Go to youtube.com and type in the President's name and the San Francisco Chronicle, and you can watch him say it for yourself.

I give the President, whose office and his person I respect, credit for candor. In January of 2008, he referred to this plan upon which he was campaigning and a plan upon which Democrats have now offered legislation, hearings for which begin this week.

The President said, "Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket." Adding, "That would cost money, and they will pass that money on to consumers."

Let me say again: While a careful calculation of a study done, I believe, in 2007 by a distinguished university, MIT, estimates that the average American household would experience increased energy costs of some \$3,128 per year, then candidate and now-President of the United States of America, Barack Obama, said that, if his cap-and-trade system passed into law, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.

Now, the last time I checked, which was just late last week, most of this country was going through one of the worst recessions we've experienced in decades. I say with a heavy heart that the people of Indiana recently learned that the unemployment rate in my fair State is now at 10 percent. The American people are hurting, struggling under the weight of the listing economic fortunes of this Nation. Let me say that the last thing, I believe, the American people want this Congress to do is to pass energy legislation in the name of dealing with climate change that could result in, to borrow the President's phrase, a skyrocketing of electricity rates on working families, small business owners and family farms.

As I prepare to begin to recognize some of my colleagues, many of whom have gotten to know more about this topic than I will have a chance to learn, I also want to make one more point about this: This legislation, known as the American Clean Energy and Security Act, offered on March 31, 2009, by House Energy and Commerce Chairman WAXMAN of California and by the Energy and Environment Subcommittee Chairman MARKEY, could not only result in this massive energy tax increase, but I want to say, if this legislation were to pass into law, it would be tantamount to a declaration of economic war on the Midwest by the liberal majority of this Congress.

Now, people who have known me over the last 8 years in this Congress know that I like to turn a phrase, but I don't like to be an alarmist, and so, for me to come to the floor of this Congress and say that I believe if the President's cap-and-trade bill were to become law it would, in effect, be a declaration of

economic war by liberals in Washington, D.C. on the Midwest, allow me to defend that point.

According to a recent study done by the Heritage Foundation, what they call their Manufacturing Vulnerability Index, a picture is worth 1,000 words. This map demonstrates the vulnerability being the highest among the dark red-colored States and the beige States being the least impacted by the cap-and-trade legislation. It tells the tale. I can't do better than this. So, when I say that to pass the cap-and-trade legislation could result in a massive national energy tax and would fall four-square on States that are most dependent on coal-burning power plants for the electricity that we use in our homes and in our small businesses and on our farms, the map tells the tale.

The least affected areas are on the coast—the west coast and in the Northeast—in places like New Jersey, Massachusetts, New York, Maine, and New Hampshire. A wider diversity of electricity sources of energy would be the least impacted. Likewise, California, Arizona, Oregon, and Washington State would be among the least impacted, but for the Midwest and my State, which according to this study is virtually ground zero of the impact of cap-and-trade's economic burden, the coloration of this map tells the tale. States along the Ohio River Valley, States across—let me say with pride—the heartland of this country, States that depend the most on coal-burning power plants will bear the greatest burden and households and small businesses and family farms in that region, a region, which if I can say on a very personal level, is already struggling in these difficult times.

As I mentioned, there is 10 percent unemployment in the State of Indiana, and for my Michigan neighbors who are looking in tonight, forgive me for not knowing the number, but I do know it's worse, and to think that this Congress, even as we speak, would be contemplating a cap-and-trade piece of legislation that may result in a massive national energy tax increase, falling most harshly on the Midwest, is unconscionable.

Now let me say one last item before I yield to a freshman. I'm going to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, and we'll hear from Utah and from the gentlelady who just spoke. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, you've heard that I've qualified my estimates here, because the truth is that the American Clean Energy and Security legislation, offered by the distinguished gentleman from California and by the gentleman from Massachusetts, actually includes no specific numbers on how CO₂ emission allowances would be allocated to energy producers. In other words, we don't know whether they'll be free, whether they'll be auctioned—the so-called cap-and-trade scheme. We don't know what price. Therefore, the bill that is going to be the subject of hearings on Capitol Hill this week provides

so little information that the Congressional Budget Office confirmed again today that they cannot score the cap-and-trade bill.

Now, as I told members of the media today, we had a little budget debate a few weeks ago, and I remember the Republicans came out with a budget alternative, you might remember, Mr. Speaker, and a few days before that, we thought it would be helpful to put out an outline of that budget alternative. Yet it's a live-and-learn deal around here, and what I learned was that the media really doesn't appreciate it when Republicans come forward without all the numbers in the proposal. I've internalized that lesson, and I'm applying it to the Waxman-Markey bill.

The truth of the matter is that a nonbinding budget resolution is one thing, but legislation that could literally change the economic fortunes of the heartland of America for generations is another.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, are entitled to know what all of this is going to cost, and we don't know today because the bill that will be the subject of hearings, that will be the subject of subcommittee markups just in a matter of days, I'm told, and that may well be on the floor here before we get to Memorial Day weekend has no numbers, no numbers for us to estimate the impact on the average American family, on the average small business owner and family farmer, and that is just not acceptable. So Republicans are left to use estimates like the study from MIT.

We took MIT's estimate of a key cap-and-trade bill from the 110th Congress, cosponsored then by Senator Obama, because the targets of that Senate bill tracked the emission targets outlined in the President's budget. We took MIT's own number, \$366 billion, divided that by the number of U.S. households. We assumed about 300 million people and an average household size of 2.56 people, all right? If we use that formula, you get roughly \$3,000 per household. Using current census figures, you get \$3,128 per household using MIT's own numbers.

Why are we using that? Why are we doing this calculation? Because we don't have any numbers in the bill.

The American people have a right to know. They have a right to know that the price tag is on the plans of this administration and of this majority to raise a massive national energy tax in the name of climate change. We urge them with all deliberate speed to cease and desist any further progress on cap-and-trade legislation until they put the numbers in the bill—leave aside Republicans in the Congress—and until they give the American people the opportunity to count the cost. You know, the old book tells you: Before you build a tower, before you go to war, you count the cost. The American people deserve the right to count the cost on the cap-and-tax legislation that is going to begin to be considered this week. They deserve nothing less.

So, with that, I'd like to yield to a new Member of Congress from Texas. The distinguished gentleman (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir. Well, thank you very much, my friend and colleague from Indiana, the chairman of our conference. I appreciate those eloquent remarks. I'm just going to echo them in a, probably, less eloquent way, but you are right on the money, my friend.

Last week, like my colleagues from Indiana, Utah and Minnesota, I was privileged to attend TEA parties across my district and to listen to my constituents express their outrage at the out-of-control spending that's going on here in Washington, D.C. While Washington goes on a spending spree, the American people are struggling to pay their mortgages on time, are concerned about keeping their jobs or about finding new jobs and are worried that their paychecks won't cover their bills.

Instead of trying to ease the economic burden on our families, congressional Democrats have decided to move forward with what I'll call a cap-and-tax plan—energy legislation that would place burdensome new taxes on American industries in the name of a shortsighted, politically correct and unscientifically proven environmental agenda. Even as families struggle to make ends meet, these new taxes could increase the cost of living of every single American, as my colleague said, by \$3,100 per year for a family of four and could pull \$860 billion out of family budgets to put in the Federal budget. I can't imagine a worse idea, and I can't imagine a worse time to do it. In these trying economic times, we should be doing everything we can to keep jobs in America and to encourage reinvestment in our own resources.

The Democrats' plan will increase the cost of doing business in the United States. It will put U.S. manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage, and it will likely force millions of U.S. manufacturing jobs overseas. The Democrats' bill even acknowledges the potential problem because they include rebates for specific sectors, industrial sectors, that would be harmed by the energy tax imposed by the bill. These specific industries are not named in the bill. Rather, the administration would get to pick and choose which industries would be eligible for the rebates—who wins, who loses.

As my colleague from Indiana eloquently said, the least the sponsor of this legislation could do is allow an honest debate over the course of the measure. Unfortunately, because of the lack of details in the draft legislation, the Congressional Budget Office is still not able to provide a cost estimate.

□ 2100

The bill does not identify how the tax would be levied or where the proceeds would be spent. How can we expect to debate a bill that will deeply alter our Nation's energy production and affect every American without the most important details? Specifically, how will

the Federal Government collect the more than \$640 billion of taxes estimated to be imposed by this bill? And where will that money go once it is in the hands of the Federal Government?

Any plans to implement a cap-and-tax program cannot be considered in a vacuum. We must engage in a broader, more comprehensive energy discussion. But I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to create an all-of-the-above energy solution that increases domestic energy production, supports renewable fuel innovation and encourages cleaner fuel technologies.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and congratulate him on arriving on Capitol Hill and in such a short period of time commanding the respect of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. PETE OLSON, we thank you.

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentlelady from Minnesota, let me amplify a point that Mr. OLSON made about the impact on this economy and jobs.

According to the National Association of Manufacturers, passing the cap-and-tax regime the likes of which Democrats are considering would result in the destruction of at least 3 to 4 million American jobs. According to the nonpartisan association, the National Association of Manufacturers, which really—as the gentlelady arrives at the podium—and I will recognize MICHELE BACHMANN from Minnesota—but this really begs the question, and I think this was a little bit of a question that was asked at some of the so-called TEA parties last Wednesday, people wonder if anybody in Washington here gets it anymore. I mean, during difficult times, every American family, every small business, every family farmer is out there finding ways to put off to tomorrow what they don't have to spend today. They are making sacrifices, they are making hard choices, they are looking for a little in-town income to supplement—looking for extra means to make it through.

What they are not doing is increasing spending in their family budgets and small business budgets, and they are certainly not increasing their costs. But that's what Washington, DC, is doing.

We've been on a spending spree over the first 3 months of this year: stimulus and omnibus and massive budget. And now the American people—as we dust off from being home with our families over the Passover and Easter holidays—and Congress is prepared to begin to have hearings on what could well be the largest tax increases in American history, a national energy tax that could raise the cost of living on every American household by more than \$3,128 a year, which I hasten to add, as I recognize the gentlelady for 5 minutes until she asks me for more, I hasten to add that the President of the United States, that as a candidate in January of 2008, “Under my plans,”

speaking of the President's plan of a cap-and-trade system, “electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.” And that is precisely the massive tax, national tax increase that we are here to oppose today.

I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota, MICHELE BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank so much my colleague, Mr. PENCE from Indiana, for yielding to me for 5 minutes.

And I want to recognize and honor our colleague, Mr. PETE OLSON. He's a wonderful freshman, and he's focused exactly on where we should be focusing, and that's on solutions.

We have a great solution to America's current energy crisis, and we do have one. And the great news is that the answer is here in our backyard. We have more coal in the United States than any other country in the world. We have abundant sources of natural gas. We have abundant sources of hydropower. We have abundant sources of wind, of solar. We have oil reserves. We have so much here in our backyard.

Instead of talking about a negative, draining our economy with the new cap-and-tax proposals, we could be here on this floor this evening talking about how we can create millions of new American jobs, high-paying jobs; be the lead exporter in the world of energy. That is the American story, and that's part of America's greatness. Unfortunately, the Obama administration, Mr. Speaker, as well as the Democrat majority that runs this body, is proposing a quite different solution. It's the new cap-and-tax proposal.

But people talk about cap-and-tax and they aren't sure exactly what we're talking about. Let's get back to step one: What is the problem? Why did we have to have this tax in the first place?

It's about carbon dioxide. Well, what is carbon dioxide?

Let us just go to a fundamental question. Carbon dioxide, Mr. Speaker, is a natural byproduct of nature. Carbon dioxide is natural. It occurs in Earth. It is a part of the regular life cycle of Earth. In fact, life on planet Earth can't even exist without carbon dioxide. So necessary is it to human life, to animal life, to plant life, to the oceans, to the vegetation that's on the Earth, to the fowls that fly in the air, we need to have carbon dioxide as a part of the fundamental life cycle of Earth.

As a matter of fact, carbon dioxide is portrayed as harmful, but there isn't even one study that can be produced that shows that carbon dioxide is a harmful gas. There isn't one such study because carbon dioxide is not a harmful gas. It is a harmless gas. Carbon dioxide is natural. It is not harmful. It is a part of Earth's life cycle. And yet we're being told that we have to reduce this natural substance and reduce the American standard of living to create an arbitrary reduction in something that is naturally occurring in the Earth.

We're told the crux of this problem is human activity. It's human actions

that are creating more carbon dioxide. Is that true or false? Well, carbon dioxide is a natural part of the Earth's atmosphere. But carbon dioxide is perhaps 3 percent of the total atmosphere that's in the Earth. So if you take a pie chart and all of Earth's atmosphere, carbon dioxide is perhaps 3 percent of that total.

What part of human activity creates carbon dioxide? If carbon dioxide is a negligible gas and it's only 3 percent of Earth's atmosphere, what part is human activity? Human activity contributes perhaps 3 percent of the 3 percent. In other words, human activity is maybe 3 percent contributing to the 3 percent of carbon dioxide that's in Earth's atmosphere. It's so negligible; it's a fraction of a fraction of a percent. It can hardly be quantified.

But let's go ahead and give those who believe in the global warming theory, let's give them their due. And let's say that former Vice President Al Gore is completely right in all of his premises. Let's give him his every premise that he believes on carbon dioxide and that emissions are rising here on planet Earth. Let's give him every premise.

And as we give him every premise, let's also give former Vice President Gore every solution that he believes the United States should embrace to address global warming; that we need to reduce our standard of living, tax our people, hike up the taxes. Let's say we put into place every solution that Vice President Gore has put forth for our country.

Even if we give Vice President Gore his premise, even if we give him his solution, what will be the result? Under his own figures, under Al Gore's own figures, we would reduce the amount of carbon emissions in Earth's atmosphere by the year 2095—the end of this century—we would reduce them by less than seven-hundredths of 1 percent. In other words, the temperature of Earth would drop less than seven-hundredths of 1 percent by the year 2095, and we would be essentially bankrupting our economy to do that. Certainly we would be dramatically lowering the American standard of living.

What will this mean? As my colleague, MIKE PENCE, has said, the American people will be paying not once for their electric bill; they will be paying twice. The American people will be paying double. They will be paying double for their electric bill; they will be paying increased prices at the gas pump, increased prices at the grocery store. They will be paying increased prices when they go to Target or Kohl's to buy clothing or goods for their family or to Wal-Mart. When they go to buy furniture, the prices will be included. Why? Because energy touches every part of American life. There is no part of American life or life anywhere on the planet that energy doesn't touch. What will that mean?

That will mean dramatic job losses. As a matter of fact, a study in Spain was concluded and it talked about new

green jobs that were created. For every green job that was created in Spain, 2.2 jobs were lost in Spain. Is that what we want in the United States, create green jobs only to see a dramatic reduction in American jobs? As my colleague, Mr. PENCE, said, the American heartland—I represent the great State of Minnesota—we can't afford that. And the chart that Congressman PENCE pointed to stated in the Heritage Study that Minnesota would lead the Nation in job losses if this new cap-and-tax situation was put into place, is that what America wants? I don't think so.

When you look at the fact that carbon dioxide is a natural Earth substance, part of Earth's life cycle, that human activity only contributes 3 percent of 3 percent, so negligible that even if we give the global warming enthusiasts every premise and put into place every prescription, that even so, by the year 2095, we will only reduce carbon dioxide emissions less than seven-hundredths of a percent. And we are willing to export American jobs to do that and do that in spite of knowing that China and India have already declared, We're not in. We're not in. So you might as well call President Obama's and the Democrats' cap-and-tax plan the "India and China job stimulus plan" because that's exactly what this will mean for the American economy.

We can do so much better.

As our colleague, PETE OLSON, said, we can, instead, embrace American energy solutions and create more natural gas, more oil, more coal, cleaner ways of heating and electrifying our Nation. That's not the way President Obama wants to go. President Obama said you can build a new coal plant but we will bankrupt you. As my colleague, MIKE PENCE, said, your electricity prices will skyrocket. It doesn't have to be that way.

I am so excited about solutions that we can have in our country, and that would be to make life better for the average American by reducing America's energy cost. This is reality. This is the good news. It's available to you, and the Republicans have a plan to do just that.

I yield back to my colleague from Indiana to tell more of the positive solution and the concerns that we have about this new cap-and-tax. As we go forward in the next weeks, we want to let the American people know, Mr. Speaker, that there are solutions to this problem, that we don't have to reduce America's standard of living.

With that, I would yield back to my colleague and thank him with much appreciation for hosting this remarkable hour this evening.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentlelady. And before she departs the floor—reclaiming my time—I would call the attention, Mr. Speaker, to you and anyone who might be looking in, to a map that reflects recent research done by the highly respected Heritage Foundation. They call this the manufacturing

vulnerability index, which really calculates what the gentlelady said about her home State of Minnesota, my home State of Indiana, represent those kind of heartland States that will be undeniably most impacted by a cap-and-tax system.

I would yield to the gentlelady for a quick response. We're struggling in Indiana. Our economy, Mr. Speaker, has a 10 percent unemployment rate. The idea of Congress actually making a priority today—in the name of climate change—to pass legislation without numbers in it. Again, I want to emphasize we don't have numbers in this bill, but the estimates are based on independent studies that it will cost millions of jobs, the estimates are that it will burden families.

I would just ask the gentlelady, are the good people of Minnesota in a better position than the people of Indiana to absorb a national energy tax of some \$3,128 per household?

I would yield.

□ 2115

Mrs. BACHMANN. Absolutely not. As a matter of fact, in Minnesota, we have had, historically, a very low level of unemployment. However, now, with the economy in the condition it is in, Minnesota is very unusual; we are upwards of 8 percent unemployment. In my largest city, we are looking at approximately 10 percent unemployment. In one of my great rural counties, we are also at about 10 percent level of unemployment. In Minnesota, that is absolutely unheard of.

And I would also refer to the map that the gentleman from Indiana is holding. This is a wealth redistribution scheme—some people would call that socialism. This is a wealth redistribution scheme. The reason why I say that is because the individuals in the United States that live in the heartland will be paying the tax, much of which will be redistributed to States on the coast, which will be paying negligible tax. And so all of that money will be taken out of the area in the United States that is very hard hit by this economy and transferred to Washington, D.C. and redistributed to other States.

This is adding insult to injury to an already painful process that a lot of people are going through. And that is why no one can understand this right now. I think no more clear statement needs to be said than that which our President stated perhaps about 4 or 5 weeks ago when he stated, he will have—this is a nonnegotiable. He wants this cap-and-tax. This is President Obama's highest priority. He wants this passed. But he also said that our economy couldn't take the imposition of this tax right now; it couldn't take it because our economy is vulnerable. So he is saying that he wants to delay imposition of this tax until 2012.

What does that tell the American people? The American people are smarter than that. They recognize this is a tremendous burden on their pock-

etbook and a job killer and, therefore, it should be a deal killer here in the Congress. And I know for you this is, for me this is. We have got to get to a better solution. Thank God we have one.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentlelady. And I will let her get on to her evening. But I did hear news reports of the administration's suggestion that they might consider phasing in the cap-and-tax. It kind of reminds me of that story of how you boil a frog, whether you turn the heat up slowly and bring it to a boil or whether you drop it into scalding water, it seems to me you've still got a dead frog at the end of that story.

The truth of the matter is that there are better solutions, solutions where we don't end up transferring enormous amounts of wealth from the heartland of the country, from the manufacturing bedrock of this Nation, if I can say with some regional pride. There are better solutions where we can deal with CO₂ emissions, with new technologies. We can develop a broad, comprehensive energy strategy. And as I thank the gentlelady, Mr. Speaker, and wish her a restful evening, I am prepared to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Let me just assure, it has been mentioned by several of my colleagues, I was actually asked by the Republican leader of the Congress to lead a Republican Energy Solutions Working Group. We have brought together not only the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, JOE BARTON, but also I've got the capable assistance of co-chairmen in the likes of Congressman JOHN SHIMKUS, Congressman FRED UPTON, men who have the experience and the background that helped us develop the American Energy Act as a Republican alternative in the last Congress and are in the process of building a comprehensive Republican energy alternative as we speak.

There are better solutions. There are better options. We can achieve cleaner air without raising taxes on every American household in the form of a national energy tax, a cost of living tax, according to estimates, of more than \$3,128 per year.

Before I yield to the gentleman, let me say this point again because it is—you can probably tell I am a pretty patient man, Mr. Speaker, but when it comes down to denying the American people the information that they need to make informed choices, I am an impatient man. The truth is—and anyone looking on deserves to know—that this week this Congress will begin to debate what could well result in a massive change in our energy generation system in this country, the so-called cap-and-trade system, which would fall foursquare on coal-burning power plants in this country, would fall foursquare on the region of the country that I call home in Indiana and the industrial Midwest that relies so heavily

on coal-burning power plants. And this massive multigenerational impact on our economy, on our way of life, all in the name of climate change, and we have no numbers.

Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable. It is not acceptable that the American Clean Energy and Security legislation that will be the subject of hearings beginning this week has been brought to the floor so bereft of detail that the Congressional Budget Office cannot tell the Members of this Congress or the people of the United States of America how much this is all going to cost. That is not acceptable. I urge my colleagues, burn the midnight oil, put the numbers in, or pull these hearings, pull this legislation until you can produce a bill that my colleagues—like the gentleman sitting across the aisle tonight, colleagues that I respect, colleagues with whom I differ vehemently on issues, but whose integrity I respect—that our colleagues can come together and have an honest debate about what this will really cost the American people.

Let's debate climate change. Let's debate the science. Let's debate the solutions for achieving carbon dioxide reductions and particulates. But let's also debate the cost. Let's allow the American people to count the cost before this Congress considers a massive national energy tax that could change our economy forever and essentially amounts to an economic declaration of war on the Midwest by liberals here in Washington, D.C.

With that, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the former Speaker of the Utah State House, a distinguished member of the Republican minority, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), an expert on issues of energy and an eloquent spokesman about positive solutions.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the kind words from the gentleman from Indiana. And I understand not only the passion, but the desire to be able to have some kind of strong, stable numbers that you can grasp to try and discuss the debate. No one really knows what it is going to do when you are trying to go into the darkness of a room that doesn't have the lights turned on—maybe because there is too much of an energy tax—but doesn't have the lights turned on to tell us what those numbers actually are.

We have heard a great deal about the cap-and-tax proposal. I would like to take the debate maybe one step backwards slightly and just talk about a few basic principles if I could. For we have been engaged in this Congress in something I find very unique, something we haven't had in the last 15 or 16 years in either the Bush or Clinton administrations. We are truly involved in a philosophical, fundamental debate in this Congress. There are those in this Congress and in the administration who truly believe that the best solutions to our problems lie in increasing the role of government. And there are

others who truly believe that the best way of finding those solutions are in empowering individuals. And on every issue we have had to date in this Congress, that is truly the crux of the debate. I mean, we may be talking about energy today, or we may be talking about health care tomorrow, or we may be talking about bank bailouts, housing, the budget yesterday. But in each of these issues, that was the same debate; is the better solution empowering individuals or growing the size of government? And in each of those debate areas, in all sincerity, the Democrats basically gave us three options. And it doesn't matter which issue you want to use, you can just put it in there and it is basically the same concept, that in each of these issues they decided, first of all, that it will be the government that will dictate and regulate.

In this cap-and-tax or cap-and-trade policy, if it goes through, every person will use the kind of energy and the style of energy as has been dictated by Washington. And in so doing, it would create bigger government, when the EPA will already say without additional legislation they have the power to control the air that we breathe just as they have said they have the power to control the water so they can illustrate or demand that an irrigation ditch be classified as part of the navigable water system of the United States. That is essentially big government.

The third element is that it will involve higher taxes. By the President's own budget numbers, this program is identified in his budget as adopting \$600-plus billion of new revenue coming from this cap-and-tax. And it is revenue that is not going to the production of alternative energy; it is revenue that would go into the paying for the increase of government that we have done in other bills that we have debated already. And any time that we actually talk about higher taxes, they become winners and losers, as the gentleman from Indiana showed you on his map.

If you go to the west coast, the Speaker's district, for example, with a great deal of hydrogen power, there is less of an impact than if you go to the heartland of this country, into the Midwest, where almost all their energy comes from coal-fired sources. There are winners and losers in this type of approach. And even the President's budget director simply said that this program will impose costs on the economy, and we need to know what those costs are in very, very specific numbers.

You know, last week we had the TEA tax protests that were going on. And as an old history teacher, I'm sorry, I had to think about this, history does repeat itself. Back in 1773, the British East India Company was in financial trouble, and so the Parliament decided the British East India Company was too big to fail and, therefore, they entered into a bailout agreement. And in this

bailout agreement, they imposed a one-size-fits-all mandate on the colonies that the only tea they could drink would be imposed and come from the British East India Company, and the only tax they would pay had to go back to one specific source. It is amazing sometimes that we actually do repeat what has happened in history.

Now, I said this is a basic debate and the Democrats have three positions. Well, so do the Republicans, and a vast contrast to them, whatever the issue you want to put in there. But the first one goes back to the idea that the fundamental difference in the solutions that Republicans have proffered—whether they were actually heard on the floor or not, but have proffered—the first one is to go back to the concept that we believe there should be choice and options for Americans. The Founding Fathers in 1773, when they were dumping tea in the harbor, were not just upset about a tax—which, actually, technically, had been lowered—they were upset about the fact that they were eliminated the choice to drink whatever tea they wanted to; that if they wanted to pay for a more expensive Dutch brand, they could not have that option.

You know, when I was growing up and I wanted a particular song in the age of plastic records, you had to buy the whole album to get the song. Now, I don't know how iPods work, but my kids tell me that it's cool enough right now that you can actually download the particular song you want. You look around in the world we have today, and everybody, in almost every aspect of their lives, is able to select and make choices and options except when you deal with the Federal Government. And maybe it is time the government needs to realize that, rather than giving a one dictate, one solution and regulate it, you allow people the choice to have options, and in so doing, you empower people with those choices.

We have already had different concepts placed on the table that are out there for debate. The No-Cost Stimulus Act is one that I sponsored with Senator VITTER that deals with developing energy sources across the board. The Western Caucus will join with the Republican Study Committee in coming up with an option. There will be more options that will empower Americans to be able to make choices by using all of the above, not taking some energy sources off the table, not trying to use a tax that will pick winners and losers, but simply trying to give those. And those will be alternatives that we will be throwing out.

There are some people that say my party is the party of "no." I have to admit, with some of the bills we have had on the floor, it is very easy to vote that way. But if you were to ask me if the bailout bills excessively entangled business and government, I would say yes. If you asked me if the stimulus bill stimulated the growth of government more than jobs, I would say yes.

If the GIVE Act actually paid people to volunteer and allowed groups like ACORN to get Federal funding? Yes. If the omnibus land bill made a difference in making it more difficult for the Park Service to fulfill their mission, I would say yes. If the AIG bonus tax was an unconstitutional tax that was a regressive cumulative tax to try and get even with somebody, I would say yes. But if Homeland Security, when they implied that veterans may be part of a right-wing group that needs to be watched carefully, and you asked me if that was outrageous, I would say yes. If you asked if the budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much, I would say yes. In all due respect to my colleague from Indiana, I think we are the party of "yes"; it is just the media is not asking the right questions.

And if you were to ask whether empowerment of people and giving them options and choices is the right thing to do, emphatically yes. Because when we try to lower taxes, we take the winners and losers off the table and realize that far too often when we raise taxes, it is people who are on the margins are the ones who are most likely to be harmed.

□ 2130

If you were rich, a cap-and-trade policy, or a cap-and-tax policy, will be merely an annoyance, just as the \$4-a-gallon gasoline was last fall. It kind of takes you back to the medieval time period where the aristocracy knew that there were sins out there but they could simply go down and buy an indulgence and thereby simply continue on with the same lifestyle without any kind of inhibitions or disruptions whatsoever because they simply bought their way out of it. Poor people could never do that. People on the poverty level today where 50 percent of their income goes to energy, when they hear us talk about energy processes or energy policies, for them that debate is how they heat their homes and how they cook their food and whether they'll be able to afford a luxury like tuna casserole this evening.

Affordable, comprehensive, and available energy has been the great equalizer in the history of this country, allowing people to escape poverty and move forward. When we talk about programs that are either going to take money away from those people and then maybe even return it, that is a ridiculous concept. If we talk about programs that are going to increase the prices for those on the margins to survive and to live, that's the same thing as a direct tax on those individuals. For, indeed, if we get to the point in those different parts of this country where you go into a room and you have to flip on the light switch, and if you're rich, it's okay, you can handle it; but if you're poor, you have to determine where flipping on that light switch today makes a difference on whether you can afford Hamburger Helper to-

night, we have reached the point where we are no longer taking care of the needs of our people, and we are putting a great slice of the American population at extreme risk.

That is a dangerous situation in which to move, and it should be done carefully and it should be done realistically with, as the gentleman from Indiana has said, the numbers and the debate all on the table. That's the future, and that is the fundamental debate that we will be having on this issue and with every other issue, transportation, housing, budget, that we will come up with. That's all there.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for his extraordinary remarks and eloquence. And let me thank my colleagues who have joined me and let me thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy of recognizing us for this debate. It will be the first of many, many hours on this floor, in committees, on the airwaves, and on the stump that House Republicans and, I expect, more than a few Democrats are going to be taking a case against this extraordinary national energy tax increase to the American people.

I am very provoked by the larger themes that Congressman BISHOP brought forward tonight because, as I have been tapped to lead the House Republican Energy Solutions Working Group. Republicans will be coming up with an alternative energy strategy that will be built on precisely those ideals, on choices and options, on empowering individuals and small businesses, and on not only not raising taxes, as the President's cap-and-trade plan intends to do, a strategy of tax increases and fees on utility companies that will be passed along to the consuming public, most especially those of us who live in the Midwest; Republicans will be bringing forward ideas to actually use the Tax Code to give incentives for energy-producing companies to develop the new technologies that will result in cleaner air and a safer environment.

But let me recap, if I can. Anyone looking in tonight, Mr. Speaker, has a right to know this week, in the midst of these challenging economic times, this Congress is going to begin hearings and in a matter of a few days is going to begin the process of legislating, marking up, and ultimately bringing to the floor within this month legislation that could result in an increase in the cost of living, energy cost of living, of some \$3,128 per year for every working family, small business, and family farm in America. And as the Heritage Foundation's recent Manufacturing Vulnerability Index showed, the President's cap-and-tax proposal will fall most squarely on the heartland of America, where my heart is, in the State of Indiana, and other great States of the industrial Midwest. Why? Is there an intention to go after a part of the country? Of course not. It's that

we out in the Midwest along the Ohio River Valley, there where I went to college, we rely on coal-burning power plants for an inordinate amount of our electrical energy, in our businesses, in our farms, and in our homes. So the President's plan to cap and tax utility companies that burn coal principally will fall foursquare on the Midwest. In fact, the President admitted this point, and I give him high marks for candor and clarity.

In January, 2008, the President said: "Under my plan of cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. That will cost money. They," referring to utility companies, he said, "will pass that money on to consumers." Give the President of the United States credit for candor.

And, you know, as I always tell folks back home, don't take a politician's word for it. Go to youtube.com and type in the President's name respectfully and type in "San Francisco Chronicle," and you can watch him say it for himself, as more than 200,000 Americans already have.

The last complaint I have is just that it's about the numbers. I spoke to a number of colleagues in the media today and pointed out to them that the Waxman-Markey bill that will begin hearings today includes no specifics whatsoever on how CO₂ emission allowances will be allocated to energy producers. In other words, we don't know if they'll be free or if they'll be auctioned or at what price. This legislation they are about to have hearings on is bereft of numbers. That the Congressional Budget Office can't even tell us what it's going to cost. Namely, the American people are expecting this Chamber to take up legislation that could transform the economy of this Nation forever, transform the economy of the Midwest forever, and we are not being given the numbers necessary to count the cost and make an informed judgment. And that is simply not acceptable.

I close with some words that I first noticed about a year ago. They are the only words chiseled on the wall other than "In God We Trust," which I also believe. But Daniel Webster has got some words up there that without my reading glasses on, I can't get all of them, but they are actually words about the environment, and they are words about natural resources. Isn't it interesting that in the last century as they put together this room, they put words up on the wall that talked about natural resources and energy. It's pretty interesting. Daniel Webster, at some point in his storied career, said, "Let us develop the resources of this great Nation and call forth its power, and in so doing, let us do something worthy to be remembered."

I really believe that the foundation of American greatness is our faith in God, our freedom, and our vast natural resources. The combination and our fealty to those three things, our belief

that America wasn't just an accident with somebody sailing on the way to India, that Providence had His hand on this miracle, our belief in freedom and free institutions and private property, economic and political freedom, combined with this extraordinary continent of natural resources, has allowed us to build the freest and most prosperous Nation in the history of the world. We can confront every challenge facing us in the 21st century if we build on that foundation of a belief in freedom and embrace those natural resources and renewing our faith in Him who set this miracle on these shores. But it all begins with knowing what we're doing.

So let's get the details out. The American people deserve to know what's in the cap-and-tax bill before the hearings start tomorrow, and we will keep coming to this floor until we get the numbers for every single one of those Americans that will be affected.

ENERGY AND THE CLIMATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it was enjoyable to listen here to my colleagues from the other side of the aisle with their version of what they would like the debate to be about.

I do hope that the American public zeros in on what we are saying here tonight, listens to my friends on the other side of the aisle, and draws their own conclusions. This is the most important discussion that we are going to have in this session of Congress.

Now, my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, doesn't think there are any problems with the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. It's interesting to listen to her say that something that was naturally occurring simply couldn't be harmful, ignoring the fact that we have the highest concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for two-thirds of a million years. The consensus of the scientific community, not people making things up on the floor of the House, is that this has been profoundly influenced by human activity starting with the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, where we started consuming huge quantities of coal, burning fossil fuels, accelerating that over time. The consensus of the scientific community is that this is, in fact, a serious problem.

The debate is going far beyond sort of the modest disputes that people may take back and forth from one another that it may not work. The new Secretary of the Department of Energy has likened it to somebody who has been given an assessment by an engineer that their house is in danger of falling down, that it has an 80 percent chance of falling down or burning up because of faulty wiring. And the re-

sponse, before a rational person spends huge sums of money, they might get a second opinion. And if that second opinion says, yes, that house is going to burn up or fall down in the not too distant future, it would be not irrational to maybe get a third or a fourth. But as Secretary Chu points out, it's pretty risky business to run through all the engineering professionals until you find one outlier who says forget about it, don't worry, your house isn't going to fall down. None of us, none of us, would treat our family that way.

I am embarrassed for them that they continue to trot out the number of somehow a \$3,100 cost on the American public according to an MIT research analysis. Well, as I pointed out during the debate on the budget before the floor of the House of Representatives, that is a hopelessly tortured interpretation of some decent scientific research. The author of that study, John Reilly, sent, on the 1st of April, to JOHN BOEHNER a letter setting the record straight. Mr. Reilly indicated that it was wrong in so many ways, it's hard to begin. The fact is that they totally misrepresented the thrust of the research and they assumed that none of the benefits would flow back to the economy or the families in question.

□ 2145

Professor Reilly pointed out that that's a bogus number, that it is perhaps, at most, one-tenth of that amount, according to their research. And yet the Republican leadership and Republican members keep coming to the floor citing erroneous information, but it is symptomatic of the approach that they have taken to this critical issue. They ignore the fact that we are facing dramatic changes to our economy, to the health and future of our family, to our way of life, to the environment, if we continue down this path.

Sir Nicholas Stern issued a report on behalf of the British Government that indicated, according to their analysis, that the cost of inaction is five times greater than the threat of moving forward and making a change.

So it's one-fortieth of what BOEHNER is talking about and the other Republican talking points, but they are not comparing it to what is happening to our environment now and where this path is going with rising temperatures, with permafrost that is no longer permanent, roads buckling, changing patterns of disease, insects, problems with forests that are infected, coastal areas washed away, drought, loss of snowpack.

These are things that we are facing right now in the United States. The high likelihood is that it is a result of our dependence on fossil fuels, greenhouse gases, failure to act.

And if we follow this path, we are going to pay a much greater price over time. But it is not true that there are no benefits to this alternative.

You know, if our friends on the other side of the aisle would ignore the advice of the Republican leadership that they not be legislators, that they be

communicators, if they would ignore that, roll up their sleeves, work in the committees of jurisdiction, we would have an opportunity to have the give-and-take. We would be able to focus on optimal ways to make sure that the fees for carbon pollution are channeled back to the American public and incent new matters of economic development.

We are seeing an explosion in solar and wind energy. We have an opportunity to not only create new industries, but of making America no longer the greatest waster of energy in the world. We waste more energy than any country in the world at great cost to American families.

If the Republicans join with us, roll up their sleeves and look at alternative ways of dealing with the fees on carbon pollution, we would be able to provide opportunities for a whole host of new products, techniques, buildings and at the same time we can reduce the energy costs of American families.

It is true that if the massive polluters of carbon pollution into the atmosphere, if they are finally charged a fee, if it is no longer free for them to pollute the atmosphere with carbon like we did with sulfur dioxide, like we did with CFCs—and, I must note, at that time industry analysts, the Republicans, apologists, some of the business associations, claim that acid rain, the trading, was going to wreck the environment. They claimed that the health benefits were not supported by science.

Well, the OMB has found that the acid rain program accounted for the largest quantified human health benefits in history: \$70 billion annually, more than any federally-implemented program in the last 10 years with benefits exceeding costs more than 40-1. Likewise, when we were concerned about ozone-depleting chemicals, DuPont warned that the United States' costs would exceed \$135 billion and "entire industries would fold." Well, the actual costs were almost 100 times less, and not only didn't DuPont fold, but they made millions of dollars selling substitutes for phased-out chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be some attention from the American public, attention to what the consequences will be for a fee on carbon pollution, the benefits for stopping the progress of global warming, the benefits for a whole new array of industries and practices, ways to make families safer, strengthen America, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and move us into a path in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that I am joined this evening by a number of my distinguished colleagues who are leaders in the efforts to protect the environment and the American public and to chart a new direction for environmental protection and the revitalization of our economy, creating jobs and saving the taxpayer money.

One that I would like to turn to right now is my friend PAUL TONKO from New