

and ranking minority member) to one minute.

Rule 10. Reference of Legislation and other Matters. All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks of the date of receipt by the Committee unless action is taken by the full Committee within those two weeks, or by majority vote of the members of the Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee. In the case of legislation or other matter within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, the chairman of the Committee may, in his discretion, refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration, or may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and also refer the matter to one or more additional subcommittees for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction. Such authority shall include the authority to refer such legislation or matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the chairman, with the approval of the Committee, from the members of the subcommittees having legislative or oversight jurisdiction.

Rule 11. Managing Legislation on the House Floor. The chairman, in his discretion, shall designate which member shall manage legislation reported by the Committee to the House.

Rule 12. Committee Professional and Clerical Staff Appointments. (a) Delegation of Staff. Whenever the chairman of the Committee determines that any professional staff member appointed pursuant to the provisions of clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who is assigned to such chairman and not to the ranking minority member, by reason of such professional staff member's expertise or qualifications will be of assistance to one or more subcommittees in carrying out their assigned responsibilities, he may delegate such member to such subcommittees for such purpose. A delegation of a member of the professional staff pursuant to this subsection shall be made after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and with the approval of the subcommittee chairman or chairmen involved.

(b) Minority Professional Staff. Professional staff members appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who are assigned to the ranking minority member of the Committee and not to the chairman of the Committee, shall be assigned to such Committee business as the minority party members of the Committee consider advisable.

(c) Additional Staff Appointments. In addition to the professional staff appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee shall be entitled to make such appointments to the professional and clerical staff of the Committee as may be provided within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee. Such appointee shall be assigned to such business of the full Committee as the chairman of the Committee considers advisable.

(d) Sufficient Staff. The chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee.

(e) Fair Treatment of Minority Members in Appointment of Committee Staff. The chairman shall ensure that the minority members of the Committee are treated fairly in appointment of Committee staff.

(f) Contracts for Temporary or Intermittent Services. Any contract for the temporary services or intermittent service of in-

dividual consultants or organizations to make studies or advise the Committee or its subcommittees with respect to any matter within their jurisdiction shall be deemed to have been approved by a majority of the members of the Committee if approved by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee. Such approval shall not be deemed to have been given if at least one-third of the members of the Committee request in writing that the Committee formally act on such a contract, if the request is made within 10 days after the latest date on which such chairman or chairmen, and such ranking minority member or members, approve such contract.

Rule 13. Supervision, Duties of Staff. (a) Supervision of Majority Staff. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman who, in consultation with the chairmen of the subcommittees, shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(b) Supervision of Minority Staff. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

Rule 14. Committee Budget. (a) Preparation of Committee Budget. The chairman of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee and the chairmen of the subcommittees, shall for the 111th Congress prepare a preliminary budget for the Committee, with such budget including necessary amounts for professional and clerical staff, travel, investigations, equipment and miscellaneous expenses of the Committee and the subcommittees, and which shall be adequate to fully discharge the Committee's responsibilities for legislation and oversight. Such budget shall be presented by the chairman to the majority party caucus of the Committee and thereafter to the full Committee for its approval.

(b) Approval of the Committee Budget. The chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House. No proposed Committee budget may be submitted to the Committee on House Administration unless it has been presented to and approved by the majority party caucus and thereafter by the full Committee. The chairman of the Committee may authorize all necessary expenses in accordance with these rules and within the limits of the Committee's budget as approved by the House.

(c) Monthly Expenditures Report. Committee members shall be furnished a copy of each monthly report, prepared by the chairman for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year by the Committee and subcommittees, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel.

Rule 15. Broadcasting of Committee Hearings. Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chairman of the Committee, the subcommittee chairman, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House.

Rule 16. Subpoenas. The chairman of the Committee may, after consultation with the ranking minority member, authorize and issue a subpoena under clause 2(m)(2)(A) of Rule XI of the House. If the ranking minority member objects to the proposed subpoena in writing, the matter shall be referred to the Committee for resolution. The chairman of the Committee may authorize and issue subpoenas without referring the matter to the Committee for resolution during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of 3 days when, in the opinion of the chairman, authorization and issuance of the subpoena is necessary. The chairman shall report to the members of the Committee on the authorization and issuance of a subpoena during the recess period as soon as practicable but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

Rule 17. Travel of Members and Staff. (a) Approval of Travel. Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following: (1) the purpose of the travel; (2) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (3) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and (4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) Approval of Travel by Minority Members and Staff. In the case of travel by minority party members and minority party professional staff for the purpose set out in (a), the prior approval, not only of the chairman but also of the ranking minority member, shall be required. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the ranking minority member in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

Rule 18. The chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purposes of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain an official website for the purpose of carrying out official responsibilities, including communicating information about the activities of the minority members of the Committee to Committee members and other members of the House.

Rule 19. The chairman of the Committee is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the chairman considers it appropriate.

CARBON POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, in every great problem there is a great

opportunity. We are now facing the most severe economic crisis in a generation. At the same time, the scientists are telling us clearly that our inaction dealing with carbon pollution is threatening the planet that is our only home. Fortunately, the same actions that will fix the economy will also help save the planet. In an economic downturn, we want to put people to work and help them manage costs. Energy efficiency does both and reduces carbon emissions at the same time.

The United States finally shook off the great economic depression of the thirties by mobilizing the economy to fight World War II. We can fight off this recession, deep as it is, by mobilizing our fight against global warming.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama, from the rostrum before you, laid out an ambitious agenda in his first speech to the Members of Congress, recognizing that as Americans we can do great things when we come together to work for the common good, as we did dealing with the challenges of World War II and the Great Depression.

The President has presented us with a clean energy jobs plan, a plan that will create new jobs that can't be shipped overseas, a proposal that will protect existing jobs while it reduces our dependence on foreign oil. It will avoid tax increases on working families as we all work to reduce carbon pollution. This plan starts by regulating carbon polluters and making them pay for the pollution that they've been allowed to spew out for free into the sky, damaging the atmosphere and threatening the water and land without regard to the cost to the rest of us.

Then the President's plan will create new jobs through research and development and deployment of new clean energy technologies such as wind, solar and biomass. It is exciting to see in the President's economic recovery package that we have already taken decisive action, investing billions of dollars across America to do something about it.

His plan further provides the support and the incentives needed to help the American spirit of innovation and creativity to build the new clean technologies of the future. Just as we led the world in developing the automobile and the computer, we can, and if we follow the plans that have been set forth that have been articulated by President Obama and the Democratic leadership, we will be able to lead the world in developing the new cheaper, cleaner energy technologies that will power this century in America and around the world.

These new technologies are already resulting in clean energy jobs that are forming the basis of our new economic security. Change is difficult under the best of circumstances, but I think there is growing recognition at this point that we have no choice. But we want to be thinking about the future, not planning the economy through the rear-view mirror.

The proposals that we are working on will provide all Americans with clean energy tax credits so that they will have money to buy clean energy technologies so that they personally can join in America's clean energy future. This will allow them to be stewards of the family budget while we are all stewards of the planet. In this way, the actions of millions of Americans to reduce their energy bills and to protect the planet will create even more jobs and lead to that prosperity that is so important to us all.

There are any number of examples, Mr. Speaker, about how what we have already done in energy efficiency has made a difference. Researchers at the University of California calculate that the gas and electric energy efficiency measures for the past 30 years in California have saved the residents of that State \$56 billion while producing 1.5 million new jobs.

They have projected that the savings in jobs for meeting California's new carbon cap-and-trade law, and by projecting it forward just to the year 2020, that Californians will save an additional \$76 billion in energy costs just at current rates. And I heard my good friend from South Carolina on the floor just a few minutes ago predicting that energy costs are going to be going up. I personally agree with him, I think he is right. But even at current rates, Californians would save \$76 billion and create an additional 400,000 new net jobs.

I'm from the Pacific Northwest, where we've been working very hard on energy efficiency over the course of almost 30 years. My hometown of Portland, Oregon, was the first city in the United States with a comprehensive energy policy that has made a difference for us in terms of saving money on energy, while we've created new economic opportunities and have reduced our carbon footprint.

In the Pacific Northwest, our Power Planning Council has estimated the work that we've done just in the Northwest alone between 1980 and 2000, where we invested almost \$2.5 billion in energy efficiency, our region earned that total investment back about once every 18 months. This is a rate of return of about 67 percent, annual rate of return on investment. An extraordinary record when we think about how our 401(k)s are turning into 301(k)s and 201(k)s. Watch the gyrations in the stock market and uncertainty in housing prices. Looking at what has happened with a very solid year-in, year-out rate of return on energy efficiency is truly encouraging and inspirational.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. We have heard the warnings from the vast majority of scientists developing a consensus about the threats to the planet. We are already feeling the effects of changing climate as we watch large quantities of polar ice disappear, as we watch snowpacks rise, when we watch the shift of patterns of migration of birds, where the permafrost in

Alaska is no longer perma, and the roads are buckling and coastal villages washing away.

The realities of climate change effects are being visited upon Americans across this country in all 50 States, and they are gathering momentum in terms of a sense of urgency and public awareness. We are watching groups in the evangelical arena, scientific arena, civic organizations, American business, labor, environmental organizations coming together to be part of this consensus. Leadership is being exhibited on college campuses and at synagogues across the country. Over 900 cities have made the decision that they weren't going to wait for the Bush administration; they were starting ahead with their own efforts to reduce pollution from carbon.

Well, we ignored the warnings of experts, for example, with the risks in the financial sector and, sadly, we've seen the consequences. We have learned the dangers and added costs of trying to move after the fact, after a disaster or after some sort of natural catastrophe occurs. It is very expensive cleaning up after Katrina, after flooding, after wildfires, as opposed to taking action to try and prevent it.

We, once again, need to act as good stewards of the Earth, protecting our children and grandchildren. We must remember that there will be great costs associated with dealing with impacts once they have occurred. Mr. Speaker, Mother Nature doesn't do bailouts.

We need to focus on the big picture. The economy is the task at hand. The next step to create millions of American jobs in renewable energy, energy efficiency, and modernization of a smart electric grid is going to make a difference now. Clean energy can provide an engine to drive the Nation out of a recession and sustain our economy for years to come.

It is time for us to step forward, investing seriously in energy innovation. We invest about one-tenth of 1 percent of our annual energy bill in research. It is absolutely ludicrous to have an area that is so central to our economy and our way of life, where we see costs escalating around the globe, and that we have neglected to invest in ways to drive technological innovation. Luckily, as part of the economic recovery package and legislation that is working its way through the House and the Senate, we will be addressing this issue of greater investment in innovation.

I see I have been joined by my colleague from the great State of Washington, Congressman INSLEE, who has focused a great deal of time and attention on this question of innovation as it relates to energy. He has sponsored legislation in this regard. He has been a champion in speaking out in forums large and small around the country and is hard at work now on the Commerce Committee in the formulation of legislation that will codify these opportunities and bring them to fruition.

I am pleased to yield to my friend if he would care to share some of his thoughts in this area.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I come to the floor with some good news tonight, and that is that the Energy and Commerce Committee will be working to produce a bill starting either late this week or early next week to really jump-start President Obama's vision for a transition to a clean energy future for the country.

□ 2030

And we reached today some very important milestones to reach consensus in our committee to move this vision forward. And I'm very optimistic about that, contentious as this is, for a couple of reasons. One, I just was being briefed by some findings about what Americans' beliefs are about this issue from a fellow named Mark Mellman, who basically looks and asks questions of people and what they think of America. And it was amazing how optimistic Americans are and how much they embrace this idea that we can innovate and create millions of new, clean energy jobs. In fact, the research showed that by two-to-one margins, over two-to-one margins, Americans believe that if we act in Congress to promote the creation of clean energy technology, to do the research and development to create these high-tech, energy-efficient sources of energy, if we create limits on the amount of pollution that polluters can put in the air, by two-to-one margins, Americans believe this will create jobs, clean energy jobs. And that fundamental belief is the thing that will allow the U.S. Congress this year to pass a bill to move us down the clean energy future.

And I would suggest there's a reason Americans believe by two-to-one margins that action on clean energy will create jobs, and that is that we're the most innovative, creative, dynamic, entrepreneurial society ever. And with all due respect to the Egyptians and the Romans, we are the most innovative society, and I think that this optimistic view by two to one that we can create jobs by moving forward in clean energy, it's really consistent with the American character. That's the first reason.

The second reason I feel excited tonight about the Commerce Committee's now advancing President Obama's clean energy vision is the same things that I've seen happen. I went home to Seattle, the Seattle region where I represent, and I just met such exciting people in the State of Washington who are creating these new jobs today.

Yesterday, I went to a company called MacDonald-Miller, a company in Seattle, and they install heating and cooling equipment and energy efficiency equipment. And a few years ago, they started to try to figure out how can they boost their sales. They were having some tough times. They actually went through a restructuring, and they asked themselves, how can we

boost our sales and build our company? And they decided to really pursue energy efficiency. And they decided to build a model, a business model, around selling efficiency services, and they showed me one thing they're doing. It's pretty amazing.

It seems so simple, but they are employing hundreds of people at this company by selling a product that will simply adjust your thermostat. If you've got an office building, it will adjust the thermostat dependent on the outside air temperature. And what they found is, and I know this sounds simple, but what they found is that people's comfort level varies on the outside temperature. So they might want it at 73 on a hot day, but they're comfortable at maybe 69 or 70 on a cold day. So they found out people's comfort level varies; so they basically are selling a product that will adjust the temperature of the office building to be consistent with that comfort level depending on the outside temperature. And they had an average reduction of energy of, I think, about 12 percent when they did that. And that's astronomical.

I mean, if you reduced everybody's energy 12 percent in your buildings, it would be incredible in your heating and cooling expenses. But most importantly, by doing that, they're creating jobs and wealth, and their sales have gone up dramatically in the last 4 or 5 years because they are adopting that strategy.

So what we are doing here in Congress in this bill, we will be adopting a provision that will call for Americans to have a higher level of renewable energy, 15 percent, and an additional 5 percent of efficiency gains that will help boost these companies that are now hiring so many people around the country.

Another company in my area called McKinstry, President Obama mentioned them when we were at the White House last week. They have similarly sold efficiency services.

So everywhere you look, you can find opportunities for this job creation. But what these companies need are policies that will level the playing field, because right now our policies just favor some of the older industries, and now we need some policies that will really level the playing field and allow this transition to take place.

Now, in this bill where we're going to be doing it, there are some costs associated, of course, as there always are. We don't usually expect something for nothing. But in our bill it's the polluters and the polluters' industries that will pay. They will be the ones that will be required to purchase and pay for permits associated with this pollution. And, generally, I think it's fairly well understood that in a society that favors responsibility, it ought to be the polluters who are responsible for costs, not citizens. In fact, there will be some assistance to citizens with their utility bills associated with this project.

So the good news that I'm hearing from across the country is Americans believe that we will create jobs if we act on clean energy, number one. And, number two, I'm seeing with my own eyes my constituents getting hired in these new emerging industries.

I went to the 3 Tier Corporation the other day. They essentially manage electricity in large corporations, manage server farms and manage the like, and they're hiring people. The AltaRock Company is doing engineered geothermal in the North Seattle area. That's where you poke a hole down, you pump water down it, it comes up hot, you make steam and generate electricity.

I went to a company called Ausra Engineering. It's a marine architecture firm in Seattle. You don't normally associate marine architectural firms with job creation and clean energy, but they are potentially working on platforms to build floating platforms for offshore wind turbines, and they are in the preliminary work of looking at particular designs to do that because we have enormous capacity for wind off of our shorelines.

So the basic American belief in the innovative spirit of the country is now being matched by these real businesses in real time, hiring real people with real paychecks, and that's what this bill is going to do that we are going to pass here out of the committee hopefully late next week to really jump-start, kick-start this job creation.

So I appreciate the gentleman's letting me join him in this discussion.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I, likewise, appreciate your comments and observations and bringing it down to real-life examples.

One of the nice things about being a Member of Congress is that we have a chance to see these products emerge. We have a chance to hear. We both serve on the Global Warming and Energy Independence Committee that the Speaker has set up, and for 30 months we have seen a parade of witnesses come before us with new and emerging technologies in wind and solar and transportation that are already putting Americans to work while they're working to save Americans money. But that is just, I think, a hint of what we can do in the future.

I'm watching in my hometown of Portland, Oregon, where we reintroduced a modern streetcar to the landscape. We just received approval from the Obama administration to move forward with a streetcar extension that's going to not only create nearly 1,300 jobs for construction and not only will we be manufacturing the first streetcar built in America in 58 years, but I know in your area in the Puget Sound you already have the South Lake Union Trolley that is in operation. You're looking to expand that. Every one of these projects not only represents an economic opportunity, but it dramatically changes the carbon footprint.

Servicing 240 units along a trolley line instead of a suburban subdivision is a million pounds of carbon a year that is saved. A trip not taken. Being able to extend things like modern streetcars to communities large and small across America, like they were a hundred years ago, provides an opportunity for thousands of construction jobs, changing the carbon footprint, changing the technological and manufacturing advances in ways that are going to affect millions of lives.

It is so important for us to be thinking about that big picture because we are exporting overseas over a billion dollars a day for oil and we're watching that probably starting up again. Last year it was \$700 billion that was lost. And this is money that is taken out of our economy. In my community, the difference between just the fact that we drive 20 percent less keeps \$800 million a year circulating in that local economy that isn't sent to Venezuela or to Saudi Arabia.

Mr. INSLEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I will be happy to.

Mr. INSLEE. I think that's a very important point is that the portfolio of these new renewable energy sources that are going to provide the electricity for both our toasters and for these train systems that Mr. BLUMENAUER talked about, when you generate this electricity using renewable sources, it's, by necessity, a domestic product. If you are using renewable energy to generate your electricity, you know you're using an all-American energy source, because that means the wind is right in eastern Washington or eastern Oregon.

By the way, Washington just had the biggest wind farm in America, became the largest producer of wind power in the world last year. There are actually as many people working in the wind power industry today as the coal mining industry. We're rapidly increasing the number of jobs, but we are using domestic energy when we use wind power.

I went to a company in Tri-Cities, Washington, a couple of months ago. The Infinia Company has developed a sterling engine. It's a solar energy system using a sterling engine, and that's a system where you have these concave dishes that look like large satellite dishes and they concentrate the sun's energy on a little engine about the size of a couple of pop cans, and that turns out pressure differences into mechanical energy and generates electricity. Now, when you use the Infinia system, you are getting a job creation in the Northwest, in Washington State, and you are using a domestic supply of energy, namely the sunshine that's falling on us right now.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. May I just elaborate on that point. I think that is a very important point to make, that this is 100 percent American energy, but also in terms of what happens with

the net economic impact. There are some who claim that, well, we should deal with the fossil fuels, the oil and coal, because they create jobs. Well, they do create jobs, but I think the evidence is clear that the investment in the alternative energies of the future that you're talking about, in wind and solar, the clean energy economy creates about four times the jobs for each million dollars invested as in the traditional fossil fuels. And when you consider that we are also avoiding some of the most negative consequences of burning dirty coal on the health of individuals and of the larger ecosystem, it is a multiple benefit to the economy and the environment.

You know, on the floor, and this was incredible to me, last week I heard my Republican friends being upset that the Speaker, with the initiative to green the Capitol, had replaced dirty coal with natural gas, which has half the carbon emissions. It doesn't have the other problems in terms of sulfur dioxide, in terms of carbon monoxide.

□ 2045

The Capitol Heating Plant was the number one source of pollution in our Nation's Capital, threatening the lives and health of people who work around the capitol. Children in our schools and the opponents of responsible action for a clean economy were saying that was somehow an attack on coal.

Mr. INSLEE. I think it's really important you have brought up the issue of coal. I think it's very important to note that when this bill comes out of our committee, it comes to the floor of the House. It is not going to ignore the potential of coal to remain part of our energy future.

We have huge amounts of coal reserves in this country that could power us for hundreds of years. But we need to find a way to burn it more cleanly, to take the carbon dioxide, which is now going into the atmosphere and making our oceans more acidic and contributing to global warming, to take that carbon dioxide and bury it in the Earth for 10,000 years so it's not going to be a problem. Now, in our bill we are not ignoring that issue. We are, in fact, contributing about a billion dollars a year in an effort to find a way to bury that carbon dioxide so we can continue to use coal.

Now, this is an important point, because we feel that we all need to move together, including the regions of the country that are very heavily coal dependent, and we intend to have a very well-balanced research program where we don't favor any one energy source. We are going to be doing work on solar, we are going to be doing work on wind, we are going to be doing work on geothermal, and we are going to be doing work to find a way, hopefully, to sequester carbon dioxide when it comes out of the coal-fired plants.

So I think that's an important point that all areas of the country you are going to have some benefit to find ways to use their energy sources.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your clarification of that. As it stands now, the way that we are using coal indiscriminately, not dealing with the consequences of not just the carbon pollution, but, frankly, there are other pollutants that we have been struggling with for years because of the hazards to human health and to the environment, but the willingness to focus on ways to truly try and make it possible to use coal in a way that is environmentally sensitive. I think it's very important. It is important not just because the United States has vast amounts of coal, but it would be nice if we could use them in a way that was safe and environmentally sound; but we are also facing a situation where there is still heavy reliance on coal in China, in India.

We, in the Pacific Northwest, are breathing Chinese coal pollution in the Puget Sound area, in metropolitan Portland every day. So your work on the Commerce Committee, to be able to have some resources to try and move this research forward dealing with ways to truly make it environmentally benign, I think it's very important, establishing standards and sticking by them.

I will be coming to the floor soon to talk about another methodology that has been employed in the past, which is an underground gasification process, where you never bring the coal to the surface, that the process of conversion takes place in the actual coal seam. There are projects under way right now in Wyoming. It was actually a technology that was developed by Nazi Germany and in the Soviet Union in an earlier era dealing with gasification of coal, but has tremendous potential for being able to use coal in a way that is environmentally responsible.

I appreciate the work that is being done to help advance these technologies and others.

Mr. INSLEE. You mentioned China, or meant to, one of the two. I wanted to comment on this too.

We are also, in this bill, dealing with, when we are advancing clean energy, we want to make sure we don't lose jobs in competition for some of these other countries, even if they don't move as rapidly as we do and try to move away from this pollution of CO₂.

And one of the things we are going to have in our bill is a provision that will protect our jobs and protect our industries against job leakage going overseas to countries that may not have some CO₂ regime to reduce pollution. We have now reached agreement, essentially, that we will essentially have a cushion for industry-intensive industries—steel, aluminum, cement—a cushion so they will be insulated from increases in energy costs associated with this so that we won't lose jobs, having these plants move to China or India or some other country that may not have a regulation on CO₂ as we do. This is a very important resolution.

I worked with Mike Doyle, a Representative from Pittsburgh, on this,

and we can now legitimately tell folks in these industries that we have this protection against job leakage. And it is a message, an important message, to countries around the world that all countries are going to have to enter into some action plan to reduce carbon dioxide.

We know we can't solve this problem without China's participation, and that's why in this bill we will also have a provision that in the event there is not progress made, that there could be trade adjustment at the border for imports from China if, in fact, China is unable to move forward with this. Now, we hope it will succeed on that and that won't be necessary.

But the point is we are designing a bill that will capture the innovation, allow us to make the electric car here rather than China, and not lose jobs in the steel industry. And I think we have designed a bill that's going to accomplish that.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We are following, on the Ways and Means, these provisions, closely. We are looking forward to having the bill out of your committee and on to our jurisdiction, one of the areas that Ways and Means jurisdiction deals with trade provisions. And we are quite confident that we can work with you in this area to make sure that people are not able to export their carbon pollution overseas or that other countries can import their carbon pollution into the United States.

I am looking forward to seeing the refinement that comes from your committee and working with my colleagues on Ways and Means to make sure that there are strong border protection provisions to make sure this is neutral. It is not anti-trade; it is not pro-trade. It is simply preserving the integrity of the carbon pollution regulation, and I am quite confident that these tools can be employed to accomplish precisely that.

Mr. INSLEE. I think, too, when we think about this clean energy future, it has to be in relationship with what other countries are doing as well. And when we pass this bill next year, it is going to be because we believe we are not going to cede these markets to countries who could steal these markets from us.

You know, we are in a race right now to see who is going to be dominant making electric cars and electric batteries. China has an interest in doing that, and they are making enormous investments to do that.

We are in a race today to decide who is going to dominate the solar-power industry. China is making enormous investments in their solar cells. In fact, I met a fellow from, I believe it was from, Indiana who had a solar cell manufacturing plant. And he had a guy walk in from China and plunk down \$300 million and try to get him to move his plant to China, lock, stock and barrel.

And the fellow said, I am a red, white, and blue American, and I am not

leaving. But that's what we are up against, and that's one of the reasons we intend to take an aggressive position here with research and development dollars, with limits on CO₂ that will spur investment and kick start the businesses here that we need so we can regain these markets.

You know, we invented solar energy in this country, but the Germans sort of commercialized it because they saw this a little before we did. We need to get in that game today and see to it that the companies like Infinia Companies and Nanosolar that's doing thin-cell photovoltaics and Bright Source.

By the way, I want to mention this one source of solar energy that people may not have heard about, the Bright Source Company and the Ausra Energy Company, two companies doing what's called concentrated solar power. What they do is they use mirrors in various fashions to concentrate radiant energy, heat up a liquid, make steam and then create electricity from it with zero pollution associated with it.

Bright Source has now signed contracts for thousands of megawatts of crystal pure solar energy in various places in the United States, and it would surprise you, it's not just Nevada. They have places in the Southeast where they can do this as well.

And it is this type of technological breakthrough that if we put our minds to it and pass this bill, we are going to jump-start jobs in this country.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the context that you have provided, and your unrelenting interest in understanding and acknowledging and advancing American technology, but, sadly, we are not—you mentioned having fallen behind the Germans, for example, in technologies that we developed in terms of the commercial application.

China is spending six times more than we spend on clean energy, \$12.5 million every hour of Chinese expenditure. We can't afford to be complacent about this. We need a sense of urgency.

While we are pleased with what's happening in the Pacific Northwest, you referenced the large wind farm in southeastern Washington. Portland, Oregon, is competing with Denver and Houston to be the wind energy capital and a couple of international companies have located their American headquarters there. And there are many technologies that we helped initiate, but we are falling behind.

We rank below Spain, Denmark and Portugal in the use of wind power. We watched what happened where little Denmark, what, about the size of the State of Washington, set its sight on being a wind energy leader, being the wind energy leader 30 years ago and have accomplished amazing feats, both in terms of their own energy production and the dominance of world wind energy activity, that one of those leading companies I mentioned that has its American headquarters in Portland, is Vestas, a Danish company.

So we watch what countries that we think are less developed than in the United States, like the Chinese, or small countries, like Denmark, really making significant advancement and putting the pressure on us to step up and do what we know we can do.

Mr. INSLEE. The gentleman has mentioned wind. Some people think of wind as kind of a toy you get under a Christmas tree or something. In fact, wind energy, according to the Department of Energy, and this was under the previous President's Department of Energy, concluded that we could have 20 percent of all of our electricity generated by wind in the next couple of decades, just using existing technology.

Now, we believe there are going to be some advances in technology. We think there is a good shot at having good storage. One of the issues of wind, of course, is the wind doesn't blow all the time. It's an intermittent source. So there is two ways to get around that problem: one, have multiple wind sites that are tied together in an advanced transmission grid so if the wind is not blowing in one place, it will be blowing in another; or to have a storage system.

And I have talked to these companies now that are developing batteries that are as large as a semi-trailer, and these now have the potential of actually being grid connected to store wind and solar when we have excess power generation. So we think there is a reasonable chance to get to 20 percent, which is very significant, just on one technology alone. Then we have so many options, of course, including efficiency, which can be done everywhere, day or night.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. And even problems of the intermittency dealing with wind energy, if it is coupled with other areas of innovation, like plug-in hybrids and using storage capacity in vehicles to be able to help balance some of the loads, we have tremendous opportunities to have these work together.

I must say, we are both from the Pacific Northwest, the issue of wind integration and how we are going to do that is something that is looming large on my agenda. I know you are concerned. We have our regional power marketing authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, which has been a leader in helping facilitate wind energy, but now it's looking at really rather dramatic cost increases for wind integration, which I am hopeful that we can look at very hard and help them find ways to not provide disincentives for wind energy production right at the point where all of the incentives that we have put in place are starting to kick in.

□ 2100

It would be unfortunate if somehow they are priced out of the market at just the time we want to engage them.

Mr. INSLEE. We appreciate the gentleman's leadership on that. I want to

thank you. I must excuse myself, but I want to thank Mr. BLUMENAUER for being such a stalwart champion of these causes. We know there's going to be thousands of jobs created in this clean energy revolution, and I hope a lot of them are going to be in Oregon, which is a great State.

Thank you for letting me join you, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Congressman INSLEE, for joining us, and for your leadership and comments.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Chamber will be able to reject the arguments of people who are looking at the smallest possible elements of the puzzle; people who are seeking to politicize it for short-term electoral gain at the expense of the long-term interests of our children.

I, frankly, have been embarrassed by some of the argumentation that we have heard; the misrepresentation of just basic factual information.

One of the things that we are hearing, sadly, from Republican leadership, is consistent misrepresentation, for instance, of the MIT study that you will hear referred to. The St. Petersburg Times had an editorial of late saying, "The GOP is full of hot air about Obama's light-switch tax. If the Republicans had simply misstated the results of the MIT study, the Truth-O-Meter would have been content giving this one a False. But for them to keep repeating the claim after the author of the study told them it was wrong means we have to set the meter ablaze. Pants on Fire," was their evaluation.

In the Wall Street Journal: "For starters, the figures cited by Republican House leadership is almost 10 times higher than the cost estimate provided in the study" by Professor Reilly of MIT.

The Boston Globe: "One particular issue is Republicans' assertion that a cap-and-trade system on greenhouse gases would mean a 'light switch tax.' 'It's just wrong,' Reilly said. 'Wrong in so many ways, it's hard to begin.'"

I would hope, particularly when we still have not had the actual provisions of the legislation put in place, for people to make wild misrepresentations about costs and consequences does a disservice to what is one of the most important debates of our generation.

Being able to protect the planet, to restore our economy, to regain our position of technological leadership, and be able to put us on the path of sustainability environmentally and economically for the future, the stakes are too high to have misrepresentation, to have an inability for people to engage in reasonable discussion.

I know the Republican leader has said that his members shouldn't be legislators; they should be communicators. They should be talkers instead of doers. I hope—I fervently hope—that many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will reject the leadership's marching orders to politicize, to talk, and to not engage; but, instead,

to deal with the facts; instead, deal with opportunities to restore our economy; to create millions of clean energy jobs—some in a whole new industry; that we take important steps to reduce the tragic dependence on imported oil.

Even if we weren't concerned about the pollution, even if we weren't concerned about global warming and the damage that is attendant thereto, just in terms of the strategic interests of the United States, we should stop wasting more oil than anyone in the world. We should stop using more oil per capita for transportation than anybody in the world. We should reduce our strategic vulnerability to actions of people who don't like us very much in unstable or hostile parts of the world. And, of course, the damage that is done to our economy by shipping over a billion dollars a day overseas.

I'm hopeful that we will be able to reduce the carbon pollution that causes global warming, that will enable us to be good stewards of the land now, because the effects of global warming are going to cost a lot more than the consequences of reducing it.

As we have discussed this evening, this is in fact an opportunity for us to put our economy back on track, create millions of jobs, strengthen our strategic position, while we make a contribution to the future of humankind.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to spend some time this evening dealing with this issue. I look forward to continuing the discussion about the new technologies, about the facts of science and economy on the floor as we prepare to move this legislation forward. Thank you.

THE HIDDEN HAND

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Tonight, I return to talk about an old topic and also to talk about something that's just happened in the last couple of weeks.

The Speaker may recall that a number of weeks ago there was outrage at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue when it was determined that located within the \$792 billion stimulus bill there was a provision that authorized \$173 million in bonuses to executives at the insurance company AIG. At the time, a number of us thought, Well, how could that happen?

It seems, just to review, Mr. Speaker, that when the stimulus package was considered on the other side of the Capitol in the United States Senate, two Senators, in a rare display of bipartisanship—Senator SNOWE, a Republican of Maine, and Senator WYDEN, a Democrat of Oregon—authored an amendment that would have put restrictions and basically indicated that if you were a firm like AIG that has received billions and billions of dollars in bail-

out money, perhaps there should be some restrictions on executive compensation and what people should make.

Well, a funny thing happened, however, on the way to the conference committee. The Snowe-Wyden language was removed and instead this paragraph was inserted.

Now this paragraph, if you read it carefully, Mr. Speaker, indicates that rather than placing restrictions on the bonuses, it specifically authorizes and exempts any bonus at AIG or any other Wall Street giant that received billions and billions of taxpayer money. Any executive compensation scheme that was entered into before February 11 of this year, which happened to be the date that the stimulus package was considered, would be exempt and the bonuses would be paid.

Now I have indicated a number of times on the floor that I know that a lot of people were embarrassed by that. I would suggest that that's what happens when you legislate in a sloppy, rushed, haphazard, nonpartisan fashion.

The Speaker will recall the week of the consideration of the stimulus bill, the members of the Republican Party—the minority party—put forward sort of a novel proposition, and that was since we were talking about spending \$792 billion in the stimulus bill, it might be a good idea if Members had 48 hours to read the bill, and further suggested it should be put on the Internet so anybody in America could take a look at this over a thousand pages of legislation.

Well, that proposal passed. It came to a vote here in the House, and every Member who was present that day, Republican or Democrat, voted and agreed that that was a good idea. That we should have 48 hours to read the bill. That was Tuesday.

On Thursday, apparently the majority leadership forgot about the vote on Tuesday. And the bill was filed about midnight on Thursday.

The next morning—and I have apologized to my constituents that I didn't read the thousand pages at midnight. It didn't come to my attention that we had a thousand-page bill that we were going to consider on that Friday until I arrived at the office that morning.

But the debate was 90 minutes and, basically, Members, both Republican and Democrat, had 90 minutes to digest a thousand pages and determine whether or not that piece of legislation deserved an up or a down vote.

It was a bipartisan vote, in that every member of the Republican Conference voted against the stimulus bill, together with some Democrats. But the overriding majority of the Democratic Party voted in favor of it. And it passed and went on to be signed by the President of the United States.

What is strange is that everyone who voted for the stimulus bill voted for this paragraph that authorized the bonuses to AIG. Yet, the next day or days