

as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof shall be ex officio Members, but not voting Members, of each Subcommittee to which such Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by resolution of the Committee. Ex officio Members shall not be counted as present for purposes of constituting a quorum at any hearing or meeting of such Subcommittee.

RULE VI. POWERS AND DUTIES OF
SUBCOMMITTEES

Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective Subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other Subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

RULE VII. NON-LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

No report of the Committee or Subcommittee which does not accompany a measure or matter for consideration by the House shall be published unless all Members of the Committee or Subcommittee issuing the report shall have been apprised of such report and given the opportunity to give notice of intention to file supplemental, additional, or dissenting views as part of the report. In no case shall the time in which to file such views be less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session).

RULE VIII. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use according to the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

RULE IX. OFFICIAL COMMITTEE WEBSITE

(a) The Chairman shall maintain an official website on behalf of the Committee for the purpose 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.

(b) The Chairman shall make the record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded in the full Committee available on the Committee's official website not later than 3 legislative days after such vote is taken. Such record shall identify or describe the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of the Members voting present.

(c) The Ranking Member is authorized to maintain a similar official website on behalf of the Committee Minority for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the Minority to Committee Members and other Members of the House.

GROWING AN INNOVATION
ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New

York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this evening we have an opportunity as members of the freshman class, Democratic members, to speak during an hour designated for our class members. Tonight is the second time our class has spoken as a group, and as you recognize, we are a diverse group of members who come from all sections and regions of the country and do share some common fabric but also would identify differences. But one thing very certainly in common that we share is the need to move forward with a positive direction on energy policy that will spark an innovation economy, Mr. Speaker.

And so this evening during this opportunity we will hear from my colleagues in our freshman class that will speak to their concerns and the optimism we share about growing an innovation economy based on energy policy that can transform just how we deal with those resources, how we create our generated power that we require, how we transmit that power, and certainly how we can effectuate conservation and efficiency programs that will strengthen our outcome.

As you know, I have spent much of my life with energy policy. My professional life found me working in the State Assembly in New York chairing the Energy Committee for some 15 years, and then I moved on to become president and CEO of NYSERTA, the New York State Energy, Research and Development Authority.

It was there that I recognized that through the program implementation we had encouraged through public policy formation that we were able to effectuate tremendously strong impacts, positive impacts on the business community and on the residential community, making certain that as we embraced efficiency efforts we could address that demand side of the equation, which has been, from a Federal perspective, not really addressed effectively at all.

And so now we find ourselves with leadership in the White House and certainly here in the House that wants to move forward and make certain that we advance sound energy policy. It is important for us to do that in a way that maintains an open mind to developing the sort of policy that needs to be crafted, policy that will speak to those innovative ideas, and projects that will find us investing in research, in development, in deployment, in engineering, in developing a green-collar workforce, all of which will create an array of jobs that are not yet on that radar screen, that will allow us to produce outcomes that are favorable to this country's economy.

And certainly as we do that, we will need to update and upgrade our transmission grid, our delivery system, which was designed for regulatory response rather than free-wheeling elec-

trons from different regions and sections of the country, or to even imports from our neighbor to the north in Canada with hydropower that has been done in some situations. We need to make certain that we address both supply-side and demand-side solutions. For far too long, we're increasing supply but not looking at that opportunity to create here in America those needs that are addressed by American-produced power that obviously would strengthen our economy and our job situation.

It allows us to also move forward to create a more clean and more sustainable environment which needs to be a goal that is embraced by the policy that we'll formulate.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it has been said often that a crisis is a terrible thing to waste. Well, there are multiple crises that this President inherited, he and his administration. Certainly the House, as a leadership, is addressing those crises that have been passed on here to not only legislators and policymakers and executives but to the American public where we struggle with situations that for far too long have gone unaddressed.

You know, I liken this to the space race that we had decades ago, where this country came behind its leadership, where President Kennedy indicated that we could place a person on the Moon, where he boldly expressed that vision, and we were able to go forward and invest in science and technology. Sputnik was mentioned in every classroom. There was a race going on, and it was important for us to win that race.

The same can be said today with the global race that exists out there for some Nation to emerge as that go-to Nation that will export the energy intellect and the energy innovation and ideas that will transform not only our economy but the worldwide use and the worldwide response to energy needs and energy solutions. We can win that race but we need to invest. We need to open up with new policy, and we need to commit to resources that are essential.

We are doing that today as we talk about the transformation to an innovation economy, and as we look at some of the situations that we have with the power that is addressed by foreign oil imports, noting that nearly 67 percent of our oil is imported from foreign supplies, from foreign countries, that is finding we're spending some \$475 billion that is shipped overseas. People will talk about different economic impacts or concerns or fears that they try to forecast and project, when in fact we need only to look at history to see what's been happening with the hundreds of billions that are invested in foreign economies and an overwhelming, near two-thirds, of our supply for oil being imported from foreign countries.

This should tell us something. It should tell us that there are opportunities to create jobs to go forward and

produce American-based power and to address jobs through energy efficiency and conservation efforts, through research and development, to develop those prototypes to make certain they're deployed into the manufacturing sector and that we can grow this richness of economy and also export these ideas and this invention to other world economies across the globe.

My colleague and friend from our freshman class—and I've grown to respect each and every one of my freshmen colleagues, but one who has expressed a very strong concern about jobs, job creation, job retention is MARK SCHAUER from the State of Michigan, from the seventh, I believe, district in Michigan. Representative SCHAUER is very concerned about jobs, and I believe MARK sees this as a way to address that job situation.

Mr. SCHAUER. I thank Mr. TONKO. It's an honor to be part of this discussion on behalf of a new group of Democratic Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I am from Michigan. The Seventh Congressional District is seven counties in southern and central Michigan in a State with an unemployment rate of 12.9 percent. To me, energy policy is about two things. It's about protecting our planet, being stewards that we need to be to hand this planet to our children and grandchildren, but energy policy in my State is jobs policy, and that's how it must be and that's how my constituents look at it.

I'm here to offer that and magnify reality in Michigan. Yesterday, the news from General Motors was very difficult for my State when they announced seven plants that would be closed. Based on that forecast, the fiscal analysts in Michigan have projected that our unemployment rate will reach 17 percent. That is really horrific, and for every family experiencing that, that's 100 percent unemployment and very, very devastating.

So our State has lost over 400,000 jobs since the turn of this century, and we have much to do to rebuild our economy.

I want to talk about a couple of things relating to a clean energy economy in Michigan and around the country. First is in the auto industry. Michigan has the highest concentration and the most by number of automotive and advanced manufacturing research and development of anywhere in the country, in fact anywhere in this continent, and that is an asset that we must build upon.

I was at an event in my good friend and colleague JOHN DINGELL's district in Ann Arbor. My district is immediately adjacent to his and shares Washtenaw County, with a company called Sakti 3. This was a company that was a direct spinoff from the University of Michigan's School of Engineering, that this entrepreneur has developed the second generation of automotive battery technology before the first generation of that technology has actually been built.

Everyone knows, I'm sure, that the Chevy Volt will be built here in this country. The reality of the truth is General Motors chose a Korean supplier of that battery. They developed the chemistry there. Sadly, they were ahead of us here in the U.S. That battery will be built in the U.S. That's the first generation. This electric car that will be developed will be able to travel up to 40 miles without using a single drop of gasoline. Talk about reducing our carbon footprint. That is amazing. And of course, in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act there is a generous tax credit to help drive down the cost of those electric vehicles.

But I was mentioning this other new startup, and I want to mention that a number of battery technology companies in my State are seeking some of the \$2 billion that we approved in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act for automotive battery technology. So the first generation is about to be built for the new Chevy Volt. The second generation is already being developed by a company immediately adjacent to my district, and it will employ people from within my district. And this is, I think, an example of how good energy policy is good jobs policy.

This is what we need, and we candidly need, to do our part in Congress to partner with a new General Motors, new Chrysler, Ford and other auto companies to innovate. Representative TONKO talked about an innovation policy, innovation economy, and that's exactly what we can do in the domestic auto industry, and we must do, and I certainly will be making the case that Michigan should be the center of that new technology and our commitment to not only reducing our carbon footprint but to creating jobs.

□ 2015

I'm optimistic about what we can do. It's going to take all of us, Democrats and Republicans, to work together with our President to make sure that we make the right investments—the right strategic investments in protecting our planet and creating jobs. We certainly need that in Michigan. We need that in every part of the country during this deep recession.

Thank you. I yield back my time to my good colleague from New York, Representative TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative SCHAUER. You're absolutely right on with the need for job creation. The facts are there that really speak to us so forcefully because, as you indicated, we can better control our destiny simply by focusing on job creation that is American based. That we can better control our destiny with the environment by moving to cleaner outcomes, by having automobiles that burn more effectively, more efficiently, and cleaner.

Now, it's said that if we produce 25 percent of our electricity and our motor fuels by renewables—by moving to renewables to that 25 percent level

by 2025, we can create 5 million jobs here in this country. So it really behooves us to move forward and advance a situation that will find us investing in jobs in manufacturing, in engineering, certainly in transportation, as we can move forward and really effectuate the source of investments and changes that will really produce a strong economic outcome for us here in this Nation. And it's not whether or not we have the luxury to make that decision. As we speak, China invests \$12.6 million per hour in greening up their economy.

Going back to the space race of decades ago inspired by JFK and others, we have President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, leadership in the House, the conference, the caucus, the membership here, the majority in this House advancing an effort to really produce jobs to clean up the environment and create a situation that not only address a stronger sense of energy security and energy independence, but also a national security factor that is thereby strengthened simply by growing our energy independence and our energy security because our reliance on some of the most troubled spots in the world finds us in the middle of conflicts, as we see today.

One of our other freshman class members who is equally passionate about change and reform, who was also a student of history, checks into these situations of cleaning up our environment and producing jobs, Representative CONNOLLY from the great Commonwealth of Virginia, from the Congressional District 11 in that State, is with us this evening also.

Representative CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Mr. TONKO, and I thank my colleague Mr. SCHAUER from Michigan for his passion about the situation, the deteriorating situation in the great State of Michigan, and the hope a green economy brings to that situation. I look forward to joining with my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. LUJÁN, on his take on this very important subject.

Mr. Speaker, although the sky is falling, you will notice I'm not wearing a helmet. Today, a small but organized and well-compensated group of Chicken Littles is claiming that a bill to reduce global warming pollution will somehow wreck our economy and create lots of new taxes. We've heard it all before—and none of it was true.

When Congress was considering whether or not to reduce acid rain in 1990, polluting industries and their paid lobbyists claimed then that it would drive up electricity bills and destroy the domestic economy. Neither predicted disaster transpired. Moreover, in addition to the acid rain solution and with the implementation of the Montreal Protocol to reduce CFC pollution, we also used a cap-and-trade system to reverse the growth in the ozone hole due to chlorofluorocarbon, once front-page news.

During the 1960s and 1970s, sulfur dioxide pollution was poisoning rivers and streams across America, while inflicting damage on infrastructure and some of our most famous public art, to say nothing of deforesting huge swaths of woodlands here in the United States and North America and in Europe.

This pollution came from some of the same sources that are emitting global warming pollution today, including coal-fired power plants especially. In 1980, polluters released over 17 million tons of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere. Since implementation of a cap-and-trade program—yes, a cap-and-trade program that we adopted, legislated, and implemented to stop acid rain, we reduced acid rain pollution by 8.9 million tons—a 50 percent cut every year.

When Congress was considering capping acid rain pollution in 1990, polluters claimed that such a cap would drive electricity prices through the roof and cripple the economy. Sound familiar? In fact, the acid rain cap-and-trade program has saved \$40 in costs for every dollar spent on pollution controls. This 40-1 cost to benefit ratio saves Americans \$119 billion every year.

Each dollar that we don't have to spend on premature health problems or damaged infrastructure due to acid rain is another dollar saved and invested. By reducing sulfur dioxide pollution that causes acid rain, we also reduce ground level ozone that causes asthma and other respiratory health problems. By reducing sulfur dioxide pollution that causes acid rain, we also reduce the incidence of premature heart problems in America.

Nor did the acid rain program hurt American energy production, as predicted. Coal companies installed scrubbers that remove sulfur dioxide as well as other pollutants like mercury from their facilities. Installation of these scrubbers created high-paying jobs right here in America, the kind that Mr. SCHAUER from Michigan just finished talking about. We created new sources of employment for electricians and other skilled tradesmen to retrofit older coal-fired power plants.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has conducted several reports on the efficacy of the acid rain cap-and-trade program. A recent CRS memo, which I would introduce into the RECORD at this point, notes that the acid rain reduction program is nearly 100 percent compliant in pollution reduction and has not experienced any problems with market manipulation. It's an extraordinary success story and a template for what we're talking about on a larger scale, admittedly, on carbon dioxide.

[From the Congressional Research Service]
THE SULFUR DIOXIDE CAP-AND-TRADE PROGRAM

Sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions from electricity generators and other sources contribute to acid rain and fine particle concentrations in the atmosphere. Specifically,

the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) states that sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), in their various forms, lead to the acidification of lakes and streams rendering some of them incapable of supporting aquatic life. In addition, they impair visibility in national parks, create respiratory and other health problems in people, weaken forests, and degrade monuments and buildings.

The electricity sector emits approximately two-thirds of the SO₂ emissions in the United States. To address these emissions of SO₂, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 added a cap-and-trade program to the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.). The object of the program is to reduce SO₂ emissions to 8.95 million tons, compared with 17.3 million tons emitted in 1980. From the beginning of the program in 1995, SO₂ emissions have declined to 8.9 million tons in 2007—a reduction of almost 50% from 1980 levels.

According to EPA, the lower SO₂ emission levels from the power sector have contributed to significant air quality and environmental and human health improvements. In its 10-year report in 2004 on the program's progress, EPA listed the following accomplishments:

Led to significant cuts in acid deposition, including reductions in sulfate deposition of about 36 percent in some regions of the United States and improvements in environmental indicators, such as fewer acidic lakes.

Provided the most complete and accurate emission data ever developed under a federal air pollution control program and made that data available and accessible by using comprehensive electronic data reporting and Web-based tools for agencies, researchers, affected sources, and the public.

Served as a leader in delivering e-government, automating administrative processes, reducing paper use, and providing online systems for doing business with EPA.

Resulted in nearly 100 percent compliance through rigorous emissions monitoring, allowance tracking, and an automatic, easily understood penalty system for noncompliance. Flexibility in compliance strategies reduced implementation costs.

A 2005 study estimates that in 2010, the Acid Rain Program's annual benefits will be approximately \$122 billion (2000\$), at an annual cost of about \$3 billion—a 40-to-1 benefit-to-cost ratio.

Thus, the program has achieved its environmental goal of reducing acid deposition, its economic goal of reducing SO₂ emission in a cost-effective manner, and achieving almost 100% compliance. It should be noted that there have been no indications of allowance market abuse during the implementation of the program. However, it should also be noted that the secondary market for sulfur dioxide allowances is not heavily traded, as the free allocation of almost all allowances to electric generators has reduced the need for such entities to enter the secondary market to meet compliance requirements.

Today, the minority party claims we can't afford to reduce greenhouse gas pollution because it will increase costs and hurt the economy. We have heard these arguments before during the acid rain debate in 1990, and they have all been proven false. We have saved money by cutting acid rain and pollution, created clean energy jobs, and improved public health, and achieved our goals of reducing pollution. Far from being a burden, reduction of acid rain pollution improved our quality of life.

Here in Washington, there is a great debate about the reality and threat

that global warming poses to our quality of life and long-term economic prosperity. That debate, manufactured by the polluters who want to continue to pass along their costs the average Americans, is not taking place in communities across America. The vast majority of Americans understand that global warming is real and it threatens not only distant ecosystems, but neighborhoods and ecosystems all across our great country.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, our constituents understand that inaction carries very high costs. We cannot afford to let polluters pass along their costs to average citizens. For the sake of our health, our children's health, our agriculture production, our coastal communities, we must make polluters pay in order to avoid what would otherwise be catastrophic impacts of global warming.

We know from past experience we can achieve dramatic reductions in air pollution that save money for the average American while improving our quality of life.

Many Americans, Mr. Speaker, remember a time when the ozone hole was growing, raising the threat of skin cancer and other health problems, while damaging the environment. Such a large problem seemed difficult if not impossible to address.

The growing ozone hole was the subject of front-page newspaper stories all across the country, amid widespread concerns of its health impact, particularly with respect to skin cancer. Using a cap-and-trade system, again, to reverse the growth in the ozone hole, we successfully tackled one of the most pressing environmental issues this country and the world has faced by establishing a cap-and-trade system to reduce pollution from chlorofluoro carbons and other pollutants that were destroying the ozone.

We have not one but two successful models of cap-and-trade systems right here in the United States. They help solve problems that seem too big to solve at the time. Today, children may not even remember that we had to deal with the hole in the ozone. The fact that we haven't heard of it much is evidence of the success of a cap-and-trade system. Let us seize that opportunity again.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative CONNOLLY. You know, it's just so good to revisit recent past history as we look at just what the results of some of that progressive policy formation was about. And it did have a positive effect on our environment and it did create jobs and it did address in sound economic terms a stronger future.

So we seem to be at a threshold, again, that needs to be inspired. We need to be inspired by that history that perhaps was expressed and touted in some measures of fear when in fact science and technology led us through some very difficult challenges and we responded by creating jobs and responding favorably to the environment

that we share and maintain for coming generations.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. TONKO, is exactly right. I think there are some who live with a static model rather than a dynamic model. And it's all a zero sum game. In fact, that's not just how it worked.

And you're absolutely right, Mr. TONKO, that when in fact we have used it, we created jobs, we avoided health care costs, we innovated in industry, and the economy moved forward in a dynamic and vibrant way rather than in fact contract.

Mr. TONKO. Well, with carbon capture and reducing the carbon impact into our environment by having a comprehensive energy plan, by putting together a cap-and-invest program, we're able to address greenhouse gas pollution in a way that can be addressed from both sides of the energy equation, and from all sectors, including transportation. And the energy generation, more efficient transmission, where we can use superconductive cable, where there's less line lost, making it more efficient and a conservative thing to do.

To be able to move forward with diversifying our energy mix with kinetic hydropower and what it has to offer; with geothermal and what it has to offer; with the inclusion of renewables—using our wind, our Sun, our Earth to respond to our energy needs. And then, on the flip side, on the demand side, conservation and energy efficiency, where we use shelf-ready products to retrofit systems, make manufacturing more productive and efficient, saving them money in the line of producing their products.

All of this is saving jobs and creating jobs. Taking those white- and blue-collar traditional jobs, implementing the newly created green collar jobs, of which we need to speak, and really producing, I believe, that innovation economy that pulls us into a new order of thinking for energy's sake and really stakes a claim here in a Nation that has invested for a long time in R&D.

But we need now to go beyond those prototypes. We need to deploy into manufacturing and deploy into commercial sector use these great ideas that are, by the way, being picked up by emerging nations and they're using American know-how.

□ 2030

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. My colleague, Mr. Speaker, made reference to John Kennedy's call to put a man on the Moon by the end of the sixties. Think about the positive externalities, the positive consequences of that innovative decision and innovative investment. Think of the technologies that spin off inventions, patents and economic wonders that were generated by that one decision to make that one critical investment. Similarly, the investments my colleague Mr. TONKO was talking about—and he's absolutely

right—will have a lot of positive consequences for this economy for a generation to come. I would also suggest to my colleague, Mr. TONKO, that there's also a very high cost for inaction, and that needs to be examined as well. Some on the other side of the aisle seem to think that maybe if we wring our hands and hold our breath, perhaps it will all get better or go away. And I think there are huge costs that don't often get talked about associated with inaction.

Mr. TONKO. I believe those huge costs are there, that inaction that came through the prior administration found the American households, American families on average spending \$1,100 more because of their dependence on gas, oil, electricity and what have you.

Just looking at this chart, which is portraying a rise in the importation of crude oil, finds us peaking in the last several years where we're now near 3.7 trillion barrels of crude oil that are running our economy, degrading our environment and finding us without any sort of clever progressive agenda that really is within our grasp. Again, it translates into the concerns that you expressed here this evening, Representative CONNOLLY and Representative SCHAUER. And we're going to hear from another of our freshman colleagues who has been on this mantra of energy transformation that equates to job growth, job retention and innovation that we can reach to with the American know-how, the brain trust, the intellectual capacity that we have as a Nation.

Our colleague from New Mexico's Third Congressional District is Representative LUJÁN. Representative LUJÁN, you also have great knowledge and experience. You add to that array of diversity within the freshman class, in the Democratic Caucus that sees it from a regulatory perspective, but you also are there talking about the need for jobs, jobs in your State, in your district, in our American economy.

It's great to yield to you, Representative LUJÁN.

Mr. LUJÁN. Representative TONKO, thank you very much. It's very good to be here with a few of my friends this evening as we get a chance to talk to our constituency, our colleagues and maybe share some new ideas, maybe talk about some old ideas. As we've heard from my good friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), he talked a little bit about the act that was adopted in 1990, the Clean Air Act, which was strangely in response to a campaign pledge from a Republican President that we had. This was a campaign pledge that was made during the 1988 election. We hear sometimes from some of our colleagues that the idea of a cap-and-trade system is this new idea, that this is something that hasn't been talked about ever before. Well, when you go back to what the American people were hearing back in 1988 and after the adoption of the Clean Air Act in 1990, what we heard from our Re-

publican presidential candidate at the time was that there was a pledge to curb acid rain, and it could be fulfilled with the world's first emissions cap-and-trade system. And that resulted in what we now know to be the address that we moved forward with, the address to clean up acid rain. What's interesting with that is we're reminded by our friend Mr. Fred Krupp that within 5 years, the U.S. utilities cut emissions 30 percent more than the law required. They went over and beyond what was required from them because it made sense. But not only did it make sense, they found a way to utilize this to generate revenue. Even while increasing electricity generation from coal by 6.8 percent and reducing retail electricity prices, during that same period the U.S. economy grew by a healthy 5.4 percent. Even though there were dire predictions that the program would eventually cost more than \$6 billion a year, it was less, 30 percent less, between \$1.1 and \$1.8 billion. This was all in response to making sure that we were able to go out and address some of the concerns with some of our lakes and some of our rivers and our streams and our national parks.

I have a lot of friends back home that like to fish, and I know that we all have a lot of constituents that are outdoors people, that depend on being able to go out and take their kids out to show them what the outdoors is all about. The enactment of the legislation in 1990 was a direct result from being able to protect some of these things, but we have to look a little further back when we talk about history.

In 1977 under another Republican administration, when we talk about the Clean Air Act being put together, under two Republican administrations where we saw people working together, where we as a Congress could come together and reach across the aisle and work with the President to do what was right. And as we hear from our friend, Mr. SCHAUER from Michigan, we talk about the importance of job creation. Comprehensive energy reform, there's no doubt that it will create millions of jobs, millions of clean energy jobs, many in New Mexico, many in Michigan and Virginia, New York, the Midwest, the South, the East and the West, throughout the United States. And this has been an area where we've always led, and there's no reason we can't take advantage of moving forward strong policy to create good jobs that will make a difference.

I would like to point us to something that China is doing. We heard from my friend Mr. CONNOLLY about this. Doing nothing means that we fall further behind China and Europe and even Japan and Germany as we talk about the progress that they've made in this specific area. But China alone is investing \$12.6 billion in a clean energy economy every hour. Nearly 40 percent of China's proposed \$586 billion stimulus plan, \$221 billion over 2 years, is for clean energy investments, including an

advanced electric grid. We hear about what China's doing and India's doing. Well, they're investing in this area. And if we, as a country, don't get ahead of this and create jobs and make investments in clean energy and do what's right for the American people, we're going to fall behind, and we can't afford to do that.

I look forward to being here this evening and visiting with our friends as we get a chance to talk a little bit more about the benefits, about the positive things we can do and the importance of coming together, as was done in 1990, as was done in 1977, to make sure that we're able to pass and adopt responsible legislation that will make a difference for the American people and for this great Nation of ours.

Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Representative LUJÁN, well said. Whoever, whichever country emerges from this race for energy innovation will become that go-to nation. And what a chance we have out there to really create a new era of job creation and to strengthen our economy nationally and to export talent in a way that will strengthen every region of this country. It's about that job growth. It's about job retention and, more importantly, job creation, embracing that investment that we have made through academia, that we have made through the private sector R&D components.

Just recently I was with the GE leadership as they announced the plans to build an advanced battery manufacturing center in Upstate New York, and they're doing that with a commitment to a battery type that can be used for heavy vehicles, that can be used for energy generation and for intermittent energy storage. That then takes us to a whole new area of opportunity, a key that unlocks the doors to vast potential that then can transition this whole way that we respond to our energy needs and create jobs at the same time.

Let me yield to Representative SCHAUER because I know, again, his real passion here for his State of Michigan, his home State, is to talk about those jobs that we can create.

Mr. SCHAUER. Thank you, Representative TONKO. I want to tell you about what can happen when governments work together with the private sector. Obviously the ideas, the innovation comes from the private sector. It's often led by our great universities, and we all come from incredible States. But the State of Michigan has an amazing system of public universities, public higher education. I've talked about the University of Michigan a little bit. There are others, including Michigan State University, that are doing amazing things in biofuel and bioenergy. But I want to tell you what can happen when everyone makes a commitment to developing these new energy technologies.

Having recently come from the Michigan legislature, some of these in-

centives are very real to me. The State of Michigan made more than \$500 million in incentives available to prospective advanced battery manufacturers. The State of Michigan has already attracted four of these advanced battery manufacturing companies. They plan to invest \$1.7 billion—with a B—and create more than 6,500 jobs.

Now, to stand here the day after General Motors announced some very difficult cuts in my State and in other States around the country, the prospect of 6,500 jobs from advanced battery manufacturers to propel our vehicles with clean energy to reduce our carbon footprint is exactly what we need to be doing.

I will mention one other thing that I have been working on in my office, and I gather each of my colleagues here have been working with companies in their States. We all have assets regardless of our region. Some are sunnier. Some have stronger winds. In Michigan we have the most fresh water shoreline in the country that we need to take advantage of from an energy standpoint. But I've also been working with some wind energy companies and solar energy companies. There is a company in my hometown of Battle Creek that is developing a facility to build the state-of-the-art photovoltaic material. I think to the credit of President Obama and through the work of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we will move more aggressively to see that our Federal buildings—and I'd like to see that include our military buildings—use that photovoltaic material to reduce energy costs. That's a job creator. And certainly with a company like United Solar Ovonic that's building a facility in my district, that's a job creator. But I'll mention briefly, before I yield to Representative CONNOLLY from Virginia, that wind energy in a State like Michigan provides incredible job opportunities. I am working with a company that is an automotive supplier, that is one of those shops that's been in business for multiple generations. In this case, in Eaton County, the company is called Dowding Industries in Eaton Rapids. They made the leap about a year ago to start building windmill turbine hubs, creating new jobs. They partnered with a company to build the machining. They're the industry standard. But they're ready to do more, and they're talking about creating thousands of jobs with a new technology to build wind turbine blades right in a State that has lost hundreds of thousands of jobs due to the decline, the transformation of the auto industry. So this is about energy policy. But to me, this is about economic policy and jobs policy.

I thank the gentleman from New York for the opportunity to talk about jobs, talk about Michigan and talk about energy policy.

Mr. TONKO. It was a pleasure.

Representative SCHAUER, you said it well. It is the transitioning, that we

need to transform that economy into ways that can assume some of those gaps that have not been addressed. I know, coming from a State that I will talk about in a while, about the investments we've made in our region. It was without that sort of broader comprehensive plan coming from the Federal level. I think while we are a diverse freshman class, and we cover the map of the U.S. rather well as a new class, even amongst our diversity, there is that common thread that we understand, that the American public stated clearly through the election. We want change. We want reform. We want production. We want productivity, and we want things to happen. And these are the things that can happen to the very good.

To the freshman Member, Representative CONNOLLY, you are coming from a State that, obviously, is a large State, that hears the issues that are expressed out there. And you've been a very strong and forceful voice on behalf of reform and change. Your perspective again on job growth?

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague from New York. I'm struck by listening to you, Mr. TONKO, and you, Mr. SCHAUER, especially on the whole issue, for example, of advanced battery research.

□ 2045

The enormous extraordinary potential of an innovative investment, when we look at advanced lithium batteries for example and the impact potentially on your home State, Mr. SCHAUER, of Michigan, in particular it could completely revolutionize the automotive industry and once again put the United States at the edge, the competitive edge and the dominance of the automotive industry as in years past. That advanced battery research has the potential to create a plug-in hybrid, for example, that gets on average the equivalent of 100 miles per gallon. If every vehicle on the roads in the United States, just as an example, actually could average 100 miles per gallon, we could virtually eliminate the need for foreign oil imports in the United States with just that one innovation. That is the power of advanced battery research.

Similarly, and you mentioned it, Mr. TONKO, the potential of new batteries to store power could transform the solar panel industry and suddenly make solar affordable and accessible to residents and commercial entities alike. And I had reason recently to look at the German experience before I came to Congress. In Northern Virginia, we have a sister relationship with the Stuttgart region in Germany, and we went and we looked at a combination of solar and geothermal as an alternative to high utilization of fossil fuels. And these two renewables dominated huge swaths of Germany that we visited: Berlin, Hamburg and Stuttgart.

Now, Germany is not known for its sunny climate, and yet they are making it work with a combination of Federal incentives and a lot of research that has made the deployment of solar practical for Germany. And I believe that the advanced battery research that we funded in the stimulus bill earlier this year in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 holds enormous promise, similar, Mr. TONKO, to that call to put a man on the moon over 40 years ago.

Mr. TONKO. Most assuredly, Representative CONNOLLY. And you speak of the impact that Germany is making with perhaps lesser solar hours available to their situation. While at NYSERDA, at the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, at I believe our third conference on green collar workforce development, we were visited by representatives from 33 States and four nations, including Germany. They talked about the particular niche they were creating for plumbers in Germany to do hot water solar arrays where you could address those hot water needs through solar panels.

We know also, through the stimulus package, the opportunity to shave that priceyness from solar activity PV by thin film advancements along with the intermittent battery storage issues. So there is great potential out there that is yet untapped, or undertapped, that should motivate us, should challenge us to really move forward with a comprehensive plan that is well structured, that deals with carbon capture, that mentions both the supply and demand side of the equation, and to go forward in a way that structures and implements the policy that then shows sound leadership. That is what we are looking at here. We have a President who gets it, a President who talks about innovation, who talks in a way that will allow us to be creative and put the academic notions of this society to work. That, to me, is tremendously strong. The expression of innovative ideas can really inspire our Nation.

The Speaker, the leadership of this House and the membership of this House is there ready to move forward to progressive outcomes. And that, I think, speaks to sounder environmental outcomes, sounder economic outcomes and a stronger energy policy, crises that are addressed in one fell swoop of activity with public policy.

Representative LUJÁN, you have joined us this evening, for which we are most grateful. You have a regulatory aspect that you have borne before your involvement here in Congress, which is always helpful. But you also seem to have that tremendous passion for thinking outside the barrel, if you will, in a way that will reduce that glutinous dependency of this society and this economy on foreign imported oil.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. TONKO, we talked a little bit about my background. Before I came to Congress, before I was given

the great honor of serving in this Congress to so many wonderful people, I did serve on the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission. And we were one of many States who adopted a renewable portfolio standard, standards which will require utilities to generate more power from the sun, from the wind, being smarter about the way we generate power. And when we talk about the American Energy and Security Act, about making sure that we are looking after our Nation's security, when you look at the chart which shows so much of our Nation's money, billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars going to other nations that aren't friends of the United States, we have to wonder why aren't we moving forward with the commitment and will to bring about the change that is required? This provision includes enacting a provision where we will encourage more renewable generation across the United States. It is going to encourage more energy efficiency standards and building standards that will make a difference.

This last week, on Monday, before I came back to Washington, I had the great fortune of visiting a new high school being built in one of the cities in my district, in Rio Rancho. It is a large high school, but it is a high school that was built with energy efficiency in mind, with smart building standards. And the increase in cost is actually going to be regained, and it is going to be seen within 5 years, a 5-year paydown of the investment. This means better lighting for our students, a stronger learning environment. It is what is right. And that is what this act will do.

We heard about the importance of education. In New Mexico, we have a few colleges, the National Wind Research Center in Tucumcari, at the Mesa Lands Community College, working on wind research and turbine research in agricultural parts of my district where ranchers and farmers are excited about seeing these wind turbines pop up around New Mexico. This is the kind of investment that we are talking about, job opportunities and revenue streams that will make a world of difference: the investment that is being made in our laboratories where the gains can be made to solve the storage problem so we can see more robust generation when it comes to renewables, job creation, investments in science, investment in our schools and how we can go tie that education gap together from K through 12 to college, to our laboratories, bringing everyone together.

This last week we heard from the President, and he said, "I have spoken repeatedly of the need to lay a new foundation for lasting prosperity." That is what we are talking about here, a foundation for new prosperity. We, as a Nation, will lead again. We will work with the rest of the world. We will make sure that we are providing job opportunities for Americans

from sea to shining sea, as the President likes to remind us.

For the first time, what is interesting to my friends here this evening, my colleagues, for the first time we have utility companies and corporate leaders who are joining, not opposing, environmental advocates and labor leaders to create a new system of clean energy jobs. We were reminded of this from our President last week. It is amazing what can happen when people come together.

We have an opportunity now, again, to act responsibly for the American people to come together, come together as a Congress and make a difference, come together and create more jobs, invest in science, technology and change the way that we do things, but change them for the better.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I wonder if my colleague will yield for a question.

Mr. LUJÁN. Absolutely, Mr. CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I heard your eloquence and I heard you talk, Mr. LUJÁN, about the high cost of oil imports. Sometimes I want to have us focus on the other side of the equation, what are the costs of inaction? You talked about how, in 1977, President Jimmy Carter came into office, but prior to that, in the Nixon-Ford years, the United States had committed itself to energy independence. Is that not correct?

Mr. LUJÁN. That is absolutely true, Mr. CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. And how did that turn out for the United States of America?

Mr. LUJÁN. We saw what resulted after the adoption of the act in 1990. The economy actually increased from about 5.4 percent. We saw growth in the economy. We saw utility companies making wise decisions in investments and creating jobs.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. But with respect to energy independence, is it not true, Mr. LUJÁN, that instead of creating energy independence that the United States became more energy dependent on foreign oil?

Mr. LUJÁN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Doesn't that underscore the reason and the imperative nature of why we need to take action now?

Mr. LUJÁN. If we, as a Nation, don't take action now and utilize these dollars to invest in American jobs, in solving our dependence on foreign oil, talking about our Nation's security, we couldn't be more right. And as we talk about our Nation's security, what has happened to the economy, we need to create the jobs to be able to provide opportunities for the American people, make sure that we are changing the way we are going to generate power, move power, consume power, be smarter about the way that we do things. It is all wrapped up in one, Mr. CONNOLLY, and I couldn't agree more.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. LUJÁN, I just want to echo, if I may, what you just said about national security. It is another cost to the United States. Every year, because of our growing appetite for foreign oil, we are putting money into the hands and into the pockets of many countries who don't necessarily have American interests at heart. Is that not true?

Mr. LUJÁN. That is absolutely true. And we saw with some of the charts that Mr. TONKO was sharing with us, as we see what is happening with the U.S. imports of crude oil, we see what is happening, you go back to the time period we are talking about here, Mr. CONNOLLY, you go back here to 1977 and you see some of the changes that resulted and going forward with what has happened with imports and what can be done here. What didn't we learn when we saw these increases and spikes starting in the 1970s there? We have an opportunity to learn and to make a difference here.

And I know that Mr. TONKO had the other chart there, and I will yield to Mr. TONKO to be able to explain what has happened with the dollars again.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. CONNOLLY, this chart says it all, what you're raising as a very strong concern. Somehow there is a willingness to spend, export \$475 billion out of the U.S.

When you think about the impact that has on our economy, the jobs that could be created if we relied on American-produced power, if we put American brain trusts to work, what couldn't happen? Might we not see this as a tax, a situation that finds us dealing with a dreadful blow to our economy and impacting in strong negative measure our environment which we borrow and need to send on to the next generation in even cleaner format?

So when I look at the small microcosm of the country expressed by the 21st Congressional District in New York, I see so many opportunities that require that overlay of energy policy and energy resources from a Federal perspective. And that is why the President and the leadership in the House, the Speaker and our Chairs and our rank-and-file Members are to be encouraged, I believe, to move forward on this matter.

We have, within the 21st New York Congressional District, semiconductor investments, nanoscience investments, emerging technologies all on a green campus, R&D investment centers through General Electric's emerging wind institute that will also embrace other renewables with their ecomagination situation and private and public sector campuses that are investing in R&D. We have superpower which is breaking its own record in superconducted cable development that can be used to transmit far more electrons over similarly sized traditional cable.

So all of this is there as an undercurrent, an underpinning of support that can then blossom into its fullest poten-

tial if we allow for policy to take hold. And that is what the moment is about and leadership expressed in the greatest, boldest green upturns.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. TONKO, I would be remiss if I didn't include the faith community. They came together and they wrote a letter to the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life, the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, the National Council of Churches USA, the United Church of Christ, Justice and Peace Ministries, and the United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society. They said, "The American Clean Energy and Security Act lays a necessary foundation to begin addressing the global climate crisis. We urge you to oppose any attempts to further weaken the bill as it goes through committee and continue moving this legislation forward while working to strengthen key provisions and ensure a just and sustainable future for all of God's Creation."

Understanding how we can work together again, Mr. TONKO, it is truly amazing, and it is great to see that we can come together to get great things done.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative LUJÁN and Representative CONNOLLY.

Representative SCHAUER, we are going to let you close our hour here because we are running out of time.

Mr. SCHAUER. Thank you. This is why we are here. I came to Congress to help fight for Michigan's economy, help move our country in a new direction, and energy policy is going to help us do that. We have touched on so many of those pieces this evening. As new Democratic Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we will continue to lead to make sure we invest in our country, invest in protecting our planet, and invest in new clean energy jobs in this country.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you so much to my colleagues from the freshman class, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the remainder of our time.

CALCULATING YOUR SHARE OF "CAP-AND-TRADE"

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

□ 2100

Mr. AKIN. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to join you and to take a look at a very interesting topic today. The whole idea of, it's kind of a combination of thoughts, first of all, the idea of global warming, and then how that relates to this cap-and-tax bill that we've been hearing more about, and exactly what's behind all of this discussion, because what we have here is something that is, if you want

to talk about change, there's a whole lot of change here.

This is a very, very significant proposal that's being made in terms of the size of the tax that's involved, and the proposal that we're actually going to change the climate of the world by some of these different things that are going to be done by the government, a very interesting thought.

And so I thought, when we talk about global warming, there's a little bit of the story that I think has been forgotten. Some of it, not surprisingly, is the history of what's going on. I'd like to go back just a little bit in what's been going on.

Let's go back to the year 1920, when newspapers in the 1920s were filled with scientists' warnings of a fast approaching glacial age. The Earth was going to get cold. And so you had to really be stocking up on extra coal and overcoats and things in the 1920s.

In the 1930s it seems that the scientists changed their opinion, and they reversed themselves, that there was going to be serious global warming in the 1930s.

By 1972, Time magazine was citing numerous scientific reports of imminent runaway glaciation. So it's going to get cold again.

In 1975, Newsweek reported that the scientific evidence of an "Ice Age" called to stockpile food. And we also were even engaged in discussions about melting some of the Arctic ice cap or something because of this Ice Age that was readily, eminently approaching.

By 1976 the U.S. government said the Earth is heading into some sort of mini ice age. And now we have back again, global warming. In fact, global warming is even getting a little bit out of fashion now, and people want to talk about climate change. It's a little safer to talk about climate change because you're not predicting whether it's going to get colder or warmer. But anyway, we've had some considerable amounts of disagreement, depending on what year you're on. So we go back and forth. It's either going to be the sky is going to fall because it's going to freeze, or the sky is falling because it's going to get warmer.

So we have today this whole subject of global warming. That's what the most common term that you hear nowadays is global warming. And I think the facts of the matter are that there has been a considerable amount of disagreement, depending on which decade you're living in.

I'm joined this evening by some very good friends, some respected colleagues, a medical doctor, as a matter of fact, and another gentleman from Pennsylvania, a very big coal and energy producing state. We're going to be chatting with them in just a minute.

But I thought it would be appropriate just to kind of lay down, first of all, historically some of the differences of opinion, depending on which decade you live in.

The general theory today, the way it works is the idea that mankind is creating CO₂. We do that when we breathe,