

Agency's authority to require energy efficiency at power plants and refineries. This bill simply says that science doesn't matter.

I stand here today to refute that claim and, further, to protect the integrity of science. It is this science, these facts and figures, that have led hundreds of scientists to confirm that global warming is real. In fact, over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies have found that global warming is real and that man contributes to it. To this date, zero peer-reviewed studies have found otherwise.

It is this science that led the Supreme Court to rule that the Environmental Protection Agency does in fact have the authority to regulate greenhouse gases, and it is this science that led the Congress to pass the Clean Air Act, the act which designated the EPA as the body charged with overseeing, adapting, and implementing these regulations.

In the coming months, EPA will begin regulating greenhouse gases from certain emitters for the first time. These regulations have become hugely controversial and, sadly, political. These rules seek to combat man-made climate change; man-made climate change that is melting our polar ice caps, that is raising the level of our oceans, and that is modifying our seasonal temperatures; man-made climate change that is altering the duration of our growing season, that is flooding part of the world and is causing multiyear droughts and others; man-made climate change that is allowing particulate matters to infiltrate our children's lungs, making them suffer from lifelong asthma and making us die earlier.

And still, here we are, ignoring cries from health and medical professionals who have asked us, as Members of this body, to fulfill the promise of clean, healthy air for all Americans to breathe.

Support full implementation of the Clean Air Act and resist any efforts to weaken, delay, or block progress toward a healthier future for all Americans.

Ignoring requests from former senior military officials who wrote just last week, "America's dependence on oil constitutes a clear and present danger to the security and welfare of the United States," and that, "As former senior military officials, we are concerned about congressional efforts to undermine the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory authority that is critical to reducing our dependence on oil," Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford the costs of the Energy Tax Prevention Act: Lost and devastated ecosystems, lost jobs, and lost lives.

PASS A COMMONSENSE ENERGY PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 2 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, let me cut to the point. Gas prices have skyrocketed at the worst possible time, the economy is in a slump, and people are hurting. The administration and congressional Democrats are making the problem worse with their burdensome energy regulations that destroy jobs and drive up costs. Democrats and the White House are blocking commonsense reforms that would allow for more targeted energy exploration here at home, which would lead to lower gas prices and additional job creation and greater security.

Three weeks ago, I had the privilege of sitting in the office of Benjamin Netanyahu in Israel. He expressed great appreciation for America, but also ended by saying that he was greatly concerned that America was unwilling at this time to do what was necessary to make sure that we had an energy plan of independence from, as he called it, the earthquake zone of the Middle East. And I agree. So I am joining with my colleagues, my Republican colleagues, their common sense and pro-growth, in proposing an alternative.

I believe we should allow for more exploration in Alaska, so I cosponsored H.R. 49, the American Energy Independence and Price Reduction Act. I believe we should pass an all-of-the-above energy plan. So that is why I am becoming an original cosponsor of H.R. 909, A Road Map to America's Energy Future. And the government should stop the painfully slow permitting process for drilling in the gulf, so I joined with Representative SCALISE and others of my colleagues in the House to urge the President to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, the current energy policy is one of overregulation, and it is not working. We must work to change that now. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to create an energy policy that lowers energy prices and allows for more job creation. The people of my district and of this great country are demanding nothing less.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this morning thousands of people on Capitol Hill turned to NPR radio or the NPR Web site to find out the latest developments on the horrific situation in Japan, the potential nuclear meltdown, and with the fast-moving events in the Middle East. This is why the Pew survey revealed yesterday that, while media across the board is declining—broadcast television news, newspapers, radio—that we are watching a renaissance as far as public broadcasting, in particular NPR, which is increasing its audience, its revenues, and its reporting staff.

But the health and vitality of NPR is not a reason to slash the financial sup-

port for public broadcasting. First and foremost, it is a miniscule part of the budget, less than one half a cent per day for each American. But more important, this is the type of infrastructure America needs right now.

The public broadcasting support provides a unique service that is not available on commercial television. The education, culture, news, even the boring news, is an area where there is no commercial market. That is why you will search 500 stations in vain on cable and satellite to find that type of programming that is available for news and for educating our children, not selling them something.

□ 1020

More significant, the amount of money that comes from Public Broadcasting to NPR is a tiny fraction of its budget. Most of the Public Broadcasting support that is provided by Congress goes to local stations, with particular emphasis on rural and small-town America.

Taking as an example my home State of Oregon with its award-winning Oregon Public Broadcasting, it costs 11 times more to broadcast to the far eastern reaches in Burns, Oregon, than it does in metropolitan Portland. That is a pattern that is repeated coast to coast. Rural and small-town America relies more heavily on Public Broadcasting. It doesn't have the population base to ever provide for itself.

Slashing Public Broadcasting funding is not going to stop Public Broadcasting in New York or Washington, DC., in Seattle or Los Angeles, or even Portland, Oregon. What it will do is make the programming less rich, and it will reduce the ability to provide those services in the outlying areas.

Even the most recent flap about the media ambush of a former NPR fundraiser, which produced an 11-minute video that appeared to be very damning as far as Public Broadcasting is concerned, well, it took NPR to do an in-depth study. It reviewed the entire 2-hour conversation captured on tape to find out that the edited 11-minute version was misleading, trying to portray the point of view of the ambush journalist. This is the same guy who was caught by law enforcement officials trying to illegally "bug" the office of Senator MARY LANDRIEU in Louisiana.

In the course of 2 hours, it was very clear, reviewing the entire record, that it had been inappropriately edited to suggest that there was an acceptance or that it was amusing that there was somehow an attempt to impose sharia law across the country. It ignored the fact that the NPR employee made it clear that there was a firewall between any contributions and influencing the editorial content.

That is why NPR and PBS are the most trusted names in broadcasting, and why 78 percent of Americans in a recent poll said they wanted Public Broadcasting support maintained or

even increased. And, indeed, two-thirds of the Republicans wanted support maintained and increased. I hope my Republican colleagues will listen to the public and support this vital resource.

HONORING CORPORAL JONATHAN W. TAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of Corporal Jonathan W. Taylor.

Four years to the day of his graduation from boot camp, Corporal Taylor died on February 22, 2011. At the age of 23, he bravely gave his life while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan.

Growing up, Corporal Taylor always knew that he wanted to be a United States Marine. As a student at Lecanto High School, he was a member of the JROTC program. He was an active member of the Sea Cadet Program out of Yankeetown.

In October 2007, Corporal Taylor was deployed on his first combat tour in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Following that tour, he was deployed to support Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan three separate times. While his unit was not deployed during his second-to-last tour, Corporal Taylor bravely volunteered to go back to Afghanistan to continue the fight with his Marines.

Corporal Taylor was laid to rest today with honors in Arlington National Cemetery. Over his career, his awards included the Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the NATO Medal-ISAF Afghanistan, and the Purple Heart.

Now beside his fellow brothers in uniform, his parents, Mark and Debbie, have said they are proud to have seen their son off on his last and final deployment, his final tour of duty.

Corporal Taylor courageously made the ultimate sacrifice for his Marines and his fellow Americans. As a country, as a Nation, we owe our fallen heroes and their families a debt that can never be repaid. It is our duty to always remember that these sacrifices were made on behalf of all Americans, and that our brave young men and women in uniform are clear examples of what makes this Nation so great.

Today, I am humbled to have the opportunity to introduce this House to a true American hero. Corporal Jonathan W. Taylor, God bless you, and God bless your service to this Nation.

OPPOSE THE U.S.-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the proposed South Korea trade deal is the

largest NAFTA-style trade agreement proposed in 15 years. Some people in Washington, including President Obama, support this agreement. Congress should not. Most importantly, this "NAFTA"-Korea deal will result in more job loss across countless communities in our country.

The U.S. International Trade Commission studied this agreement and determined that it will be a net job loser for our country, just like the NAFTA deal was, just like the China deal was, just like all the failed nonreciprocal trade deals our Nation has negotiated over the last 25 years. Yes, a handful of companies will come out ahead, and they have a lot of power in Washington, but, as a whole, our country loses.

We have heard a lot about deficits lately. This deal with the Koreans will only put us deeper in the hole. Why would Congress do this again to the American people and to the American economy? Last year, the United States ran up another half-trillion-dollar trade deficit with the world, and this past quarter, one of the largest in history. Both American and Korean estimates predict that this deal will only add to our deficit.

These NAFTA-type trade deals translate into net job loss. Even the President doesn't claim that the deal will create new jobs. That is because it won't. In fact, it will cost jobs.

America needs trade reciprocity. We need balance, at a minimum, where our exports balance our imports and more hopefully exceed our imports. We need to make goods in America again, not outsource more jobs. It is obvious to everyone we have a job crisis in America. Across our economy, the real rate of unemployment and underemployment is over 17 percent.

This agreement, again, will negatively impact employment. In my district alone, the agreement threatens thousands of jobs. Why would America do this again to our people? More outsourcing, more job loss.

My district is at the center of the automotive sector, and our companies supply manufacturers from Alabama to Detroit to New Jersey to California. This deal is bad for the entire U.S. automotive sector, yes, the entire automotive sector.

In December, the administration negotiated with the Korean government a supplemental agreement on the automotive sector, and this side deal was supposed to ensure fairness for our auto companies. But it simply leaves too many unresolved concerns still on the table. And it doesn't provide reciprocity. There is no threshold measure that if we take half a million Korean cars, which we already do, and they only take 6,000 of ours, which is what is going on right now, that they have any requirement at all to actually increase imports. We ought to fix what is wrong with the existing system, rather than trade away more of our economic substance.

There is also a strange logic that we somehow level the playing field by allowing the South Korean government to subject our cars to additional regulations within 4 year. And importantly, there is no threshold measure that we actually are balancing the huge trade deficit we already have with that nation.

□ 1030

There's another loophole. The cars don't really have to be made in South Korea. Nearly two-thirds of the actual content can come from, guess where? Communist China and other countries that are relentlessly engaged in predatory and illegal trading practices is not a prescription for liberty.

The automotive sector isn't the only industry that is at risk. Multiple sectors will be impacted, including textiles, electronics, and metal products. And that's just in manufacturing. Beef producers better pay attention because they're going to lose under this deal as well.

I look forward to the day when this President, or any President, submits a trade agreement that will actually create new employment opportunities across our country. We surely need the jobs. Yes, trade can help fuel economic growth, but we need agreements that yield reciprocity and put America on a level trade playing field. NAFTA-styled Korean free trade agreements simply don't meet that test. This deal is over 400 pages long—and that's without the annexes to the agreement. The American people should read it. And so should Congress.

America needs jobs here at home, not more job outsourcing. And surely not more trade deficits. We need reciprocity, and it would be the first time in a quarter century. That should be our target, not more job loss in America.

HONORING MAYOR JOSEPH ESQUIVEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Joseph Esquivel for his 39 years of public service to the people of Lakewood, California. Joe began his service to Lakewood as a member of the Lakewood Recreation and Community Services Commission in 1972; and in 1990, he began the first of his five terms on the Lakewood City Council. After 21 productive years of service on the council, Joe is retiring from public service to spend more quality time with his family.

Joe and his wife, Pat, have called Lakewood home since 1963, raising three wonderful children and in the process becoming proud grandparents and great grandparents. As an active leader in his community, Joe had a hand in the founding of many local organizations such as the Lakewood