

tonight in terms of the inconsistencies in the President's position. I also want to thank you for having pointed out the joy of having children. And I want to bring up one more example of what I think is an inconsistency on the part of the President.

He has nominated Dawn Johnsen to head up the Office of Legal Council, and she is among the most controversial of his nominees. She formerly worked for NARAL and the ACLU's Reproduction Freedom Product.

She has compared pregnancy to involuntary servitude, describing pregnant women as "losers in the contraceptive lottery," and she even criticized then-Senator Clinton for claiming a need to keep abortions, traumatic experiences, rare.

She, as I said, has said that she believes that being pregnant or banning abortion undermines the 13th Amendment, which bans slavery. And she says "that there is no 'father' and no 'child'—just a fetus." Any move by the courts to force a woman to have a child amounted to "involuntary servitude." She goes on and on and on to talk about how horrible it is to bear a child.

And I think it is a very sad, sad situation that the President has nominated a woman who has these kinds of beliefs to head up an extremely important position in the administration, the Office of Legal Council. And I wanted to point that out as another inconsistency in the positions that he's taken.

And I yield back.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I thank you so much for that because consistently since January, the words and the actions have not met the conscience clause, which he clearly took out, and yet said both as a candidate and in subsequent speeches as President that our conscience needs to be recognized and our moral beliefs need to be recognized, especially on this issue. He has really taken that away.

□ 2030

What we now are facing today is the change in the D.C. policy in which we are going to be faced with allowing for the public funding of abortions. Congressman Dornan's amendment prior to FY1989 allowed the District of Columbia to use congressional funds, appropriated funds, something that we have to do because of article I of the Constitution, give the District of Columbia money to operate with. The disconnect between using those funds inadvertently for abortions was shut down by Congressman Dornan's amendment. This was an amendment that has been faithfully in place, except for a few years in the Clinton administration. Now with the President's new budget, he wants to cleverly allow for the District of Columbia to use federally funded money for abortions.

I would now like to turn some time over to my very dear colleague, an individual who has been at the forefront of life issues, not just recognizing the value of a child both inside and outside

the womb, but the value of children all across the world, including his fight for a father to bring his child home from Brazil.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for yielding. As a matter of fact, that's why I was late in getting here. I was working on that very issue.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. You are a great American. Take as much time as you would like.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. JEAN, just very briefly to say to my colleagues tonight, Barack Obama has said he is seeking common ground, and he wants to reduce the number of abortions. Sadly, virtually everything he has done, months to date, as President of the United States has expanded abortions internationally as well as domestically by executive order as well as by his embedding into his administration a virtual who's who of abortion leaders, people from the organizations who are now running agencies of the government of the United States. These are the people who ran the organizations for abortion rights. Now they're there.

The District of Columbia for years has not provided—and our hope is that it will continue not to provide—any funding for abortion, except for rape and incest and life of the mother. That language, as you have pointed out, was crafted by Congressman Bob Dornan; and it was a little game that was played for years. I have been here 29 years, and I will never forget the game that was played. The language would say, no Federal funds can be used to pay for abortion; but they would allow it because we congressionally authorize local funds, so the bottom line was, the net consequence was, abortion on demand unfettered was paid for by public funds, by taxpayers.

Barack Obama keeps saying he wants to reduce abortions. The common ground on reducing abortions is proscribing, prohibiting funding for abortions. The Alan Guttmacher Institute, the research arm of Planned Parenthood, and Planned Parenthood itself continually say that about a third of the abortions don't occur when public financing is not available. So as a result of the Hyde amendment, as a result of an amendment that I offered back in 1983 that proscribed funding under the auspices of the Federal Employees Health Benefits plan, the Dornan amendment on D.C. approps, and all the other amendments have actually permitted, facilitated those children who otherwise would have been aborted because public financing of abortion wasn't there. That's true common ground. Taxpayers don't want to subsidize chemical poisoning and dismemberment of unborn children.

People can talk all they want. The cheap sophistry of choice is that it does not bring into the visibility that it deserves the very active abortion, which is the maiming, ultimately the killing, of an unborn child. This is the year 2009. We know more about the magnificent life of an unborn child

than ever before. Microsurgeries are being done. These unborn children are the littlest patients. They can get blood transfusions. Unfortunately in some hospital rooms and especially in clinics, they are being dismembered; they are being chemically poisoned; and they are being starved to death in the act of abortion, which then is suggested to be a benign act. It is anything but. It is not compassion. It shows no sense of justice; and the public should not be forced, compelled to finance abortion in the District of Columbia or anywhere else.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I would just like to close, Madam Speaker, by saying this is a very sensitive and important issue. The public has spoken out on the fact that they really do not want Federal funds to be used for abortion. The President, as a candidate, when he took office, and in subsequent speeches, has said he wants to work to reduce the number of abortions. To do that is not to allow for Federal funds. So I would only hope that this administration would match their words with their action.

CREATION OF NEW JOBS THROUGH CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, we are truly on the verge of a historic moment. We're moving closer and closer to finally achieving legislation that will put us on the right path towards true energy independence and true environmental protection. Legislation that, at the same time, will grow our economy through clean energy jobs and promote an investment in cutting-edge American technology all while addressing the costly damages to our public health, economy and environment that is coming and will come from a changing climate.

The Republican Party just doesn't seem to get it. They don't seem to understand that the American people know that the cost of inaction is far higher than the cost of action. The same scare tactics and lack of faith in science and in American innovation which lost them the last election won't fool the American people. Madam Speaker, the minority party has chosen to put this debate in oversimplified and disingenuous terms, and that's truly sad. They've decided to call our clean energy future a tax because they don't think the American people can figure out the truth, that endangering our economy, our public health and our environment is what is truly taxing our Nation.

Madam Speaker, what the Republicans are espousing is a tax of inaction. The Republican inaction tax will cost our country many, many middle-class careers. The Republican inaction

tax will mean harm to family farms, harm to water sources, and harm to the fastest-growing sector of American jobs, clean energy infrastructure. This Republican inaction tax means higher energy costs for families who won't be able to weatherize their homes or invest in energy efficiency. The Republican inaction tax will pass along growing debt to our children by leaving behind opportunities to invest in innovative sectors and businesses that we are promoting in this American Clean Energy and Security Act. The Republican inaction tax will mean further devastation to our real estate market, as melting polar ice caps and rising sea levels could cost our Nation hundreds of billions of dollars in lost real estate value. This Republican inaction tax will cost the American people nearly \$1.9 trillion annually, or 1.8 percent of U.S. GDP, by 2100. It's time we have a real debate on this issue, not rhetorical oversimplifications that fail to serve our country but with the high-minded debate that we all deserve. It's time that we discuss what's really in this bill.

I would like to welcome my colleague and good friend from New Mexico, Representative MARTIN HEINRICH, who has a lot to say about what this bill has to offer.

Mr. HEINRICH. I want to thank my friend from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, we formed the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition in the 111th Congress because we believe in America's promise to become the global leader in energy and environmental strategies of the 21st century. Leadership and innovation is the hallmark of American success. In 1961 when President John F. Kennedy said that our country would lead the world by landing an American on the Moon, within 8 years his goal was achieved with the Apollo project. Today that same innovation is present in our emerging clean energy economy.

Madam Speaker, the opportunity for America to create thousands of clean energy jobs that will build our 21st century economy cannot be understated. Evidence of that clean energy job growth, a key component of our local economic recovery, is already visible on the ground in communities like New Mexico's First Congressional District, which I represent.

Part of this clean energy cluster growth is a result of the vast natural resources that New Mexico has to share. We are second in the Nation in solar energy capacity and 12th in the Nation for wind energy production potential, but we also have invested heavily in our human capital. One example of this success is the work being done in partnership with Sandia National Laboratories, which has been at the center of multiple renewable energy advancements across our country, including the creation of a high-performing biofuel that can be used in military aircraft. With Sandia's help, thousands of jobs in new energy fields

have been created in our community by companies like Advent Solar and EMCORE, which makes concentrated solar photovoltaics. Just a month ago I participated in the grand opening of a \$100 million Schott Solar manufacturing plant in Albuquerque, which is on track to eventually employ 1,400 people. On the west side of the First Congressional District, Solar Array Ventures is building a factory that will employ 1,000 people; and in the rural east side of our congressional district, hundreds of people have been at work with good-paying jobs on the near complete 100-megawatt High Lonesome Mesa wind project.

Madam Speaker, these jobs are part of a thriving clean energy cluster that is leading our community towards economic recovery. I'm proud to report that Albuquerque's clean energy job growth recently earned us a second-place national ranking in Kiplinger's 2009 list. Albuquerque was recognized for leading the Nation in key job growth areas of tomorrow. The potential to create these kinds of clean energy jobs across our Nation cannot be denied, and I am proud that the 111th Congress has already started investing in our clean energy future.

In the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we invested more than \$60 billion to help jump-start the clean energy jobs of tomorrow. These investments include building transmission lines to carry solar and wind to communities in need, improving battery technology, training a new clean energy workforce, and increasing energy efficiency to help our country use less energy while we strengthen our economy.

I'm proud to have sponsored the Clean Energy Promotion Act, a bill that will expedite the review of wind and solar energy projects on our public Bureau of Land Management lands. I also cosponsored the national renewable energy standard legislation that is included in the current legislation to increase our country's generation of energy from renewable sources.

Madam Speaker, in New Mexico's First Congressional District and across the country, we are at a crossroads. We can either cede leadership and clean energy innovation to nations like Germany, which has the highest solar generation of any country in the world even though it only has the same average solar exposure as the State of Alaska; or we can jump-start the American clean energy industry, spurred by the same spirit of innovation that put us on the Moon, to put Americans to work in clean energy careers, building solar panels and wind turbines. Let's choose the path of innovation, the path that has led to American success throughout our history. Now is the time to take bold action on our energy policy.

Mr. POLIS. I have a question on that. I've heard supporters of this Republican inaction tax trying to argue that this bill costs jobs, that somehow this is going to be bad for the economy. A

lot of what you've been talking about, I mean, a solar plant hiring 1,400 people in your district, job growth on the infrastructure side. It certainly sounds to me like by passing this bill, it's going to lead to even more job growth in your district.

Is that what you've been finding?

Mr. HEINRICH. I believe that's absolutely the case. In fact, what we've seen is even in the midst of this recession, the good news on our horizon has been these quality high-tech jobs in the renewable energy sector.

Mr. POLIS. Earlier on, as we were walking to the floor, we were talking about American ingenuity and innovation, and we talked about what's possible with solar cars. I thought maybe you could share with us this story of what's possible. I mean, the strength of America has always been innovation and ingenuity. I think this bill is really playing to our strength as a country in terms of what's possible.

Mr. HEINRICH. I couldn't agree more. I have to say, as someone who got my degree in mechanical engineering back in the mid-nineties, I actually participated in a solar car team, just a group of college students that got together in the early nineties, built a carbon fiber lightweight solar-powered vehicle that we raced across the United States against teams from Stanford and Michigan and other colleges around the country. I always thought to myself, if we could do that in 1993, 15 years ago, a bunch of college students who didn't even have our degrees yet, then think of the potential that we have today with the technology and the real support of policymakers like yourself. I think the opportunities for science and for business are absolutely endless.

Mr. POLIS. I see we've been joined by our colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO). Would you like to add to this discussion?

□ 2045

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Absolutely. Let me thank you, Mr. POLIS, for managing our discussion this evening here on the floor of the House of Representatives. It is a pleasure to join you. I know you have been an outspoken voice for greening up our thinking as it comes to energy and the environment and the economy, three areas that are critical right now that face a crisis of some dimension, and we can resolve those crises simply by moving forward with progressive policies.

So I thank you for providing the leadership here this evening on the floor and to join with you and our friend and colleague Representative HEINRICH because, you know, you are surrounded here by two mechanical engineers in background, education background.

Mr. HEINRICH. I believe that doesn't happen on the floor of the House of Representatives very often.

Mr. TONKO. It doesn't. We are usually vastly outnumbered. So it is good

for us to step back and look at these issues from an academic perspective and to respond to them in technological terms. That is real leadership. And the President, the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, leaders here across the board here in the House and rank-and-file Members have joined together to speak forcefully about just what we can accomplish if we set our sights on this innovation economy that is sparked by a green energy arena.

The numbers of jobs that we can create in this clean energy career ladder are tremendous. It is a way to provide opportunities for those emerging members of the workforce and to train and retrain our existing workforce. As we look at the opportunities out there, they are immense.

Representative POLIS, you talked about the fear and despair approach taken by some as they try to message in very negative terms the work that is being done in this area. Well, a \$475 billion bill that finds money going to foreign imports for fossil-based fuels could be referenced as a tax. We might say we are paying our bills for the energy supply we need, but it is taxing our economy and, more importantly, it is taxing households, families that could otherwise be producing here in America the supplies we need with American jobs, American know-how, American intellect.

You know, as I listened to our Representative from New Mexico, as Representative HEINRICH spoke of that global race back from the decades ago, from the sixties, having heard Sputnik over and over again in the elementary classroom and having seen us in a race somewhat narrower than today's race would be, Russia, the U.S. all competing to land a person on the moon. But a vision shared by a very eloquent, articulate leader of this Nation, John F. Kennedy, allowed us to come together as a nation in bipartisan frameworks and provide the kind of energy that is required to get us to think in those positive and progressive terms, and it stretched our thinking, it provided loftiness to the outcomes, and it created career opportunities for many.

That same race, global race, is upon us today, and it is not like we have a choice to enter into the race. We have no choice but to be part of it, and the pressure is on for us to win.

When China invests \$12.7 million per hour in its greening-up opportunities, that is a signal to us that we can and we must do better than we are today. And whoever emerges, whichever country emerges the leader, the winner of that race, will then be that go-to nation that will export energy intellect, energy innovation, energy ideas. The energy capital that we can build will be extremely valuable for all of our American families.

I, as you know, had worked at NYSEERDA before I entered here. I had chaired the Energy Committee in the New York State Assembly for 15 of my

25 years in the Assembly, and then went to assume the role of president and CEO at the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority.

Projects that found us utilizing our wind, our sun, our Earth, our soil and our water enabled us to create energy supplies for New York State. Hydrokinetic power that was produced simply by the turbulence of the East River along the shoreline of the Island of Manhattan is there as a demonstration project, an R&D project, that as a prototype holds promise, great promise, when deployed into the manufacturing and commercial sectors.

The opportunity for geothermal, where I witnessed at the Culinary Institute of America six new dorms, lodges as they are referred to, utilizing geothermal as an energy source, and using the constant temperature of the Earth far below us was a simple and novel idea, almost cave-like in its concept, but it is providing modern-day usage. And certainly wind, solar, PV, all being utilized in New York State, as much as 1,100 megawatts worth of wind power.

So this is possible. It is very possible. And the jobs that we can create are countless as we go forward, and it provides energy security, energy independence, and therefore I believe is critically important to us, to our national security. We won't be putting our sons and daughters in harm's way because we won't be in the battle zone fighting over the commodity of oil and fossil-based fuels.

Mr. POLIS. If the gentleman will yield, what you are talking about sounds great, the great spirit of American innovation, jobs being created, improving our security. I mean, do you think that if we fail to enact this policy, that will be a blow to a lot of this activity, economic activity, security activity, everything you are talking about?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. And, you know, we will have to pay some other nation for their ideas. When we spoke the other day with the SEEC Caucus, of which both of you made mention, with the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, the Green Dogs, so-to-speak, in the 111th Congress, we heard from the most recent energy minister, past energy minister, that a lot of American know-how and patents were being utilized in Denmark. Well, if we are coming up with this intellectual capacity and this brain power, what a shame if we don't invest it for our own benefit.

So the time is now to move. The time is long past that we have a comprehensive energy plan for this Nation. And it was one of the motivations for me to run for Congress, so that we could come here and do those sound policies that will move us into a new era of energy thinking, eclipsing us from a political generation of denial.

Mr. POLIS. You know, I think with regard to all of the great economic activity you are talking about, when we

are talking about the cost of not taking action, it is not only an environmental cost, it is not only the direct impact of global climate change, we are also talking about disrupting a lot of these science and research, economic activities, undermining our own national security, all these other costs.

So it is frustrating when people try to say, oh, this costs money. Well, you have to look at the cost of not taking action, which is far greater, orders of magnitude greater, than what we are talking about here, which is a very practical way to boost this industry and create green jobs.

Mr. TONKO. Well, one of the great investments at NYSEERDA in the State context that I functioned was a huge investment in R&D. And you need to see that R&D, research and development, and deployment, I would add, are economic development tools. You are using very bright minds with clever ideas, putting that lab experiment together.

Then we need to further commit to the deployment stage. You cannot just research and develop. You need to take that success story, of which there are many, and deploy them into manufacturing and the commercial use of those ideas. That is what this agenda is about. And it is not maintaining the spirit of \$475 billion per year of American dollars, call it a tax, call it an investment, call it paying your bills. Whatever it is, it is cash leaving us to help another economy that isn't providing any benefit because these are, in many cases, unstable governments and some of the most troubled spots in the world.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to welcome our good friend Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I am so pleased to join my fellow Green Dogs to talk about the subject. I couldn't help but pick up, if I may, to our friend from New York, Mr. TONKO, the point he was making about the power of research and development, R&D dollars, in innovative technology.

Let's just take the potential power of the advanced battery research. What could that do? Well, in the automotive industry, advanced lithium batteries, for example, could get you plug-in hybrid vehicles that get an average equivalent of 100 miles per gallon. If every vehicle in America got an average of 100 miles per gallon, you would almost wipe out the need for any imported oil in the United States of America. It is not science fiction. It is around the corner, but it needs an extra investment. It is an investment with an enormous potential return that would more than return dollars to U.S. taxpayers and, of course, contribute to the economy.

Similarly, advanced battery research is desperately needed to essentially bring the solar industry in the United States to that next step. What we lack in solar right now is the ability to really store the sun. And if we could have

a breakthrough, and, again, it is not rocket science, it is not science fiction, if we could have a breakthrough in advanced battery research so that we can extend storage capacity, so on sunny days we can store that energy on overcast days, especially in climates that aren't as warm as, say, the Southwest where our friend Mr. HEINRICH comes from in New Mexico, we could absolutely transform the solar industry and make it a practical either supplement or alternative for households and businesses all across the United States.

What could that do in terms of job creation and reviving the manufacturing sector of the United States? An almost endless return on a very wise investment of dollars.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. POLIS, if I might, to the comments made by Representative CONNOLLY of Virginia, and I thank him for his insight, to those comments I would add that as we achieve those efficiency outcomes, we are also cleaning the environment. We have the moral responsibility to make certain that our children, our grandchildren, generations that will follow us, do not get handicapped by some sort of situation out there like climate change, global warming, the carbon footprint, that will destroy our environment.

The air we breathe is essential, and as stewards today of the environment that we inherited, we must pass it on to further generations, future generations, in a state that is acceptable, clean and better, improved, so that we can achieve that.

While we are on the battery situation, I would just make quick mention of GE. Their corporate headquarters are in Schenectady, which is housed within the 21st Congressional District within New York State, which I represent.

GE recently announced its intentions to build an advanced battery manufacturing center in the capital district region of New York. That will provide some 350 to 400 jobs for a state-of-the-art battery that will deal with sodium chloride and nickel as a combination, adding to the diversity. There are lithium-ion batteries that are spoken of and other sorts of batteries that are being encouraged. This provides for diversity, which is sound for our mix. It is good for our energy choices.

That battery will be able to be used for heavy vehicles. That is important. It can be used for intermittent energy storage, and it can be utilized also for energy generation.

So the transportation sector, the energy generation and energy storage areas can all be addressed by this battery innovation. That is the key that can unlock the door to immense potential and opportunities of all kinds.

So we are at the cusp, I believe, of tremendous discoveries here that will allow us to compete effectively in this global race to be the energy go-to nation.

Mr. POLIS. When we hear about all these wonderful things, battery storage

technologies, jobs being created in New Mexico and New York, clean electric vehicles, what we are talking about and the nexus to why this is important and what American families need to know is the American Clean Energy and Security Act is the enabling law that allows all of this to occur. All of this great stuff that we are talking about, the job creation, the clean cars, the storage, this will all be dealt a huge blow if Congress fails to act. That is why the stakes for this debate are so important.

Mr. HEINRICH. You know, I think this whole issue of research and development is absolutely critical, because we have fallen behind the entire world in things that we were at the very front edge of just a few years ago. We can do so much better. And when you look around at the American innovation in New York, in New Mexico, in Virginia and Colorado, there is no more innovative people in the world than the American entrepreneur.

You know, I was lucky to have the majority leader visit my district last year, so I took him out to Sandia National Labs, one of the places involved in basic research and development, that is rebuilding our energy economy and pushing us forward to the leadership position in the world that we deserve.

One of the things that we looked at Sandia National Labs was actually a process where they take solar energy and a carbon dioxide feedstock, what is currently a problem, it is pollution, it is warming our planet, and utilize that to make liquid fuels, high-density energy fuels that can then be used as an energy storage medium, just like the advanced batteries you were talking about.

There are people doing research today on a much more efficient method of hydrolysis that would then utilize hydrogen as the output, basically do in the energy field what trees do every day, take sunlight and then store that as energy in a way that you can use.

□ 2100

Take sunlight, and then store that as energy in a way that you can use. And if any country in the world should be leading these efforts, it's the United States. And it's time for us to take back our rightful position, leading the world on the future of clean jobs. But we can only do that through changes in policy. If we sit back and watch as the battery research moves to Korea and Japan and other places, we will be buying the advanced vehicles from those countries. And instead, we need to be supporting the advance battery research that's being done in places like New York.

In my own home district we were doing research on batteries at Sandia National Laboratories to make sure that we do a better job increasing the density and the safety of these things. So, this is a huge opportunity for us.

As you said, it's a job creator. And the cost, the opportunity cost of not

acting, really hits us in the West, I think, probably more than anyplace except for maybe where you have a coast line. We are reliant for our economy on water, on the water that falls as snow pack, just like it does in your district in Colorado, Congressman POLIS, and that water flows down hills and it runs our farms and it runs our factories. It keeps our rivers alive.

And yet we have seen a dramatic decrease in the amount of snow pack that actually reaches places like Albuquerque because it's evaporating earlier, you know, temperatures are rising. The Tehemas Mountains in New Mexico have seen something like a seven-plus degree Fahrenheit swing in temperatures over time. That's impacting forest fires. It's less water for all of us to use for economic activity. And so the cost of not doing anything, of not implementing this bill, which is basically an Apollo project for energy independence and jobs in this country, is so much greater than the cost of acting.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. If my colleague would yield, because the point you've both been making about the need for that competitive edge for American industry is really underscored by the various American companies that, in fact, have endorsed this legislation. Let's just take the automotive sector. Ford, Chrysler, GM, John Deere, Caterpillar have all endorsed this legislation. There's a reason for that. They understand that to stand still with existing technology is not going to cut it. They're going to continue to lose market share, and they're going to lose to foreign competition.

If I may, I'd just like to read into the RECORD some of the other companies, especially in the energy sector. And the reason I want to read these names into the RECORD is because so often we hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle, this is going to destroy American business as we know it. Well, that would come as news to the following list of companies who've enthusiastically endorsed this specific bill. Duke Energy, coal, by the way, represents 75 percent of Duke's portfolio. American Electric Power; Edison Electric Institute; Exelon; PG&E Corporation; FPL Group in Florida; Entergy; Austin Energy; Constellation Energy; Seattle City Light; Public Service Enterprise; P&M resources in New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH; Shell Oil; Conoco; BP America; Entergy Energy; GE; Alcoa; Dupont; Dow Chemical; Johnson & Johnson; Rio Tinto; Siemens; National Venture Capital Association.

These are American companies that understand the point you were making a little bit earlier, Mr. POLIS, that to stand still is to lose ground; and that actually, we have an enormous opportunity here to regain America's competitive edge, create jobs and, once again, lead the world in innovative technologies and techniques. But we've got to make that initial step. This bill creates that framework.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. CONNOLLY, you know, one of the things that Mr. HEINRICH talked about, he said, you know, if these jobs aren't created here, they're going to be created elsewhere. The research will be done elsewhere. The fact that the American industry, the companies that you recognize, who are, many of them American-based companies, feel that this is good policy. These are global problems we're facing. Some way or other the world is going to need to wean itself off fossil fuels. Don't you think that this policy helps make sure that those solutions happen here in this country?

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Absolutely. And the bill takes care, where there are trade-sensitive and energy-intensive sensitive industries, to give them a transition period of time, in some cases a very generous transition period of time in which to get themselves competitive again.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Sometimes the issue comes across in such a complex picture that it's difficult for people to get their arms around what the discussion is all about. To repeat what I mentioned earlier about the hundreds of billions of dollars that we have been spending that go to foreign nations that import to us these fossil-based fuels, we need to see this as an embracing of the American intellect, to take ideas that are there shelf-ready and put them to work for us. It's, quite simply, American power to power America. It is providing our opportunity to utilize the American workforce to produce this power that then powers this country to do all that it needs to do.

It provides great opportunities for manufacturing sectors, and for our business communities, small and large, because I witness firsthand what happens when we retrofit these facilities, even our dairy farms in New York State, with state-of-the-art opportunities for efficiency. Where you need to use fuel for the power that you're using, let's use it efficiently. That's good for the environment; it's good for the economy. It's good for the energy equation.

But in many cases we'll be able to produce that power we need with no fuel cost. So the \$475 billion that has been spent annually that goes outside this Nation's boundaries is a fuel cost. We won't have that fuel cost when we benignly utilize our wind, our sun, our soil and our water.

And I think that's an effective way to approach a situation where we allow for the brain power of this country that is invested in, when people choose their career paths. We want to make certain that all that investment in the classroom and on the college campuses and in the private sector through its R&D opportunities of workforce training and development, we want to put that to work here. And we have those available solutions. We need to go forward with that sort of concept.

And, again, it takes a vision. I believe this public, the American public,

joins in the efforts when a vision is painted for them. It's been painted in bold green measure by President Obama. His administration is taking us to a new level of thinking. The Speaker of the House, the leadership in this House, the Members, the rank and file Members of the majority know this is the right thing to do. And it takes that boldness of vision and that determination, the integrity to move us to this new economy, and it will happen.

Mr. POLIS. So what you're saying is, you know, rather than, we're sending hundreds of billions of dollars a year to Saudi Arabia, to the Arab countries, to Venezuela. That money is gone from America when it's gone. And we send it over there and that's fueling their economy. We can recapture some of that money here and create clean energy here.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. Mr. POLIS, I would add this: As Representative in Colorado, like any of us as Representatives, we have seen far too many of our sons and daughters lost in the efforts to, in our involvement in the Mid East. Some of this money is going to those nations that we are now fighting against with the war on terrorism and the war in the Mid East. And so it really behooves us to think in newer terms, in bolder terms, in ways that build our independence, our security and our national security, which is critically important to us as we speak.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. HEINRICH.

Mr. HEINRICH. That word, independence, I think, is absolutely critical because this legislation will give us the independence that, as Americans, we crave. And I can say, you know, one of the pieces of this is renewable energy portfolio standard, something that says all the utilities are going to create a certain portion of their power from renewable and clean sources, we've had that for a number of years in New Mexico; and it's worked remarkably well. In concert with photovoltaic technology, this spring, you know, starting March or April, I started getting a credit from P&M resources that you mentioned earlier because I've got solar panels tied into the system, and during the day when we're not home, we're selling power back to the grid at the very time when everybody's turning on their air conditioner. It is innovative solutions like that that are already working in so many places that are going to give people freedom from those energy bills and independence from this international and foreign oil that sucks so much money out of our economy in the United States.

Mr. POLIS. You know, and a good point you raise, you're right. New Mexico and also my home State of Colorado have really been leaders in terms of instituting renewable energy standards, also instituting incentives for solar technology. You know, at our State level and probably yours, the opponents made the same arguments. They said, oh, this is going to drive jobs out of Colorado and New Mexico. This is going to hurt the economy.

Well, here we are several years down the road. This has made both of our economies stronger. I mean, isn't this a great success story in New Mexico?

Mr. HEINRICH. Absolutely. And always better to be the leader that's creating jobs than the State or the country that's following and watching those jobs go someplace else.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I might add to the point you're making, Mr. POLIS, in my State of Virginia, for example, we have a gubernatorial election going on right now, and one of the candidates, the Republican nominee, has talked about drill now, right off the shore of Virginia. Maybe that makes sense; maybe it doesn't. But the wind power potential off the shore of Virginia dwarfs any estimates of what possible oil and gas reserves there might be offshore and could create jobs and could actually make Virginia an enormous net exporter to the Northeast and the Mid-Atlantic of a renewable source of energy forever.

Mr. POLIS. You know, Colorado is in this boat and I think New Mexico too. We are blessed with some natural resources, with natural gas and with oil. And I have to tell you, it's a mixed blessing.

First of all, it's highly cyclical. We've been through several cycles in Colorado where there's been oil boom times. Everybody was riding high. Three years later the price crashes: everybody's out of work, everybody's looking for work.

We are also using a nonrenewable energy source. You take it out of the ground, it's gone. We're also destroying one of our other revenue sources, and it's frequently at odds with the tourism industry, with preserving our natural heritage of great value to Colorado residents, the quality of life that attracts people to New Mexico and Colorado in the first place.

I mean, you know, we can have and we do have now, thanks to the leadership in our State of Governor Ritter and, in fact, the leadership of our voters who passed a number of these initiatives overwhelmingly. The renewable energy standard was passed by Colorado voters with over 60 percent of the vote. They didn't buy the arguments of the other side. It's even more popular today, 5 years down the road, than it was at the time because people have seen that effect. We can have a more stable economy. We can create jobs, and we can promote a clean environment all at the same time.

Mr. TONKO. Representative POLIS, I believe that even T. Boone Pickens has said we are not going to drill our way out of this given crisis. This energy crisis needs to be addressed in a constructive way. The constructive way reminds us that there are ways to produce power, as you suggest, without a fuel cost. And then our fuel of choice needs to be energy efficiency. That plant which we never built simply because we have reduced demand by a

given order of megawatts is then allowing us to avoid the construction of a larger facility. And we can do that.

When you look at the size of this Nation, the population, the business sector, any 1 percent of improvement translates into a huge supply, as Representative CONNOLLY mentioned earlier, of power saved. And the demand side of the equation was not addressed by the previous administration. It was supply, supply, supply: How much more can we create and let people consume? We have some of the most gluttonous consumption in the entire world. And we know that there are ways to allow us to be more efficient and to provide those savings by addressing demand-side solutions. And I think that's where this plan is taking us also.

Mr. POLIS. I'm really happy that my good friend Mr. TONKO from New York brought up the demand side in conserving energy. There are many Federal energy efficiency provisions that are part of the American Clean Energy and Security Act. And in terms of what they mean to American families, the estimates are that American families will save \$750 per year per household within 10 years because of the energy efficiency provisions of this bill. You know, what would you do with another \$750 a year? That is the savings the average American family will have as a result of the energy efficiencies presented in this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Would my colleague yield on that point, because that's such a good point you're bringing up, Mr. POLIS, because we hear from the other side, seemingly deliberate misinformation on the floor of this House. And the figure constantly cited is a little over \$3,100; this is going to cost everybody \$3,100 a year. The opposite is true, as you just indicated. There's a new study the American Council for Energy Efficient Economy just issued that says that the Federal energy efficiency provisions in this bill will, in fact, save \$750 per household by 2020, as you indicated, and \$3,900 per household by 2030. So maybe our Republican colleagues just have their numbers inverted.

□ 2115

I might point out that that magical figure of \$3,100 per year that they cite, and derive this bill as a cap-and-tax bill, not a cap-and-trade bill, is based on a study done by an MIT professor—a rather obscure study. And interestingly, that professor, the author of that study, has written the Republican leadership of this body objecting to the use of this study, saying they vastly overstate any potential costs that in fact might accrue to consumers. And it is based on faulty analysis as well.

The provisions of this bill are carefully drafted so that any increase in utility costs, for example, that aren't already protected by the provisions in the bill would not be allowed to be passed on to consumers. It is patently false. And talk about not reading the bill; clearly our friends on the other side of the aisle either haven't read the

bill or choose to ignore the facts therein. But there are carefully crafted provisions that not only protect consumers, but as our colleague, Mr. POLIS, indicated, and as this recent study indicates, will in fact save, not cost, consumers hundreds of dollars—and ultimately thousands of dollars—every year.

Mr. POLIS. Well, \$3,900 in 20 years, and in 10 years, \$750. I mean, that is a lot of money for American families that this bill saves right there.

Mr. TONKO. And also, Representative POLIS, I think it's important to note that controlling your destiny when it comes to energy choices, having those American options available, having the production here domestically enhanced, having the efficiency tools that we require, not only utilized that are shelf-ready, but to develop additional product lines that can create these, given opportunities, smart meters in which we invested this year with the stimulus package, with the Recovery Act, are a great way to provide for control over your energy consumption and your bills, to utilize off-peak where possible, and to have a smarter opportunity presented for us as consumers. That's all available with technology today.

And as we further develop these packages that will enable consumers to control their energy destiny, it's a great thing as we develop this American power to power America. It's a wonderful concept.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Would my colleague yield just for a moment on that? Because this same study that Mr. POLIS and I are referring to, I just want to read a paragraph that addresses the very point you're making, Mr. TONKO.

It says, In total, the energy-efficiency provisions of H.R. 2454 could reduce U.S. energy use by 4.4 quadrillion BTUs by 2020. These energy-efficiency savings are more than the annual use of 47 of the 50 States, including your home State of New York. Moreover, such savings will avoid 293 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions by 2020, the equivalent—this is astounding—of taking 49 million automobiles off the road every year. By 2030, these energy efficiency savings go to 11 quadrillion BTUs, accounting for about 10 percent of projected U.S. energy use that year.

This is incredible. And that's what you're getting at, that there are other efficiencies that can be achieved by this bill that, by the way, also will lead to innovation, job creation, and savings for consumers we haven't even calculated.

Mr. HEINRICH.

Mr. HEINRICH. I think what my friend from Virginia is describing is actually a very conservative position. And I think that one of the ironies in all of this is when you realize that we have nonrenewable resources and they're very valuable—they cost us billions and billions of dollars in our economy—to use less of them, to stretch those out and to utilize them

more effectively, that is a fundamentally conservative position, not to waste the resources that God has given us, but to utilize them as efficiently as we possibly can.

You know, I remember during the campaign of 2008 there was this whole issue of the tire gauge, and hearing Rush Limbaugh just make fun of this idea that a tire gauge could be of any value at all. And when you think about the fact that we will fight like dogs and cats in this Chamber over this little postage stamp of oil and gas in the North Slope of Alaska, the same amount of which could be conserved in a few years if people would use those tire gauges, that is, I think, a fundamental irony in all of this.

We're going to continue to use oil and gas; we're probably going to continue to use coal for a number of years. We should use those nonrenewable resources as conservatively as we possibly can.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. And, Representative POLIS, I would go back to an earlier statement that I made. We're all talking about how we can improve our economy, address our energy crisis, address our environmental crisis, but at the same time, we need to bear in mind that this is the way we draw attention to this Nation and her intellectual capacity, where we become the exporter of energy thinking, of energy ideas, of innovation. This is the strengthening of the economy.

As people invest in this economy, in the American know-how, we then become even stronger as we develop the solutions for our air that we breathe, the water that we drink, and certainly the soil that we utilize for our own opportunities and routine opportunities throughout life. We can then become this go-to nation, which is as critical today, if not more critical, than the space race was in the Sixties, which we won because we committed to thinking in new terms, in bolder terms.

Change is not easy. Change is not easy to get our arms around. But change is what we ought to be about as leaders of legislative policy that can then take this country into new orders of job development and energy policy.

Mr. POLIS. The American Clean Energy and Security Act will help make sure that a lot of this technology is created here. We all worry about the trade deficit. It seems like America doesn't make anything anymore. It seems like we're importing everything from all over the world. Well, here is our opportunity to start making things again.

I visited a company in my district 2 weeks ago. They got a big order from China for solar panels. They are exporting solar panels from Colorado to China.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. POLIS, right on message, I visited a company in my district the other day that manufactures microchips. That market is very cyclical. And the manufacturing capacity in the United States has shrunk and shrunk and shrunk.

They had a factory they had to close in the Midwest. They are retrofitting, and they are going to make solar panels at this factory should we pass this bill. They are waiting for this bill to pass, and almost overnight they are going to start to manufacture solar panels.

Mr. TONKO. And I will add, if I may, that there are those industries that are energy intensive and trade intensive. And those are the focal points that we can provide where there needs to be this assistance—if you can produce something at less cost, which becomes a reality if you provide energy retrofits that make it more efficient, some of these industries that are energy intensive, when improved upon, where you utilize, as Representative HEINRICH said, your resources more wisely and effectively, that produces a lower cost of production of that given product and so it makes you more competitive in the global marketplace.

Mr. POLIS. So you're saying that it's going to create a lot of jobs. But there is a family out there, and let's say they're a steelworker, let's say they are working in some of these industries; we can reassure them that this won't hurt their competitiveness in the global environment at all. That has been dealt with in this bill, right?

Mr. HEINRICH. I think not only on the steel front will it help their competitiveness, the way it's structured actually rewards them for being more efficient. We produce steel in this country with far less of a carbon footprint than they do in China. And one of the things that the incentives in this legislation does is it will incentivize spending money on capital investment that will continue to bring down the carbon footprint and increase the efficiency, making steel in this country more competitive worldwide in a way that is even compliant with the WTO. So we will actually be improving the competitiveness of the American steel industry instead of, once again, shipping those jobs and ceding them to another country.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. And to the point you're making, Mr. HEINRICH, and yours, Mr. POLIS, the legislation specifically addresses the steel and cement industries and provides them a very generous transition through the year 2025. Thereafter, the President could still extend that transition should he or she decide it's warranted. And if he or she decides it's not, it's phased out, but on a maximum of 10 percent per year. So it is a very generous set of circumstances to make sure that our domestic steel industry and our domestic cement-producing industries have the requisite period of time in which to make this transition.

Mr. POLIS. And as Mr. HEINRICH pointed out, along the way they actually have an incentive; they actually get paid. They earn money if they find more energy-efficient ways to produce these metals, which of course they're going to.

Again, American ingenuity, as Mr. TONKO talked about. There is no prob-

lem that's created that Yankee ingenuity can't solve. And technology has been a great force of growth for this country. And Mr. CONNOLLY pointed out, you know what? They probably will be there with the right incentives by 2025. Not only will this bill help create a whole new green tech and manufacture and research base, but it can also be the salvation of some of our existing manufacturing jobs by showing them the way to do it more cleanly and actually providing an economic incentive that is actually money in the pockets of workers and companies manufacturing in this country by being ahead of the curve and ending their reliance on fossil fuels.

Mr. TONKO. And Representative POLIS, if I might, as we choose to speak to this green energy thinking, our actions, the vision shared with this Nation will percolate into all sorts of layers, even reach our youngest population where in the classroom they may be inspired to move into these careers. We need to encourage that sort of outcome. We need to encourage our more technically sophisticated workers of the future. And it could start as early as the elementary years when they hear the discussion out there—when they don't hear the denial, when they don't have the deception, but when they get the facts brought to them. When they see the potential out there that exists today and that can grow into the future, that can't help but spark the interest.

How many young people were watching the first step on the moon? How many young people then chose to be scientists and engineers to go along that path? Our community colleges that are there as the campus of choice in so many communities, where they can train and retrain a workforce to become those stewards of the environment, that will help us in this agenda to be most energy efficient and to grow R&D opportunities in the lab.

This is a tremendous opportunity to inspire our Nation, to lift us from the doldrums of an energy environment and economic crisis that has really hampered a lot of progress for this country and has denied competitiveness for our manufacturing base.

Mr. HEINRICH. This really is our generation's Apollo Project. It is the greatest challenge of our generation. And we intend to meet it and not cede that leadership to someone else.

And the words that keep coming up over and over again, when you discuss these issues, independence, ingenuity, entrepreneurship, conservation, I mean, those are things that this Nation was built upon, and we certainly cannot turn our back on them now.

Mr. POLIS. You know, and again, what started this whole discussion is the cost of inaction, and we're talking about the benefits of action. And I think we've made that case; I mean, when it's 750 bucks a year in your family's pocket, whether it's extra jobs being created or whether it's us export-

ing technology to China and Europe, I mean, these are the benefits. And when we look at the cost side, that cost side is skewed towards not taking any action.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Boy, are you right, Mr. POLIS. You know, I listen sometimes to the rhetoric of our friends on the other side of the aisle, and they never talk about that. They never talk about the fact that the cost of inaction to the automotive industry is the utter collapse of any automotive manufacturing capacity in the United States. They don't talk about the challenge of power generation. They don't talk about the extraction industries. They don't talk about what it means to any other kind of manufacturing capacity.

For that matter, technology today, the industry that dominates my district, the information technology industry, is dependent on a reliable source of energy. And they understand that reliable source of energy needs to be, if we are going to stay competitive with foreign competition in the technology sector, a renewable source of energy.

Mr. POLIS. As Mr. TONKO pointed out, another cost which we never hear the folks on the other side talking about, a cost of our reliance on oil, over \$800 billion with the war in Iraq. Our foreign adventures in the Middle East, even absent the first war in Kuwait that we had to liberate Kuwait, the new war in Iraq, our ongoing presence in the region, these are all costs that the American taxpayers are paying. Where is the outrage from the other side of the aisle, as stewards of our taxpayer dollars, about all that money that is built into our reliance on foreign oil? That is all money that is leaving our country, never to be seen again. Not only are we sending all of our money to buy barrels of oil from Saudi Arabia, we are sending our young men and women, our brothers and sisters over there to risk their lives for those barrels of oil that we have coming back. I mean, this is critical for the national security of our Nation.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. And if I might interject just one thing, Mr. POLIS, because when you said that, I am reminded of what we went through just 1 year ago this very summer, where the volatility of the price of gasoline really hit the pocketbook of the average American consumer. You want to talk about cost—it affected people's choices. If affected whether they could take that vacation. It affected their commutes. It affected discretionary travel in terms of shopping or seeing movies or even seeing friends and relatives because the cost of gasoline had become almost prohibitive for so many of our citizens. That's the cost, too, if we do nothing.

Mr. POLIS. I mean, wind and solar, they don't fluctuate like that. The quantities are there. I mean, absent a bill like this, we could very well see \$5 a gallon, \$6 a gallon of gas.

□ 2130

I saw oil again hit a peak today. It was up over \$80 a barrel. The dollar is weakening. Why is the dollar weakening? Because global investors are losing confidence in our currency. We can restore that confidence by being the centerpiece of this green revolution.

Mr. TONKO. Representative POLIS, I believe that volatility, that unpredictable nature of what we have to pay for this import of oil or gasoline should really drive our thinking. And I firmly believe, with every ounce of my being, that this is the moment for America. This is our moment, a golden opportunity to turn green. And we can grow an economy and really respond to the environment that needs to be nurtured by us, and we can utilize our energy resources in an efficient way by having this American power that will power America. And this is our moment, and we can't walk away from it.

Mr. POLIS. Our time is soon coming to an end. Do you have any closing thoughts, Mr. HEINRICH?

Mr. HEINRICH. Just to thank my friend from New York for really closing, I think, on the issue we need to think about. This is about independence. It's about seizing the moment. And it's about providing the good jobs of tomorrow for the next generation. For my sons who are 6 and 2½, I want them to grow up in this country with the same opportunities that I had and more. And it's going to be up to us to be able to pass this legislation to be able to provide those kinds of opportunities for the future generations of our Nation.

Mr. POLIS. When people hear the American Clean Energy and Security Act, when they hear cap-and-trade, when they hear these, this is what they really mean, a lot of things we talked about here today. We are talking about the future of the American economy. We're talking about creating green jobs. We're talking about saving American households \$750 a year within 10 years and \$3,900 a year within 20 years. We are talking about creating an immense growth sector, making America the center of this technology, exporting this technology to some of the very same countries that we rely upon today for importing either manufactured products or energy-related products.

And, most importantly, we are talking about ending the cost of inaction. We are talking about completely reducing a lot of these hidden costs and overt costs that we are paying every day when you fill up your tank with gas; sending our men and women overseas; importing products from overseas; sending our jobs overseas; and, of course, climate change, which is having an effect on farmers across our country as well as everybody else.

So by passing this American Clean Energy and Security Act, which our SEEC coalition, Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, is heavily involved with here in the United

States Congress, can be the single most important act that we take this term in Congress to help make sure that America has a strong economy throughout the rest of this century and that the dollar regains its strength, that we create jobs here in our country, and we also save American taxpayers and families money along the way.

So when people hear about this debate and they hear about costs, they need to realize the costs of inaction are greater, and they need to realize that the benefits of taking the right action now, and the right action is in this bill, will be a great testimony to America's success and ingenuity for the next generation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after noon on account of family reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. BERKLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAULSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 17.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 17.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 17.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today and June 11.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, June 11.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 11, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2091. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Metconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0514; FRL-8408-6] received May 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2092. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Novaluron; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0166; FRL-8409-8] received May 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2093. A letter from the Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on Joint Officer Management, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 667; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2094. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the legislative proposal entitled, "Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009", or "PAYGO", together with a sectional analysis; (H. Doc. No. 111—46); to the Committee on the Budget and ordered to be printed.

2095. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Extended Permit Terms for Renewal of Federally Enforceable State Operating Permits [EPA-R05-OAR-2008-0031; FRL-8899-3] received May 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2096. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plans for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Huntington-Ashland Area, Lexington Area and Edmonson County; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-1186-200821(w); FRL-8900-4] received May 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2097. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plans Required for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone national Ambient Air Quality Standard; North Carolina and South Carolina [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0043; FRL-8901-8] received May 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2098. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementations Plan, North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0668; FRL-8780-1] received May 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2099. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0891, FRL-8782-7] received May 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.