

equation that takes place. And I think we should be able to have real-time accounting. There should be a Web site there. Here's your \$700 billion in TARP money, and here's where it all went. Here's a spreadsheet. Click on here and we'll give you a changing scene real-time.

□ 2130

I think there ought to be a Web site, also, for the stimulus accountability czar so that he could have that Web site up. We wouldn't have to be pressing for answers; America could just go to the Web site. They would contact us, and let us know what they think about how this money is being spent or not being spent.

But one thing we know is it has not been—and doesn't look like it's going to be—spent according to plan. And whether or not it's spent according to plan, the results don't look like what they were designed to come out of either the TARP funding or the stimulus funding that came. And by the way, I'm proud of all my colleagues for voting "no" on that plan. Remember, it was one leg of a multi-legged stool that we had to construct in order to get us out of this economic crisis; that's what the President told us that day. It looks like a multi-legged stool has got to be a four-or-more-legged stool. If it was a three-legged stool, you would say so. I've never seen a two-legged stool and I've never talked to anybody that had ever seen a two-legged stool. That would defy logic, but so does this stimulus plan defy logic. So maybe it is a two-legged stool, but I think it's more like a four or more, at the cost of about \$2 trillion a leg, Madam Speaker.

So what do we get back for that? And these margins that were to come, we weren't going to see unemployment go up over 8 percent and now it's 9.4 percent. And I didn't see how the stock market closed today, but the last I looked at it, it was down 204 points; and I don't imagine how it had a good day. The level of confidence there, it seems it's less volatile than it was, it's more stable than it was, but we have a whole lot more debt than we had. When this all started, the Chinese were happy to buy our debt. I was never happy to sell it to them, but they were happy to buy it. Today, they're not happy to buy it, and I'm not happy to sell it to them.

We've got to find a way to tighten this belt. We've got to tighten this belt down, and we've got to slow down this spending, and we've got to get back to balancing our budget. I believe that every one of us here on this floor voted for a balanced budget this year. And in the face of all this economic crisis—those of us on the Republican side of the aisle, many of us supported a balanced budget—it's hard to put one together in this tailspin that we're in. We did that. We voted for it. And that sends the right message. And every year hereafter we've got to put a balanced budget out there and build the

votes until we can actually get it balanced.

I yield back and thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for joining me.

As we sum this up here, Mr. KING mentioned something that I think is important. He mentioned we needed a denationalization czar or an exit strategy czar, or maybe both. In this world of proliferation of czars, maybe we need both. But the reality is, in seriousness, when the President of the United States came into office, he told us there is a drop-dead deadline we're going to get out of Iraq. This is it. There is a drop-dead deadline we're going to close Guantanamo Bay, and this is it. So this time next year, we won't even need the Guantanamo closure czar because it will be closed. And very clearly, we are going to draw down our soldiers in the war in Iraq.

The President has shown leadership. Whether you agree or disagree with him is for other times. But he certainly has become one who says there should be a drop-dead date, an exit strategy. I think it is important that this Congress, when we look at this massive increase in the executive department and we say to ourselves, They are not answerable to us except through the appropriations process, we can cut off the money, but other than that, they're answerable to the President.

We had nothing to say about who got hired. We had nothing to say about what the duties were. This was a creation of the executive department, and that would be the President of the United States and his staff. They owe this Nation and some of these areas a time to get out.

They say they don't want us to run the automobile industry. Well, we need to be planning on getting out of the automobile industry. We can't stay in there. The country doesn't want a government-made car. Just ask them; they don't want one. So we can get rid of the car czar, the executive pay czar, a lot of these other czars, if we would just say, this is their mission, here's when we expect that mission to be accomplished, as we did to our soldiers, and this is when we expect it to be accomplished, and by that date you either accomplish it or you're getting out.

You know, I personally think the way we look at this massive \$1.5 trillion worth of authorized spending, authorized by this House—mainly that side of the aisle—the way we look at that right now is we should be saying stimulus means rapid infusion into the economy. Anything that hasn't been rapidly infused this year we should halt. So if they haven't spent the \$787 billion—or whatever that number is—like right now, at least some papers report only \$25 billion of that money, or we'll say \$40 billion of that money has been used so far. And if you study some of those projects, many of those projects are for getting money to peo-

ple for things that will not have an effect on our economy for years—3, 5, 7 years down the road. That's not stimulus. If they haven't gotten the thing done this year, we ought to say, de-authorize it at that point in time. It hasn't worked; try something that works. That's where we ought to be. That's the way this Congress needs to start thinking because we are creating a power structure that is outside the normal power structure of the executive branch of the government. These are things for us to think about.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for your courtesy tonight.

CLOSING GUANTANAMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be recognized and addressed here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And I appreciate the collaboration of my colleagues from Texas, the two judges from Texas, that addressed this subject matter of the czars in the last hour.

A lot has been said about the czars, and now maybe I will just transition from that into another subject matter, Madam Speaker. But the idea that we are going to see the end of the Gitmo closing czar, it's pretty interesting to me. We have an Attorney General that seemed to have gotten that assignment. I remember the look in his eye as he was trying to figure out what to do with that January 22, 2010, mandated closing date that was established by the President in his executive order.

I have also been down to Gitmo and seen down there in the commons area where the Gitmo inmates—the detainees, the enemy combatants, the terrorists, the worst of the worst—where they get in their communal area just off of where their little soccer field is, and it's an area where they play foosball and sit in the shade just off of where their big screen TV is, where they get their refreshments and their education in the English language and the cultural education that takes place. Just off of there, Madam Speaker—and not to set the scene too distinctly—there is a bulletin board just put up, it's a ply board. And on that ply board is the executive order, the President's executive order dated January 22, 2009. It's seven pages long, the English version of it, and that's set on this ply board. And then the Arabic version is about the same number of pages. And there is Plexiglas over the top of it. So these inmates, these worst of the worst—however many we have left down there—they can interrupt their soccer game, or stop, or if they're waiting their turn to play foosball, or whatever it might be, they can go over there and read or reread the executive order which says—it's a promise to the worst of the worst, the Gitmo detainees, that they're not going to be down

there in Gitmo one day past January 22, 2010. That's the pledge to them.

When I looked at that, I had been involved in a lot of this discussion that had to do with the Gitmo detainees and the utter logic that says keep them there, don't close Guantanamo Bay. You couldn't have a better—no nation has treated the people they picked up in warfare as well as we have treated the Gitmo detainees.

So these individuals are down there, and they live in air conditioning. And they say their cultural temperature is between 75 and 80 degrees, so they, essentially, are the ones that set the thermostat in their residences—which they are cells, private cells. They don't share a room. They have private cells with a nice little arrow on the floor that shows them where Mecca is. And our operations down there stop five times a day for 20 minutes each time—that's 100 minutes a day—while our guards stand respectfully and wait while the five prayers a day go on. This 100 minutes isn't interrupted by their opportunity to fill out the menu. They do that at a different time.

They get to choose from nine different items—five-times-a-day prayer, 100 minutes a day, nine different items on the menu every day they can choose from, check the box and decide which ones of these Islamically approved meals do they want to eat in the three squares a day that they get—all within the air conditioning that they live in if it's not their desire to go outside in the fresh Caribbean air and play a little soccer and foosball and schmooze around a little bit.

So there is a pledge on that bulletin board, and that pledge is the executive order with the Plexiglas over the top of it. It is President Obama's executive order that is the commitment from the President of the United States that Gitmo will be closed.

Now, when I saw that, I came to the conclusion that no matter how much logic there is that supports sustaining Guantanamo Bay, no matter that it is the best place in the world for these Gitmo detainees, no matter that it's air conditioning and nine Islamic meals to choose from in a day and outside exercise and indoor climate control and arrows for prayer and the fancier prayer rugs that I don't know anybody that has rugs this fancy in their house, and a skull cap and a Koran—no Bibles, by the way. Out of the 800 or so inmates they've had down there, one of them requested a Bible, but it caused too much unrest among the rest of them so Bibles are not allowed. Neither are American guards allowed to touch a Koran. It comes in a special little bag carried in and everybody gets this Koran.

Well, of all of these things going on down there at Gitmo they have a promise, no matter how logical it is to keep it open, no matter how logical it is to process these enemy combatants through the procedures that this Congress has lawfully set up, Gitmo will be

closed despite all logic. And it convinced me of that when I saw the bulletin board with the executive order on it. The President is not going to rescind an executive order that they have posted in front of the Gitmo detainees, the enemy combatants, the former terrorists. That is the strongest message that I picked up while I was there.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you were talking about Guantanamo Bay, it dawned on me that the world talks about American treatment of political prisoners, they call them. We call them enemy combatants, which I think, since we pick them up from the battlefield, we've got a pretty decent argument. We don't hear anybody talking about our enemies' treatment of our combatants when captured on the battlefield. There is a reason, I think. First off, we do everything in our power to make sure that we don't lose any of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines to the enemy. We even remove our dead. We leave no soldier on the battlefield; it's the pride of our military. But there is also an underlying principle here because, if you will recall, less than, I think, 3 or 4 years ago, they got their hands on some people and they dragged them behind cars and hung them from the bridge in Baghdad. They got their hands on another guy; and on television, with everybody watching, they cut his head off in front of anybody who wanted to watch it.

So let's compare nine selected menu items, temperature regulated to suit your lifestyle, and your religious material of choice treated with great respect—which is our way of dealing with prisoners versus decapitation, dragging, setting on fire, and hanging from a bridge. Where is the outcry? Well, there certainly can't be any comparison of treatment because we're doing our dangest not to see that happen again. And I'm proud to say that our guys are doing a great job on that; they're protecting Americans on the battlefield. It's because the enemy has no qualms with what they're going to do. Do you really think the enemy would be providing Bibles to the Christians that they captured? Do you really think, if they were from the border regions of Texas, one of their choices on the menu would be Mexican food? Give me a break. Anybody that's got any logic at all knows exactly what would happen to American prisoners that were captured, and that's why we fight so hard to keep them safe. I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman from Texas, I think it's an especially important point, and very illustrative, when you asked the question, Do you think the enemy will provide Bibles to any of our soldiers that they might one day capture as prisoners of war?

□ 2145

It sounds even ridiculous when you say it because it's so far out of the realm.

We are talking about one of the pieces that have to do with immigration, talking about renewing the religious workers visa, and we'll have about 5,000 religious workers come into the United States each year. And they should be and generally are required to, and often it doesn't work out that way, be affiliated with existing religious observations. They might well come from countries like Saudi Arabia or other countries in the Middle East, for example, those countries that aren't very tolerant of our missionaries going in there. So it occurred to me that if we really wanted to have religious workers visas here in the United States, we should turn around and require reciprocity. Just simply say to them, Fine, send your imams here to the United States, but the condition is we're going to send you some Baptist ministers and Catholic priests.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. That's a very interesting position, and I agree with you actually. That would be the kind of world we would create. That's the fairness that Americans give to others. It's not the world of those we fight against. The world we fight against is an autocratic world in which it's their way or the highway.

One more thing I want to point out. I get kind of tired of hearing people say we've got to close Gitmo because it is the target for creating more terrorists. So let's see. What do you think is going to be the target if we take everybody out of Gitmo and put them in Leavenworth? Then next year the recruiting tool is going to be, guess what? Leavenworth. So now we're going to close Leavenworth, because it could cause people to go over to the terrorist side, and send them to La Tuna down in El Paso. But wait a minute. In a year that's going to be the target. That's going to be the evil Guantanamo. So eventually they're going to end up in the Williamson County Jail. But wherever you put them, until they are back home on the enemy terrorists' battlefield, they will recruit based on that holding facility. It's a ridiculous argument to say you have to close Guantanamo because it becomes a recruiting tool for terrorists, because if they were in Leavenworth, it would be the recruiting tool for terrorists.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman from Texas, I would add to that that the representation of Gitmo is something that's created by the liberal news media and the liberal mindset and the MoveOn.org people. Name a criticism of Gitmo, and chances are that criticism is just simply untrue. One of those is that there were people waterboarded at Gitmo. Not true. It didn't happen. It didn't ever happen. But the public believes it did. So if there's a rumor out there, if there's an

urban legend that exists about something, do we go eradicate it because there's a rumor?

I don't understand what the criticism was of Gitmo in the first place. They had to go somewhere. It's a very humane thing to do. No, waterboarding didn't take place at Guantanamo Bay, but some really evil people reside down there. And they are not just innocent people that randomly were picked up. These are not goat herders down there. These are evil terrorists who believe their path to salvation is in killing us. And they have a command-and-control structure even to the extent they could order a simultaneous attempt at suicide that took place a couple of years ago; four that tried, three succeeded. Exactly a year to the day, there was another attempt. One succeeded. Now we have them all on a suicide watch where no one down there that's an inmate goes more than 3 minutes without eyes on from at least one of our guards.

One of the other things that's happened is you think about abusive treatment of prisoners. I see nothing but a culture of—it bends over backwards. There's too much respect down there, in my view, for these evildoers that are there. But on the other side of this thing is that on an average of 20 times a day, these inmates attack our guards. Half of the time they're throwing feces in their face, and the other half of the time they're physically assaulting our guards. And the worst thing we can do to punish them is reduce their outdoor exercise time down to 2 hours a day. And this is an evil empire nation and we ought to close down Gitmo because MoveOn.org is critical and liberal socialist Western Europe is critical and the people on the other side of the great divide of Western civilization are critical?

Many of them have designs on working against the United States, and I certainly don't include Western Europe in that. But I did have a conversation with the leadership of the Germans, and they said, Well, we think that you ought to close Gitmo, and they have been pushing hard for that, and that we should disperse these, at the time 241, detainees around to other countries in the world. But the Germans aren't going to take any of them as long as they might pose a threat to Germany. And how do they measure this? Well, if we're not going to bring them to the United States, then they must be dangerous for us to bring here; so why would they take them there? In other words, they put a condition on us that says they won't be accepting any; they'll just be pressing us to close Guantanamo Bay.

My answer to that is if you won't take any of these inmates, then it looks to me like you don't have anything to say about Guantanamo Bay. Your opinion, I believe is invalid, along with most of the other criticism that flows out on the behavior.

A nation has got to be able to stand some criticism. We didn't elect a Presi-

dent to run around the world and apologize to every continent and do a contrition tour of the world. That's not going to make people like us any better. And, by the way, I'm not so interested in being liked; I'm interested in being respected. And that's the thing that will bring about the right kind of results from the enemies we have. When they see us knuckle under and go wobbly because of a little criticism, and we'll close a place like Guantanamo Bay, thinking that then their criticism is going to move along because somebody said it's their best recruiting tool—who says, and why? And if that's their recruiting tool, there are many things that they can gin up over the Internet that would stimulate people to join their side.

What do they say? "Remember Guantanamo Bay"? Is that like "Remember the Alamo," a recruiting tool for 140 years or whatever it is? It doesn't hold water, in my analysis, and I just believe that this backpedaling from international criticism doesn't get you anything except more international criticism in a different area, and that's something that I think that the judge and I agree on.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Don't be comparing it to "Remember the Alamo." That's pretty sacred stuff from where I come from.

But, seriously, today I was watching the news, and I saw these four detainees who are now living in probably the most luxurious setting I believe I've ever seen in, I believe it's Bermuda. I mean it's a beautiful house overlooking the ocean with a swimming pool. It's like a three-part swimming pool, a swim area and I guess that's the lounging area or maybe a kiddie pool. I don't know what it is. And these guys are sitting there. Like the guy said the other night about what was reported on the money we were going to spend to send to Palau, where they were talking about putting some people out on that island. He said at that rate of spending, \$200 million for 12, I think it was, that were going to go to Palau, if that's the rate of spending, why don't we just buy the Waldorf Astoria and put them all in there because it would come out cheaper? And, you know, it would.

I think that the world is going to look and say, Look at how the administration is reacting to this criticism of Guantanamo. They're pulling them out of a state-of-the-art prison which has state-of-the-art rules and state-of-the-art treatment and they're moving them to the tune of \$200 million to an island out in the middle of nowhere?

By the way, none of these guys are on the no-fly list. Because I remember we voted on that less than 2 weeks ago to put them on the no-fly list, and the majority killed it in a big, big way.

Now, we pay \$200 million to Palau. They go out there and hang around a while until they kind of get their feet on the ground, and then they're on a great white jet headed anyplace they want to go. And they're not under de-

tention there. In the Bahamas where those four guys are, they've got freedom of the island. In the Bahamas you could get on a boat and go to the United States. We've got drug smugglers probably that smuggle that route.

But, seriously, this is ridiculous how we are overreacting to this thing and doing things that I'm sure the rest of the world has got to be saying, These guys are crazy in the United States, setting these guys up in a seaside resort in Jamaica. Insanity rules.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

We were having a lot of discussions here about some things that were heretofore unimagined just a few months ago or even just a few years ago. And as we transitioned over into this discussion about Guantanamo Bay, this discussion will go on, but the bottom line of it comes out to be this: Yes, there are a few of them that could potentially be facing a death sentence. A few. I don't know how big that number is, and I can't get a definitive response. I guess I should pass my request over to the Gitmo closing czar and ask him how many are facing a death sentence.

But let's just look at it in this fashion: And that is that it looks like they are going to close Guantanamo Bay. They're going to disperse these people to places wherever they can get rid of them. Some of them are likely to be released in the free world, some into the United States of America. These are the worst of the worst. We have about a one-in-seven recidivism rate of those 558 that we'd released that were the nicest guys of the lot. The least dangerous is a more accurate way to describe them. And even out of those 558, we see a recidivism rate where they have turned around and attacked Americans and free people one out of seven that we know. And I don't know what percentage it is that we don't know. But if one out of seven will come back and attack Americans when you pick the best of the worst, what will be the attack rate on free people when you release the worst of the worst? It will be greater than one out of seven. And this number is 241. So divide your seven in there and multiply it by whatever that factor is, a two or a three or so, and you'll come up with a number. I think we're going to see 50 or more of them that will turn around and attack Americans or other free people.

The bottom line of the executive order is that most or all will eventually be released and they will attack free people and innocent people will die. And among those innocent people are likely to be Americans, and that will then be the news story that will come back. And then we will replay this and unravel it all the way backwards again, and it will be, well, only one or two or three mistakes that only cost 20 or 30 or 40 lives, so that we could avoid this criticism and shut down an operation that has actually been built up to accommodate the people that are there now, including the

Uyghurs, who are now wasting away in "MargaUyghurville" from what I understand. I can't even say it because I get Jimmy Buffett and Warren Buffett mixed up, I think.

Mr. CARTER. That's good. I like that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If this subject matter has been utilized, I think, adequately, I want to take some of this discussion over, Madam Speaker, and talk a little bit about where we are with cap-and-trade and cap-and-tax.

It looks like this administration and the majority in this Congress are determined to push through a Waxman-Markey bill or some version of it, probably the version that came out of committee here a few weeks ago. And I have taken this position, and I hold it, and that is that they are wrong on the science, and they're wrong on the economics.

I want to address the science in a fairly short degree here, and it turns out to be this: Remember our history. This issue was brought before this Congress, I think the year was 1988, although I haven't referenced that. That's strictly from memory. It was a hearing on climate change. No, excuse me. It was a hearing on global warming. And the lead witness on that was Dr. James Hansen. By coincidence, he and I went to the same high school together. He was there ahead of me, and I don't recall him. But I understand that the testimony was midsummer. The room was not air conditioned. The humidity about matched the temperature. And as the Members of the Congress sat there and sweated, they were being told that this world was going to get warm and all kinds of calamities were going to take place. Well, 1988, that was only just a few years after we had all the interest in the ice age. There was a coming ice age that was published in some of the major national publications, and it was inevitable that the Earth was going to cool and we'd have to get ready for the glaciers to creep down from the north and push us off our cornfields, and Iowans were going to have to migrate to South Texas in order to avoid this. And that was 1970 and some of those years. And it's a fact that at least one and probably more than one of those scientists that were certain that we were going to undergo this ice age are now on the side of the argument that the Earth is going to get warmer, and it's going to get warmer fast—perhaps as much as 4 degrees centigrade over 100 years—and that anything that's a weather anomaly is going to be the result of global warming.

If you remember, a couple of years ago we had quite a few hurricanes, the result of global warming. A year ago hurricanes were way off, a result of global warming. Everything is a result of climate change, whether it's more rain or less rain or whether it's warmer temperatures or cooler temperatures.

So I guess if you have a nice utility to blame it on, climate change blames

everything on that's an anomaly. And you aren't going to have to be around when science actually evaluates the predictions that you make because none of us are going to live beyond 100 years. So if it doesn't get to be a 4-degree centigrade increase in the Earth's temperature 100 years from now, nobody is going to point at Dr. Jim Hanson and say, You're wrong, Doc, or to Al Gore and say, You're wrong, because they will be at the same place I will be at that point.

□ 2200

And so it is a handy little excuse to just shift it off on to climate change and then ask for this great growth in government.

Now, we had a meteorologist speak to the Conservative Opportunity Society a week ago last Wednesday morning, Dr. Roy Spencer. He is a NASA scientist. He is the one that is managing the satellite collection data that collects the Earth's temperatures from satellites. He has 25 years of data. And as he talked about this, and this was a fairly quick once-through so it wasn't like a semester course, but as he talked about this data, he explained to us that the climate change models that they are using to predict global warming, they have to have assumptions.

I asked the question, why is it that physicists tend to buy into the global warming argument more so than meteorologists do? He said, well, it is logical, because meteorologists understand the ambiguities. They are trying to predict the weather for tomorrow. The climate czar, he can't predict the weather for tomorrow, but they are predicting the temperature 100 years from now.

So, I posed the question, I have a son that is going to have an outdoor wedding in August and I would like to know what the weather is that day. Of course, the climate czar is not going to tell me. We can find out in a couple of months whether he is right or wrong. One hundred years from now he will make a prediction, but he won't tell you what it is going to be like next week. But the presumptions that are there, meteorologists understand the vagaries of predicting the weather even tomorrow, let alone 100 years from now.

Physicists have studied the exact sciences, so when they put together a climate change model, a computer calculation that brings in a lot of factors, there always has to be assumptions. The assumptions are plugged in by the meteorologists, and the numbers are calculated by the physicists and the other exact science people. They have great confidence in their numbers. They understand the interrelationships of the factors that they put on their calculations, but it is still based on assumptions.

And the assumptions fall down to this. They assume that greenhouse gases emitted by industry in the world, a lot of it from the United States, bring

about more clouds in our atmosphere. Now, I can't quite explain why that is, but they believe that is. So if it is more clouds in the atmosphere, that is one assumption.

The second assumption is more clouds make the Earth warmer. Now, that seems like an odd assumption to me, and they have been telling me this for years, and it never made sense to me.

Dr. Spencer explains it the other way. He says, no, his data shows that more clouds bring about a cooler Earth, and they have 25 years of satellite data that shows that. And that is what makes sense to me. If a cloud blocks out the sun, the Earth is not going to be as warm, and if the cloud goes away and the sun shines on the Earth, it absorbs the radiation from the sun and the Earth gets warmer. That is the simple part of this.

So if their assumptions are CO₂ gas primarily in the atmosphere increases clouds and more clouds warm the Earth, then you get one result, the Earth gets 4 degrees centigrade warmer in 100 years, or some variation of that.

If you turn around and use the data and you back-feed Dr. Spencer's data into the model, then it turns this argument around on its head. But even then Dr. Spencer is very conservative and careful. He thinks maybe that data shows not a 4-degree centigrade increase, but more about half-a-degree centigrade increase, and the argument can be made that the Earth will get cooler. Plus the data we have shows that the world has gotten actually marginally cooler or else the temperature has been flat since 2002.

Dr. Spencer argues or informs us that another 10 years this kind of data and it is going to be really hard for the alarmists to be able to make the argument that we are faced with this global warming that is only revokable if we follow their model.

So I look at that science and I understand Dr. Spencer's presentation. I do not understand Dr. Hansen's or Al Gore's presentation. It does not make sense to me with the science I have in my background.

So I simply asked the question, Madam Speaker, the foundational question: What are we trying to do here and with what? That would be the logical thing to ask.

So the first thing is, how big is our atmosphere? Well, our atmosphere happens to be, and they measure this in metric tons, it is 5.150 quadrillion metric tons of atmosphere. That is the force of all the air on the planet pushing down on gravity. So that is just a lot. That is a lot of air in our atmosphere.

Then, so what is the cumulative total of all of the CO₂ that has gone into the atmosphere emitted by the United States of America since the dawn of the industrial revolution? About 45 percent of it goes into sinks, which means it disappears and they don't know where it went; 55 percent hangs out in

the air and is accumulated. And that number sounds big, but not compared to our overall atmosphere.

So let's put this in a perspective. It works like this. If you draw a circle that represented the size the atmosphere of the Earth and have that be an 8-foot circle, so roughly the size of the wall in your house, two 4-by-8 sheets of drywall, and draw a circle around that big in diameter, that would represent all the Earth's atmosphere.

Then draw a circle in the middle of that to demonstrate the volume of the CO₂ that has accumulated in the Earth's atmosphere since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution emitted by the United States. Your 8-foot circle is the atmosphere. In the center of that you would draw a circle that is .56 inch in diameter, just a little over half an inch in diameter, the end of my little finger. That is all the bigger the circle would be that would be the cumulative total of all the CO₂ the U.S. has emitted that is in the atmosphere today.

And we are talking with Waxman-Markey about, well, that is 205 years of accumulation. So we want to take 1/205th of that and reduce that down by 20 percent a year for a little while, and then by 40, then by 60, then by 83 percent. With that tiny little bit in that 8 foot circle, we are going to set the Earth's thermostat and control the Earth's temperature?

What utter vanity to think in that tiny little bit, and we can adjust that tiny little half inch bit in an 8-foot circle only by a little bit, and we are going to change the whole temperature of all the atmosphere in the Earth, in spite of looking at these climate changes that we have always had over time. We have ice ages and warming periods and sunspots and more solar activity on the sun, and sometimes you will see the Earth cool because a volcano will erupt and cloud the Earth.

Why would we think that more clouds in the atmosphere would warm the Earth when more clouds in the atmosphere from a volcano cools the Earth?

Each of these questions are logical questions for third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth graders to ask, and even at that level we are not getting answers from the people that advocate this.

It is as "if" they had to create a convoluted science and back-figure it back to be able to justify their idea that they want to do this cap-and-tax model, and the cap-and-tax model is a large taxation scheme that for every \$5 collected puts \$1 in the Treasury and wastes the other 4.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for his description of just exactly what is going on. Just as you were saying, it came to mind some of the things that just in my lifetime I can remember.

If you study history, you learn when we put in the Panama Canal we had a horrible, horrible situation when we built the Panama Canal because of ma-

laria and yellow fever that were insect-bearing diseases. We invented DDT, and we used DDT to hold down those bug populations, and by that we were able to build the Panama Canal.

As a child growing up in Houston, Texas, without air conditioning, the DDT truck went by every Friday night and sprayed the whole neighborhood. And yet a lady wrote a book called *Silent Spring*. She said that all the research shows—I hate it when people say "all the research shows"—all the research shows if we continue to use DDT, we will have no insect life on Earth and the birds will die and we will have a silent spring. When spring comes, the birds won't be singing, the crickets won't be crickets, and they will go away.

And being loyal, progressive believers, we launched a campaign to get rid of DDT, and we got rid of it. It has been gone. But we now have one of the—we actually give millions, maybe even billions now, of dollars from this Congress to fight malaria. Something that was almost eradicated when I was a kid is now a major worldwide problem because we did away with DDT. And, guess what? Now the research, the real, present-day, 21st century research, says everything they said about DDT is just not true.

□ 2210

It was made up. And now, we're even finding out the lady knew she made it up. But she just didn't like DDT.

Now, you talked about global cooling. I can remember global cooling. I can remember people talking about why it was going to cool down. We were going to all be in the ice age. We were going to blame the Russians. It was going to be the Russians fault, okay? All this stuff. And we had to build big industries around global cooling.

You know, we told our people, you better quit propagating, because you're going to run out of space on this Earth. By the 21st century it will be standing room only on the Earth, unless you limit the number of children you have. And being good, college-educated progressives, we launched out to reduce the amount of children we had. And we did it with birth control. And later we did it with that horrid invention, abortion. But we limited our birth control, and our Western European friends limited their birth control. We still replace ourselves. Well, I think 2.1 children to the family. But I believe the Europeans now, some of the countries over there are like 1.2. And I think some of the best countries over there are 1.8, so they're not even replacing their families with the number of children that they're having.

And then we wonder why 12 million people cross the Texas and Canadian border to come into the United States to fill jobs, because we don't have enough people to fill these jobs. And we wonder why that is.

And, hey, Europeans have got the same problem and they've had that

problem—I can recall they had the problem in 1956. The Germans were importing Turks into Germany because they didn't have enough population.

Now, when you buy into a program, as you point out, down the road, if they're not telling you the truth, it has major consequences. And when you made that 10-year comment, at the present rate this Congress is going, 10 years from now, we may find ourselves sitting around trying to watch television by candle light, okay? Because we're using batteries for our television sets. Because, quite frankly, we are in the process of trying to tax our energy industry out of business, every form or fashion that has any kind of carbon connected. So 10 years from now we could have, we could be a Third World country and wonder why.

That's why this science is so very important. That's why knee jerk reaction, overreacting to things, which the government is famous for, I don't care if it's knee jerk conservatives or knee jerk liberals, any time you get in a hurry, bad things happen. And if you study the history of legislation in this country, it is absolutely true, and nobody will dispute it. You can look at slavery, you can look at the labor laws, you can look at the environmental laws, you can look at anything and see where knee jerk reaction and quick—that's why we have a Senate to slow things down because our Founding Fathers knew that knee jerk reaction created bad legislation. Well, we're about to knee jerk ourselves into the poor house if we're not careful.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Watching this climate change argument unfold, and I think about this country that we are, the most successful Nation in the history of the world, strongest economic in the world, by far, strongest militarily. Our culture penetrates the rest of the world. We're kind of American-centric because we are self-sustaining for a lot of those reasons, militarily, economically, food, for example, and also culturally; and so we don't as often look at the United States from outside.

But I wonder what it must look like for, let's just say, Socrates, looking out across this country today. 3,000 years ago they sat around and in places like Athens, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and they carried on these conversations and they shaped the Age of Reason, the Age of Reason, which was the foundation for science and technology, the theorem, the hypotheses, and they built it into their culture to be proud of being able to rationalize, both deductive reasoning and inductive reasoning. And that rationale, and even though they didn't get their elements right, what did they have? Earth, wind and fire and maybe some other elements like that they used to argue with. They didn't have the tables to be able to put the atoms together and figure out the molecule, but they had a

good rationale. The Age of Reason in Greece is the foundation of Western Civilization, and they took great pride in being able to think rationally.

And if they would transpose themselves, fast forward through history, 3,000 years, race through the Age of Enlightenment in Western Europe and primarily in France, and the dawn of the Industrial Revolution here, and how technology has flourished, and we've gone from an industrial economy to an information economy, and see all the things that we've developed from a technological standpoint, but yet, if they could look inside this Chamber and see where decisions are made in a civilized country today, and see how they're made, I think they'd be astonished that we have suspended the reason that they so carefully developed 3,000 years ago.

And now, we legislate by anecdote. We legislate by somebody's emotions, rather than legislate by empirical data. And Judge CARTER's mentioned a few of those. Pulled DDT off the marketplace, and then watch what's happened with millions that died because of the malaria that came back during that period of time.

My mother read "Silent Spring" by Rachel Carson, and our lawn thereafter had to be full of dandelions, thistles, plant and leaf clover and African violets, but not much blue grass because we couldn't spray that anymore because it was going to kill the birds. Mom knew, though, the names of all of birds and what their songs were, and we had a lot of birds around. We'd have had them anyway without the weeds.

And the alar scare comes to mind as well, Madam Speaker, the apple issue that took a lot of apple producers out of business because there was the allegation that the spray they used on them that kept the apples looking good and staying fresh was somehow dangerous. I think a carcinogen.

These are scientific Malthusians. They are just simply always another calamity around the corner. They threaten, they scare people off the safety of our food. They tell us that the planet can only sustain about so many people. And these are the people that have determined that they're going to shut down, as Judge CARTER said, our energy production in this country. And we spent last August pounding away every day here on the floor of the House of Representatives, calling for an energy plan that opened up all of the above, all of the energy that we have. We're an energy-rich Nation, not an energy-poor Nation. We just do a poor job of managing the energy that we have.

And to give an example about how easy it should be to take this Nation to the next level of our economic determinism, if we just look over to countries like Japan and Korea, in the last 60 years or a little more, both of those nations, or at least their major cities, were destroyed in war. They've rebuilt their cities, transportation, tele-

communications, the infrastructure that's there. They are modern, they're crisp, they're sharp, they work, they function. And yet in that 60 or so years, each of those countries have imported almost 100 percent of their energy and 60 percent of their food, and they still build modern technological societies.

And we are here in the United States of America, with a surplus of food, and the energy that we need, if we just manage it; and we can't discipline ourselves to utilize our own resources.

And we have a Speaker of the House who's trying to "save the planet." And please put that in quotes. Shut down energy production in America.

There are only about two or three kinds of energy that they would accept more of. One is wind, the other was solar, and the next one may be geothermal if you didn't have to use a drill rig to get it.

And by the way, wind is okay as long as you don't have to see it off of Nantucket. TEDDY KENNEDY's offended by looking at wind mills. And so we can only put them in places where some of the liberals aren't going to have to look at them. By the way, I can see 39 of them from my yard. And so that's all right.

But we need all of the above, and there is no way to meet this model on energy demand for this country, especially with electricity, under WAXMAN-MARKEY's bill. This has already, the intimidation effect and the existing regulations, have shut down any new coal-fired generation plants in America.

□ 2220

Now, we do have a nuclear generating plant that's under construction down in South Carolina. This plant is scheduled to come online in the year 2017. If my recollection is right, they've been working on it for 2 or more years by now, and in 2017, it will come on line. This is a beta model. This is the model of nuclear generating plants. The engineering is not a problem. It's how do you jump through all of the regulatory hoops to get there? If they can get that done, then presumably it will be the cookie cutter so we can build more, yet not under the Obama administration.

The Obama administration goes over and says to Ahmadinejad—I haven't heard him say "congratulations" yet for his election victory, but maybe that came out today. They're relatively silent on those results. It was, Well, we can't tell a sovereign nation that they can't develop nuclear power. The United States can't do that. He essentially said to Iranians, You have the right to develop a nuclear capability even if you do announce to the world that you want to use it to annihilate Israel.

So, according to President Obama, Iran has a right to nuclear, but Americans don't. We can't build a nuclear power plant here to make up for the gap that's created by the regulatory constrictions that are coming out of

the Left today in this energy plan. Those of us who produce energy from coal, for example, are punished States. Those States that do not are those that are recipients. If they put this on cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, you will see a massive corruption bill within the United States as they trade the carbon credits.

To give you an example of what goes on, when Speaker PELOSI received the gavel here in 2007, she decided that the Capitol complex, which we stand in the middle of right now, should be a greenhouse gas-emitting neutral facility, so she ordered that the power plant that feeds this Capitol complex, which is fired by coal and natural gas and oil, be converted from coal to natural gas. It doubled the cost of our power to come into this Capitol, but we still found out that her carbon footprint—I say hers, I wasn't calculating it as mine—of this Capitol complex was still too great. So Speaker PELOSI went on the board in Chicago, and she bought some carbon credits: \$89,000 of our taxpayer dollars paid by carbon credits that were going to offset the carbon emissions here in this Capitol complex. That's designed to cause somebody to do something more to sequester this carbon that is going into the atmosphere from the natural gas that's feeding the power in the Capitol.

So I thought I'd chase that \$89,000 down and figure out where it went. Well, some of that money went to no-till farmers in North Dakota, to Farmers Union farmers, I believe, to people who had been no-till farmers for some time, I believe, to people whose behavior didn't change. So I don't think they went out and sequestered any more carbon. I think they just kept doing what they were doing, and they got a reward from the Speaker's checkbook—from our checkbook—for what they were doing.

By the way, when you no-till, you can sequester some carbon, but if you turn around and till, that carbon is released into the atmosphere anyway, and the net gain is almost zero. So, as long as you keep up the practice of no-till and it's a plus, then that's your measure for good atmosphere.

It didn't all go to the no-till farmers in North Dakota. Some of it went to a coal-fired generating plant in Chillicothe, Iowa. So I went there, and took a look at this coal-fired generating plant. What I saw was a good, well-run plant. Emissions were, I think, pretty good and were fairly modern, but they had received a government grant to set up an operation to be able to burn switchgrass and blend the switchgrass in with the coal at, I think it was, a 10 percent rate to be able to supplement the coal they were burning because switchgrass is carbon neutral. It sequesters it each year, and you burn it each year. Of course, coal is not.

Well, I went in there, and they had two big sheds. They still had a lot of big, round bales—about 1,500-pound

bales of switchgrass. They were stacked in those sheds. There was a big hammer mill and a conveyor and a blower system to inject that all in and blend it with the coal. The place wasn't running, and it hadn't run in a while. I could tell by looking at the hay that it was old.

I asked: So how long has it been since you've burned any of the switchgrass here?

Well, about 2 years. We ran our experiment. Then we shut the experiment down.

So, first, they didn't have data for me for what they might have learned. The experiment hasn't yet yielded a result that we can utilize unless, maybe, they know and they haven't told us.

The second thing is that this money that went to them for sequestering the carbon to give an incentive to burn switchgrass didn't change anybody's behavior. They weren't going to burn any more or any less switchgrass because they got a check from the Speaker of the House. In fact, they had shut down their switchgrass burning 2 years earlier, and this was just a check that went into the treasury of the people who had burned some switchgrass, but we didn't learn anything from it yet.

Now, if that's the thing that's going to go on with cap-and-tax, cap-and-trade and Waxman-Markey, if the Speaker of the House can't get the transaction to work when you go out and buy carbon credits, how in the world are we going to do hundreds of billions of dollars of carbon credits on a massive scale and have any kind of accountability to see whether it actually brings about anything that might sequester more carbon and cause somebody to act in a more favorable way?

I think it is a bureaucratic impossibility, but we can learn from the Spaniards. The Spaniards did this experiment. The Sicilian Mafia came in to manage it because they were the best at it. They were the ones who were brokering the permits to put up the wind chargers, and they were deciding who were going to be the contractors and subcontractors who built them. They decided who would be the suppliers of the materials that went into the wind chargers. So they got all wrapped up with the Sicilian Mafia.

By the way, with the political favors that were being handed out, the permits would be controlled by politicians in the end. Politicians were influenced by political contributions that came from the profits that were being extracted out of the construction and out of the operations of these wind chargers by the Sicilian Mafia, and it made a huge mess out of it all.

I mentioned in the previous hour that, for every green job they created, it cost 2.2 private-sector jobs because it sucked that much capital out of the economy, out of the private-sector economy. The cost per green job was \$770,000. The unemployment rate in Spain is the highest in the industrialized world—17.5 percent unemployed.

The largest industries in Spain have left, and the ones that are left are looking at leaving. The electrical bills for the residents have gone up 20 percent, and the electrical bills for industry have gone up 100 percent in 3 years.

They hit the threshold where they couldn't demand any more for the electricity they were generating. They had raised the cost of the electricity that much. So they went out on the market to bond that, and they pledged the full faith and credit of their grandchildren—the Spanish Government: We'll pay the bills later, but we can't pay our electric bills today because the price is too high. This is an example.

President Obama has said we should learn from the Spanish. I agree. We should learn from the Spanish, but the lesson that I get from them is that it's a huge boondoggle that's full of corruption.

I asked them: Why don't you repeal it? Their answer was: We can't because so many people who are so influential and powerful are making a profit from it and are tied up in it. We would have to demand that our politicians would confess that they'd made a huge mistake 8 or 9 or 10 years ago.

Well, a lot of them are still there, and they can't make that confession because they'll lose their jobs.

So, once you get started into this, if we pass the cap-and-tax by Waxman-Markey—I'll tell you, at this point, the decisions made by this administration in this term, I believe, are reversible and are revokable by a Congress and a President who have cooler heads and a saner approach to economics. Yet, if we pass the Waxman-Markey cap-and-tax, that becomes an almost irreversible policy because then you'll have so many people who will be profiting and who will be benefiting from the trading of these things that don't have any value in a real economy. There are so many political dollars that get infused into this process that you simply can't repeal it. That's my concern. That's my fear. I believe that Waxman-Markey is an irreversible policy.

So I'm here, speaking against it for two big reasons: One is they're wrong on the science. I'm happy to debate them. The other reason is they're really, really wrong on the economics.

When you have the Secretary of Agriculture who testifies before the Ag Committee that somehow he believes that increasing the costs to agriculture will result in more profits for agriculture because the innovative nature of American agriculture will overcome the handicaps that government is putting on them, that is an irrational degree of optimism to be stated by a Secretary of Agriculture who finds himself at odds with Democrats and Republicans on the Ag Committee in that hearing and in disagreement with it.

There is no economic model that I know of throughout the history of the free market system that would dictate or that would show a result where, if you increased the cost to a business—

to any business or to a sector of the business world—that you would see profits go up. They would go down.

□ 2230

And this Waxman-Markey legislation increases the cost to, especially, our energy users. Those who are the most energy intensive, the highest energy-using industries in America will get the highest increases in their costs.

So let's just say that you're in the business of converting iron ore to iron and steel. Let's just say that you are in the business of converting natural gas to plastics or any other high energy-intensive operation, or let's just say you're a farmer and you use a lot of diesel fuel and you're looking at 88 cents a gallon added on to it by Waxman-Markey. All of these industries will see their costs go up. If you're generating electricity from burning coal, natural gas, fuel oil, for example, you'll see the cost of that electricity go up.

An MIT professor did a study and calculated the overall dollars increased by Waxman-Markey, or a policy very close to that, and we simply divided the number of households into it, and the bottom line came out to be this: Increased annual average household costs for energy, \$3,128 a year from Waxman-Markey's cap-and-tax bill. And as I said briefly earlier, for every \$5 collected by this cap-and-tax bill, only \$1 gets into the Treasury of the Federal Government. And the balance of that is consumed in the inefficiencies that are created.

This is the most insidious, complicated tax. It's a tax on everything we do because energy is required in everything that we do. It will tax every gallon of gas, every gallon of diesel fuel, every kilowatt of electricity. It will tax every cup of coffee, every pair of shoes, every piece of paper, every flower on Mother's Day, and every 2 by 4 that goes into your house.

And it transfers, Madam Speaker, America's industry, America's energy-intensive industry off to other countries in the world like India and China who have pledged not to participate in a cap-and-tax plan because they say that this is their century to become industrialized nations. The last century or two were our centuries to be industrialized. They say this is theirs.

They're building, between India and China, one new coal-fired generating plant a week belching smoke into the atmosphere. And these coal-fired generating plants do not meet the emission standards of American coal-fired generated plants. So for each time that we push industry out of the United States, we're pushing up coal-fired generating plants in India and in China. And if you're concerned about the atmosphere, this is creating a negative effect on our atmosphere as well.

But I'm concerned about the penalty to America's industry, to America's businesses adding costs to everyone burdening each one of these households

and thinking somehow we can overcome that burden on our economy and prosper. It is wrong thinking; it is wrong-headed. They're wrong on the science, Madam Speaker, and they're really, really wrong on the economics.

And so as this debate unfolds here on the floor of the House and throughout the committees and subcommittees and through the media and through the living rooms of Americans, the American people need to understand and remember that if they can't make the case on the science, there is no sense of talking about the economics, because it falls on its face not having the science to underpin the argument.

Even if they could make the case on the science—and they haven't and can't. And 31,000 scientists have signed a petition saying they can't support the conclusions of these climate change models, and we're getting more and more that will step forward and say, I can't take you there, I can't be with you. And these are topnotch experts: meteorologists, physicists, people that really understand these issues in a scientific way. More of them are peeling off and walking away from this and saying Al Gore is wrong.

But even if they were right, even if one stipulated that—and I don't for a minute—but if one stipulated that the global warming models were right, the economic calamity that comes from adding to the cost of all of America's business is intolerable. And the burden that it shifts onto future generations and what it does to our economy, our culture, and our civilization are intolerable, Madam Speaker. And so let them make the case.

Once as Muhammad Ali said after he fought Joe Frazier to a tie in 15 rounds was this: Well, you tied. How come you're still the world champ? Ali said, You got to whoop the champ.

Well, the champ is free enterprise. The champ is sound science. The champ is empirical data. The champ is the history of the United States succeeding by believing we can achieve and by making logical conclusions with the science we have and the economics we have. And by the way, it's free enterprise and it's not nationalization.

And let's add an extra czar or two to this list of 22. Let's do the denationalization czar and the exit-strategy czar. Put those two people together, and maybe they can get to work to eliminate all of the rest of these czars and get us back to sense, Madam Speaker.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel delays.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. KILROY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of flight was cancelled.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and June 16 on account of illness in the family.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending events with Alabama's Governor and other elected leaders to recruit significant economic development projects for the First District and Alabama.

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 Mr. ALTMIRE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALTMIRE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, June 18.

Mr. AKIN, for 5 minutes, today and June 18.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1256. An act to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make certain modifications in the Thrift Savings Plan, the Civil Service Retirement System, and the Federal Employees' Retirement System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2142. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Residues of Silver in Foods from Food Contact Surface Sanitizing Solutions; Exemption from the Requirement of a

Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0395; FRL-8412-1] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2143. 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 [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0004; FRL-8900-5] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2144. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; City Of Memphis, Tennessee; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infections Waste Incinerators [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0159(b); FRL-8912-9] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2145. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Davidson, Knox, and Memphis-Shelby Counties, Tennessee [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0161; FRL-8912-3] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2146. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; State of Tennessee and Commonwealth of Kentucky [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0160; FRL-8912-4] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2147. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Jefferson County, Kentucky; and Forsyth County, North Carolina; and Knox and Davidson Counties, Tennessee [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0158; FRL-8912-5] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2148. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Georgia: State Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0831-200825(a); FRL-8915-7] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2149. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Hawaii [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0323; FRL-8915-8] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2150. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for California [OAR-2004-0091; FRL-8912-7] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2151. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0142; FRL-8902-1] received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.