

□ 1720

All I do is take \$100 million, move it from the coal subsidies, the oil and the gas subsidies, and move it over, move it over to solar and wind, to plug-in hybrids, to all electric vehicles. And with that, by the way, ladies and gentlemen, they still haven't been cut this year in this budget. That's just taking away the increase that they get in this budget. And we still haven't made up for all of the cuts in the solar and wind and clean energy budget that they continue to slash.

So, ladies and gentlemen, it's \$100 million. Does oil and coal and gas deserve an increase this year? Let's at least keep them level and give that extra \$100 million over to the clean energy technologies of the future. That is the least that the green generation, the young people in our country, expect us to do because it's not only imported oil, it's also our national security, it's also global warming, it's also creating economic jobs here in the United States. I urge an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The gentleman's amendment would increase funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy accounts and reduce funding for Fossil Energy Research and Development and nuclear energy research. This would increase money for a program that already receives sufficient funds and hamper efforts to further technologies that produce most of our electricity.

Madam Chair, the gentleman asserted that fossil and nuclear energy are yesterday's sources of energy and that we're shortchanging tomorrow's energy sources. Well, in fact, nuclear energy produces 20 percent of our Nation's electricity, and even the State of Massachusetts depends on nuclear energy for about 10 percent of its energy. Fossil fuels, such as coal and natural gas, generate 70 percent of our Nation's electricity, and we will use these valuable energy sources for many generations. In fact, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts gets 80 percent of its electricity from fossil fuels.

I understand his desire to move us forward, but realistically, we'll be using fossil fuels for decades and nuclear energy perhaps for centuries. And we must ensure that we use those resources as efficiently and clearly as possible. Further, the amendment increases funding for that Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account, a program that has seen a record increase since 2007 and still has nearly \$9 billion of unspent stimulus funds from 2009. Imagine that.

There's a proper role for core Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy programs, and our bill preserves funding

for those activities while cutting out activities that are redundant with the private sector or that interfere improperly in market innovation.

But his amendment would add back unnecessary funding for administration proposals that are poorly planned and lack justification. For example, the administration proposes more than \$200 million to deploy electric vehicle infrastructure. But after repeated requests, the department provided less than one page of explanation for this program. At best, this funding would be poorly used, and at worst, it will interfere with entrepreneurial innovations in infrastructure underway in the private sector.

The administration also proposes a new Race to the Green program, a State and city grant program. Again, after repeated requests for justification to the Department of Energy, this new \$100 million proposal is accompanied by barely more than a paragraph of explanation.

When every tax dollar must be spent well, we can't throw money at poorly planned programs while cutting fossil energy and nuclear programs. I, therefore, oppose the amendment and urge all Members to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1730

BETTER USE OF LIGHT BULBS ACT

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2417) to repeal certain amendments to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to lighting energy efficiency, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2417

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Better Use of Light Bulbs Act".

SEC. 2. LIGHTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 321 and 322 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140) are repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if sections 321 and 322 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (and the amendments made by those sections) had not been enacted.

SEC. 3. MERCURY-CONTAINING LIGHTING.

No Federal, State, or local requirement or standard regarding energy efficient lighting shall be effective to the extent that the requirement or standard can be satisfied only by installing or using lamps containing mercury.

SEC. 4. STATE REGULATION.

No State or local regulation, or revision thereof, concerning the energy efficiency or energy use of medium screw base general service incandescent lamps shall be effective.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms "general service incandescent lamp", "lamp", and "medium screw base" have the meanings given those terms pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), as applied and administered pursuant to section 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to start off by introducing to the body my special assistant this week, Mr. Speaker, young Jack Kevin Barton, my 5-year-old son. He is with me to help with the congressional baseball game that we are going to play on Thursday evening. And he loves coming to the floor, and he loves voting. So we

are glad to have Jack Kevin on the floor with us.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because of something that happened back in 2007, when this body passed a bill that later became a law that effectively, beginning next year, if not changed, would ban the traditional incandescent light bulb, the 100-watt bulbs, the 60-watt bulbs that we have all grown up with. The bill doesn't truly ban them. It just sets an efficiency standard that the current light bulbs cannot meet.

The problem with the de facto ban, Madam Speaker, is that it has the effect of taking off the market one of the least expensive options for lighting in our constituents' homes. I went to a local grocery store last week and purchased one CFL 60-watt bulb for \$5.99. I purchased four 60-watt incandescent light bulbs in a four-pack for \$1.50, or 37.5 cents a piece. Now, obviously, a \$6 light bulb is a much bigger expense to a moderate- or low-income family than a 37.5-cent light bulb.

The 60-watt CFL does claim it will last 10,000 hours, and it does claim over its life it will save money. That's probably a true statement, Madam Speaker. But what is not so apparent is that that \$6 cost up front is real, and the savings may or may not occur, depending upon how long that bulb lasts, how often it's used, and under what conditions it's used.

If you assume that the average bulb is used 4 hours a day, which is what the American Lighting Association assumes, then it is quite possible, Madam Speaker, that that \$6 CFL bulb won't last 10,000 hours if it's turned on and off 2,500 times. It might last half that long. So I am not opposed to the squiggly tailed CFLs. I think they have their place in the market. But to take off the market something that's cheap, effective, and in average use costs maybe two or three cents a week to use seems to me to be overkill by the Federal Government.

When I have talked about the light bulb bill in my town hall meetings and in my meetings in my district, I have had very few people, Madam Speaker, say that they think that's a good piece of legislation, that they think the Federal Government should be telling us what kind of light bulbs we should and should not use. They think we should let the marketplace operate. We should repeal this de facto ban, then let people decide whether they want to pay \$6 per light bulb or 37.5 cents. Some people may decide that the life expectancy cost savings are worth it. But I bet the majority, the overwhelming majority, would choose the less expensive up-front costs of the traditional incandescent light bulbs.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this bill. I was on the committee back in 2007 when we first wrote the efficiency standards

that Republicans are trying to repeal here today. The way I remember it, our current chairman, Mr. UPTON, introduced the bill to set the standards. Our former House Speaker, Dennis Hastert, supported it, along with many Republicans. And, finally, President George W. Bush signed these standards into law.

In fact, if you look at the history behind consensus efficiency standard, you will see that this used to be something that we all agreed upon. Beginning with President Reagan in 1987, Congress and the White House have enacted Federal energy efficiency standards five times, each time with bipartisan support. These standards were developed as consensus agreements with manufacturers, energy efficiency advocates, and States.

There's more than 50 products on the market today that are covered by a variety of these Federal standards. Everything from dishwashers and refrigerators to traffic signals have become more efficient as a result of these Federal standards, saving the country energy and saving consumers money.

These standards have been in effect since 1987, have saved Americans about 3.6 quads of energy. If we continue with enacting Federal efficiency standards, we can save up to 6.1 quads of energy by 2030. That is more energy than was used in my State of Pennsylvania in 2008. The light bulb efficiency standards alone will save Pennsylvania 3.64 billion kilowatt hours of energy in a year. That means we'll save \$465 million in Pennsylvania in just 1 year from these standards.

In Congress we don't always agree on much; but for the last 25 years, we have been able to agree on energy efficiency. And it's been good for the country and for American families and for the environment. So why would we wish to reverse this policy today? But you know, energy and cost savings aren't the only benefits from these standards.

Having lived in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, my whole life, I have seen how efficiency can revolutionize an industry and revitalize a city. In the seventies, I worked two summers at J & L steel mill on Pittsburgh's south side. The industry was doing well, and Pittsburgh was a company town. But in a few years, that industry came to a screeching halt as international competitors were making steel using new technologies and more efficient processes, allowing them to undercut the price of U.S. steel. But the steel industry didn't leave the United States, and it didn't leave Pittsburgh. It re-invented itself. It got smarter and leaner and more energy efficient.

U.S. steelmakers started using blast oxygen furnaces rather than old open hearth furnaces that used more energy. They started doing continuous casting rather than ingots and molds that required reheating. They started using waste heat recovery and energy monitoring and management technologies. As a result, the U.S. steel industry has

reduced the amount of energy needed to produce a ton of steel by 33 percent since 1990.

The lighting industry has already begun to revolutionize, much like the industrial steel industry did back in the nineties. When the industry agreed to these efficiency standards in 2007, it was because they knew they could innovate and still be profitable by making the incandescent bulb, yes, colleagues, the incandescent bulb more efficient and developing new technologies like compact fluorescents and LED light bulbs. And even better, the lighting industry began making those bulbs right here in the United States of America. Even in Pennsylvania,sylvania, Pennsylvania, to make these incandescent light bulbs that meet the energy efficiency standards that we passed in 2007.

□ 1740

They are being made in the United States by United States steelworkers in Pennsylvania, and you can find them on your shelf at the grocery store or the hardware store. Or you can get these Philips bulbs, also incandescent light bulbs, colleagues. They meet the energy standards that were set in 2007.

Steelworkers are making the filaments in these bulbs in Bath, New York. In fact, United Steelworkers is opposing this bill and telling us at a time when Americans continue to experience downward financial pressures, energy-efficient light bulbs present an everyday solution to a much-needed cost savings.

But it's not just steelworkers that are benefiting. Light bulbs that meet these standards are being made all over the United States of America. In 2011, TCP, one of the world's largest makers of CFLs, is opening a new factory in Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOYLE. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

CFL is making a new factory in Ohio to meet the demand. Seven thousand U.S. jobs have been created by companies like Cree in North Carolina, Lighting Science Group in Florida, and Lighting Philips Company, the world's biggest lighting company, to produce the next generation of efficient LED light bulbs. GE recently invested \$60 million to create a Global Center of Excellence for linear fluorescent lamp manufacturing in Bucyrus, Ohio, an action that will double the number of jobs there.

New innovation and energy efficiency has brought jobs to this country. This is not the time to repeal these standards.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2011.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Today, Congress is expected to vote on the Better Use of Light Bulbs (BULB) Act (HR 2417). On behalf of the

850,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW) union, I urge you to vote “No” on this bill that would repeal the energy efficiency standards for light bulbs that were enacted under the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007.

The BULB Act would only serve to reverse the spirit of ingenuity that has taken place among light bulb manufacturers since the passage of EISA. Rather than viewing the new efficiency laws as a reason to halt production and close their doors, domestic manufacturers, such as Osram Sylvania, decided to retrofit their existing facilities in Wellsboro and St. Mary’s, Pennsylvania to produce energy efficient Sylvania Super Saver halogen bulbs. USW members manufacture the outer glass portion of the light bulbs at the Wellsboro facility and assemble the bulbs at the St. Mary’s facility.

Osram Sylvania’s decision to change their business model and use new technology to produce more energy efficient bulbs works towards our nation’s overall goal of reducing our green house gas emissions, but also provides a tangible example of family-sustaining clean energy manufacturing jobs in the U.S.

Additionally, these U.S.-made bulbs have been able to successfully compete against foreign-made compact fluorescent light (CFL) bulbs, which have dominated the market and rely heavily on the use of mercury, which the Sylvania Super Saver halogen bulbs do not contain.

Lastly, at a time when American’s continue to experience downward financial pressures, energy efficient light bulbs present an every-day solution to much needed cost-savings. A recent study conducted by the Appliance Standards Awareness Project for the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), found that repealing the energy efficiency standards would cause a seven percent or \$85 increase in energy costs for the average household.

Again, we urge you to vote “No” on the Bulb Act, and instead to support the spirit of ingenuity, job creation and preservation and energy-savings that have resulted from the improved energy efficiency standards enacted in 2007.

Sincerely,

HOLLY R. HART,
Assistant to the President,
Legislative Director.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Before I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, I would point out that the light bulbs that my good friend, Mr. DOYLE, just alluded to, are five times to six times as expensive as the traditional incandescent light bulb, and they are not manufactured—I think there is one facility in the United States, a Sylvania facility, that still makes light bulbs. The rest have moved overseas.

I yield 3 minutes to a cosponsor of the legislation, a member of the committee, Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, the chairman spoke to the cost of these bulbs and how incredibly expensive they are; and, indeed, our constituents have talked about that.

And to my colleagues who are going to try to support this standard and this de facto ban on the incandescent light bulb, I would simply say two wrongs do not make a right. I know you heard that as you grew up, and I would ask you to think about that in this Chamber today.

Putting this ban, putting these higher efficiency standards in place, many people thought it was the right decision. I didn’t think it was the right decision. I voted against it in committee. I voted against all of this on the floor.

But I would ask you just to remember the American people are telling us this doesn’t work. They don’t like the restrictions that are there in the marketplace. They don’t like the fact that the bulbs cost too much money.

And I would also remind my colleagues that all of the CFLs, the compact fluorescent light bulbs, they are made in China. They are not made here. The CFLs don’t work as well. It requires more bulbs to get the same amount of light in a given area. These things have proven to be very vulnerable to power surges. We hear that from our constituents in the rural areas.

In essence, Madam Speaker, they don’t save any energy, and we know that they are also dangerous because they are filled with mercury. I know that Congressman BURGESS, who has also worked on this with Chairman BARTON and me, is going to speak to that. There is a provision in this that does address the mercury levels.

Also, our legislation says, and I think this is very important, that D.C. cannot mandate the standards on these bulbs, that your State government cannot mandate the standards on these bulbs, that we are going to leave that to the consumer to choose. And consumers want to have that choice.

I think so many groups have come out in favor of our legislation and opposed to these light bulbs, even the AFL-CIO has an interesting little bit on their labor union Web site about that light bulb, making the point that there are many ways to save electricity without shifting all these jobs to China for a mercury-filled light bulb.

We know that the President thought this was going to help create 800,000 U.S. jobs. The only jobs we have found is that the Winchester, Virginia, plant shut down and those 200 jobs, employees that lost their jobs on September 24, 2010, they saw their jobs go to China.

There have been unanticipated consequences of the 2007 act, and it is time for us to say it was bad policy, it was a bad idea, and we need to get it off the books.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to manage the time on this bill on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee Democrats.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

First, let’s start with how much electricity this saves for our country. It

saves the need to construct 30 coal-fired plants over the next 20 years in the United States.

Now, if you are a coal executive, you are a nuclear executive, you are going, Oh, no, kill those more efficient light bulbs. People in America are going to consume less electricity. It will cut into our profits. People will buy these light bulbs.

And, by the way, here’s a Sylvania, which, by the way, looks just like those old bulbs too, because it is an old bulb. They just made it more efficient. And so people who are nostalgic for the way bulbs looked for the last hundred years, it is the same look, and it cost a buck 69 for this bulb. But it will save you, over the next 5 years, over the next 10 years, a lot of money. But it won’t cost the coal industry and the nuclear industry, who generate electricity, a lot of money because they won’t have to build 30 new coal-fired plants.

So let’s just think about other things.

And, by the way, every living descendant of Thomas Alva Edison opposes this amendment; by the way, as would every living descendant of Alexander Graham Bell oppose moving from black rotary phones to BlackBerries. I think that Alexander Graham Bell and his descendants would say, I think he would be happy that you made the transition. But, of course, we had to pass legislation here on the House floor to move that technology.

I think that people probably would think twice if a Xerox machine had to come with carbon paper at the same time, just in case people were still nostalgic for carbon paper rather than Xerox paper, because that’s really what this debate is all about. It’s really a debate about whether or not we are going to continue to see an increase in the efficiency of technologies in our society, especially those that consume energy.

In other words, there is a point to this, and the point is it reduces the amount of greenhouse gases that we have to send up into the atmosphere. It reduces the amount of energy that we have to think about importing from other countries. And it gives to the consumers something that, over the life of the light bulb—and we are talking here about Philips and Sylvania and other companies who have already figured out in the last 4 years how to comply with the law—you don’t have to buy one of those funny-looking new light bulbs. You can just buy one of those old light bulbs that look just like the one that your mother and father used to go down to the store and buy. Why? Because finally they had to make them more efficient.

And, by the way, what is the analogy? Well, back in 1987, I was able to author the Appliance Efficiency Act of 1987. And what has happened since then? Well, believe it or not, refrigerators are now three or four times more efficient. Air conditioning systems are now three to four times more

efficient. And because of that, there are hundreds of coal-fired plants that did not have to get built in this country.

Because all of these lights in this room, all of the air conditioning in this room, well, for every building across the country, piled up, that's why we need coal-fired and nuclear-fired plants.

□ 1750

The fewer of them that there are is directly related to how efficient we make the things that we plug into the wall. So light bulbs are at the very top of the list because they're on in every single room in the United States every day. So if you can double the efficiency, then you reduce dramatically the number of nuclear power plants and of coal-fired plants that have to get built.

That's really what we should be all about. We have to learn how to think smarter and not harder. We have to think how we use technology to improve our society and not bring out legislation on the floor that prohibits the advance of technology, prohibits the advance of science, prohibits the advance of efficiency in our society. And just like the Blackberry has transformed our society in the last 15 years and no one would want to go back to that old era of 1996 before the broadband revolution began, the same thing is true for these more, modern, efficient light bulbs. They save people money. They give them just the same kind of light. They reduce the amount of pollution that we send up into the atmosphere, and they make America the leader technologically on these technologies that are ultimately going to be sold in every country in the world.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Briefly, to reply to my good friend from Massachusetts, the light bulbs that he just showed, the least expensive one of those I think he said was about \$1.60, \$1.70. Your traditional incandescent light bulb you can buy, if you can find them, for anywhere from 25 cents to 40 cents apiece. So that light bulb is still five to six times more expensive than the classic incandescent bulb.

With that I yield 3 minutes to another original sponsor of the legislation, a member of the committee of jurisdiction, the good doctor from Denton County, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Four years ago, the summer of 2007, the then-new Democratic majority brought legislation to our committee that included a provision that I frankly did not understand what in the world they were trying to do, a provision that would regulate the type of light bulb that every American would have to use in their home.

During the markup of this bill, I was outspoken in my opposition to the lan-

guage. I introduced amendment after amendment to try to modify or prevent this from happening, and over and over again I was struck down along party lines. I tried to amend the bill so that we would not have to require the use of a mercury-containing light bulb in areas where there were vulnerable populations—nurseries in hospitals, nursing homes—where it would be difficult to move the people out of the way in order to comply with the EPA's guidelines for how you would deal with accidental breakage of one of these bulbs.

The bottom line is that I and every other American should be permitted, should be allowed to determine what type of light bulb we use at home. It seems so simple. Whatever happened to government with the consent of the governed?

But now the government wants to tell consumers what type of light bulb they use to read, cook, watch television, or light their garage. In fact, consumers should make that decision, and they should make that based upon what is available in the marketplace. However, we have distorted what's available in the marketplace.

Proponents claim that this bill does not ban incandescent bulbs. Well, that's correct. What it does ban is the 100-watt light bulb. Let me repeat. The 2007 Energy Security Act bans the 100-watt light bulb. That's just flat wrong. Consumers should be making the decision as to whether or not they use a 100-watt bulb in their home, not bureaucrats in Washington.

The new bulbs cost more. American families are already tightening their budgets. They need to be able to make the decision: Do I save on the electric bill, or do I save on the purchase of a light bulb? We should not be picking winners and losers in the United States Congress.

Now, I'm a strong supporter of energy efficiency. I do an energy efficiency summit every summer in my district. I did one last weekend. I invite speakers to talking about what businesses and constituents can do to conserve energy. I drive a hybrid. I have taken steps to make my home more efficient. But I've done all of this because it was the right thing to do, and I purchased those things on the open market because they made sense to me and my family, not because the Federal Government or even the gentleman from Massachusetts told me that this was what I should be doing. The American people should be able to choose what type of light bulb they use in their home. They should not be constrained to all of the romance of a Soviet stairwell when they go home in the evening.

Look, I work in a Federal building. I understand that in a Federal building I'm going to work under fluorescent light. I get that. But when I go home at night, I should be able to read my paper by the light of an incandescent bulb if that is my choice. I purchase other things, and I'm able to make an

adult choice about that. I should be able to make the choice about what wavelength of light to use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BURGESS. Here's the bottom line: Those of us of a certain age under a compact fluorescent bulb, we don't look as good as we do under an incandescent bulb. Even the former chairman of my Committee of Energy and Commerce suffers from what might be called "spectrum fatigue" under a compact fluorescent bulb. We need to be able to have the type of bulb that Americans choose, not that Congress chooses.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

Many have claimed that Washington will ban the sale of conventional incandescent light bulbs. My colleague from Texas just said he regrets that he would lose this soft glow of the incandescent light. In fact, he can use an incandescent light. It looks like this. It looks familiar. It's what in comic strips you put above somebody's head to say, "I've got a good idea." Not that I'm going to keep doing things the old way and stick in a rut, no. I've got a good, new idea.

That's what happened a few years ago when it became apparent that technology had come so far that we didn't have to throw away 90 percent of the energy of an incandescent light bulb. Scientists had shown us how you can make light bulbs that would produce, as these do, 100 watts worth of light for 72 watts of electricity charge, and you could do it for \$1.49 for each of them here.

Well, in a bipartisan effort, this legislation that has driven the country forward in lighting was passed, and now the majority on a partisan tear is coming and trying to repeal it just when it shows that it is working. About 15 percent of residential electricity goes into lighting. Wouldn't you, wouldn't anyone, like to save 30 percent of that, which is just being thrown away?

Now, my colleagues say Congress shouldn't be doing this. Why are they not also issuing calls for turn-of-the-century Model Ts or iceboxes? They have sort of a yearning for the good old days, technologies that are roughly as old as the incandescent light bulb.

We're proud in New Jersey of Thomas Edison. But we've improved the talking machines. We've done a little bit better with the moving pictures. Now, Model Ts and iceboxes are technologies that actually happen to have been improved through Federal standards. The companies are moving rapidly to make more efficient lighting that will give you all the advantages you want that you're used to of the incandescent bulb and save you bundles. Yes, this costs a few

dimes more, but let me tell you, you start saving dimes the moment you screw these into the socket.

This is a bad idea to repeal it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Houston, Texas, Judge TED POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, energy efficiency is a good idea. Mandated by the Federal Government under this legislation that we're currently serving under, it is preventing competition. The Federal Government is creating a monopoly.

□ 1800

The Model T Ford is not outlawed. You can still buy one if you can find one. But the Federal Government hadn't banned it just because it's inefficient. Iceboxes—some of us actually know what an icebox looks like—are not banned by the Federal Government. You can still find one and use one if you want to because it's competition, even though they are inefficient. But the issue is should the Federal Government come in and mandate a monopoly? And that is what has occurred.

Second, these new light bulbs, these CFL light bulbs, are dangerous to our health. Dr. BURGESS has already pointed out they contain mercury. I thought for years we were trying to get rid of the mercury in our environment, but it is in these light bulbs. Plus, now French scientists have discovered that these new CFL light bulbs may cause blindness in children. German scientists have found out it's reported that these light bulbs may cause cancer. Now, isn't that lovely? The Federal Government is mandating something that is hazardous to our health because you have no choice.

And the whole issue is about choice, Madam Speaker, that we can let the consumer decide. What's wrong with letting the consumer decide? Why are you opposed to the consumer making this choice? You want the Federal Government to mandate it. Now the Federal Government is in the business of forcing us to do something that is harmful.

And, finally, the EPA even warns in their 1,000-word, three-page, single-spaced document about these CFL light bulbs how dangerous they are, and they tell us how to dispose of one of these light bulbs.

I will insert into the RECORD this three-page, single-spaced report by the EPA on how to dispose of one of these light bulbs.

So we are, after the passage of this legislation years ago, finding out that these aren't the greatest things in the world, and we have found and shed a little light on this new CFL light bulb. The CFL light bulb is not a brighter idea. It is too expensive, it is unhealthy for Americans, and it doesn't allow for competition. So if we don't pass this bill, we might as well

turn out the lights; the party is over for the traditional incandescent light bulb.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I continue to hear my colleagues promote the fantasy that government has banned the incandescent light bulb. They think if they say it over and over again that it will be true. But it's not true. The incandescent light bulb is not banned. Manufacturers are not told which technology to use to produce light bulbs, and consumers will still be able to buy the incandescent light bulb for years to come.

Incandescent bulbs that meet the new standards are already on the market. Three American-made brands are here before me. They have the same look and emit the same light as traditional incandescent bulbs. But there is a difference: They last much longer and offer substantial energy efficiency savings for consumers.

Hopefully, a symbolic light bulb will soon go on above the heads of my colleagues to enlighten them to let them know that their rhetoric bears no fact to reality, and the incandescent bulb is here to stay whether they like it or not.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to one of our vigorous new Members from the great State of Illinois, Congressman HULTGREN.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the BULB Act because, simply put, the government has no business telling my constituents what kind of light bulbs they can use in their homes. Here's a novel idea: Let's let the free market work. This valuable bill would restore consumer choice and remove the danger posed by mandated mercury-filled compact fluorescent bulbs in our homes. As a constituent of mine said recently: Like we need a light bulb that requires a hazmat suit to clean up if you break it.

I urge my colleagues from both parties to support this bill and restore consumer choice to their constituents.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD). The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask: How do they come up with this great idea to put this bill on the House floor today under the suspension of the rules? This calendar is usually put in place for noncontroversial bills. But this is a controversial bill. In fact, it's a bill that never had a single hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction. Not only would it eliminate national standards, it would bar any State standards, taking away longstanding State authority to

improve efficiency in the absence of Federal action. And we should have cleaned up the drafting of this bill that eliminates all efficiency standards for fluorescent lighting.

I oppose this bill, first of all, on procedural grounds. We shouldn't adopt legislation with significant impacts without a single hearing or markup to understand what it does. But I strongly oppose this BULB Act on substance. It would undermine job growth, strand investments that have been made to make sure that we meet these new standards, waste \$12 billion a year on unnecessary electricity bills, and increase pollution.

I don't think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would come to the floor and say: Why are we requiring new cars to meet tighter emissions standards or tighter pollution standards? Let the public be able to choose the old ones that polluted more.

I would be amazed if the colleagues on the other side of the aisle came here and said: Why should we have more efficient dryers, washers, and refrigerators? We like the old ones that were less efficient.

This bill is absolutely unnecessary. In 2007, the lighting industry and the efficiency advocates reached a consensus on national standards to make light bulbs more efficient and avoid a patchwork of conflicting State standards, and, effective January 1 of next year, these national standards will go into effect.

So what we have is an attempt to repeal a proposal that was offered by our current chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and former Congresswoman Jane Harman. It passed on a bipartisan voice vote with Members of both sides of the aisle speaking in favor. This bill, which they want to repeal, was signed into law by President George W. Bush as part of the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act.

Since it was signed into law, manufacturers have made millions of dollars in investments to produce more efficient incandescent bulbs. Not one manufacturer but a number of manufacturers can compete, and are competing, once they can figure out how to meet these standards, and they're doing it very well.

The new incandescent bulb looks and works just like the old incandescent bulb. In fact, we know this to be the case. The only difference between this bulb and the old one is that it will last longer, cost less over the life of the bulb. American families will save an average of \$100 a year with the new standards. This is particularly welcome in today's tough economy and adds up to a nationwide savings of \$12 billion a year.

These investments are creating new jobs in the United States. While most manufacturers moved their production of the old incandescent bulbs overseas years ago, research and development

and high-technology manufacturing is now happening here. For example, there are LED facilities now in North Carolina, California, and Florida. This is a growth industry. Phillips hired 100 more people at its LED facility last year.

If we repeal this law and enact the so-called BULB Act, we will repeal standards that are driving this competition, and we'll switch back to a time when U.S. jobs would return to China and Mexico.

On January 1, 2012, we will be able to buy a better incandescent light bulb that looks and feels the same as the old ones. You don't have to buy compact fluorescents now. You don't have to buy them on January 1, 2012. You can buy the better incandescent bulbs or LEDs, neither of which contain mercury. That's more choice, not less.

Well, if this bill had moved under regular order, they might have heard at a hearing that the following groups are now opposing this legislation to repeal the law: The National Electrical Manufacturers Association, the Consumers Union, the Consumer Federation of America, the American Lighting Association, the National Association of State Energy Officials, the National Association of Energy Service Companies, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Seattle City Light, Johnson Controls, Philips Electronics, United Technologies Corporation, United Steelworkers, Alliance to Save Energy, National Wildlife Federation, and the Environmental Defense Fund.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and not repeal a law that's working as we intended it to.

NEMA,

Rosslyn, VA, July 11, 2011.

The National Electrical Manufacturers Association, representing over 95% of the U.S. lighting manufacturing industry, opposes HR 2417. A repeal of the standards established in EISA 2007 would strand millions of dollars in investments, provide a marketplace advantage to companies who have not made similar investments, create regulatory uncertainty, and increase energy consumption in the United States. Lighting manufacturers have invested heavily to comply with the federal incandescent lighting energy conservation standards as well as the standards for fluorescent and metal halide lighting described below.

Section 321 of EISA 2007 established for the first-time federal efficiency standards on the manufacturing of common light bulbs. It requires bulbs to be about 30% more efficient than today's bulbs.

The standards do not ban incandescent light bulbs.

The standards apply to production starting January 1, 2012 for the 100 watt bulb; January 1, 2013 for the 75 watt bulb; and January 1, 2014 for the 60 and 40 watt bulbs. EISA permitted California to adopt the federal standards one year earlier.

Consumers will have expanded lighting options that include:

advanced incandescent, compact fluorescent lights (CFLs), and new lighting technologies like light-emitting diodes (LEDs).

The standards are implemented over several years. This will permit an orderly process for the transition both in terms of prod-

uct manufacturing but also in terms of the consumer education and awareness of the transition and what products they need for their lighting needs. Just like today, no one bulb fits every lighting application or meets every consumer need.

Lighting accounts for about 12% of energy use in homes. While individual home usage varies, it is estimated that the average household savings associated with this transition is over \$100 per year, every year going forward. Overall national energy savings is estimated at \$10-15 billion per year, every year going forward, depending on assumptions of usage and what type of technology is selected to replace traditional incandescent.

Section 3 of HR 2417 would repeal all current energy conservation standards for a variety of energy efficient lighting:

1. General Service Fluorescent Lamps (tubes). Section 3 would repeal the standards that DOE promulgated in 2009 that are effective a year from now. It would also repeal the current standards that went into effect in 1996 that Congress enacted in the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

2. Compact Fluorescent Lamp (medium screw base). Section 3 would repeal the standards that Congress adopted in the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

3. Metal halide lighting. It would repeal the standards that Congress adopted in Energy Policy Act of 2005.

When combined with the EISA repeal language in Section 2 for incandescent lighting (EISA section 321) and certain incandescent reflector bulbs (EISA section 322), HR 2417 would erase all energy conservation standards for lighting products, except the standards for fluorescent lamp ballasts and other types of incandescent reflector lamps.

NEMA encourages you to vote "no" on HR 2417 or any other provision that would repeal the incandescent light bulb standards.

JULY 10, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House is expected to vote early next week on the BULB Act (H.R. 2417), which would repeal energy efficiency standards for light bulbs that were enacted in 2007. We urge you to oppose this legislation. There is no ban on incandescent bulbs—they are just getting better.

As a result of the 2007 law, manufacturers are already making a variety of new energy saving bulbs for homes, including more efficient incandescent bulbs. These bulbs look, light, and turn on like the bulbs we have been using for decades, but are 28-33 percent more efficient.

Energy efficient lighting saves consumers money, creates jobs, and benefits the environment. At a time when families are struggling with high energy costs, efficient lighting will save the average American family around \$100 every year (about \$12 billion nationwide) and save enough energy annually to power all the homes in Pennsylvania and Tennessee.

Phasing-in energy efficient light bulbs means more choices and savings . . . that's good for families, the country, and the environment. We urge you to oppose repeal of the light bulb efficiency standards.

Sincerely,

AEC Science & Technology; Alliance to Save Energy; American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy; American Lighting Association; Appliance Standards Awareness Project; Association for Facilities Engineering; Association of State Energy Research Institutions; Beneficial Results LLC; BlueGreen Alliance; Business Council for Sustainable Energy; Businesses for an Energy Efficient Texas Coalition; Ceres; Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future (PennFuture); Clean Energy Associ-

ates; Conservation Law Foundation; Conservation Services Group; Consumer Federation of America; Consumers Union; CREE; Earthjustice; Ecobuild America; Efficiency First; Energy Future Coalition; Environment America; Environment California; Environment Colorado.

Environment Illinois; Environment Maryland; Environment Minnesota; Environment New Mexico; Environment New York; Environment Ohio; Environment Texas; Environmental and Energy Study Institute; Environmental Defense Fund; Fresh Energy; Illuminating Engineering Society of North America; Institute for Energy and Environmental Research; Interfaith Power & Light; Izaak Walton League of America; Johnson Controls Inc.; kWhOURS, Inc.; LED Waves; Lighting Science Group Corporation; McKinstry; National Association of Energy Service Companies; National Association of State Energy Officials; National Association for State Community Services Programs; National Electrical Manufacturers Association; National Grid; Natural Resources Defense Council; Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships.

Northwest Energy Coalition; Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance; Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel; Pacific Gas & Electric Company; PennEnvironment; Philips Electronics North America Corporation; Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association; Public Citizen; Republicans for Environmental Protection; Sacramento Municipal Utility District; Seattle City Light; Southern Alliance for Clean Energy; Southwest Energy Efficiency Project; Texas Impact; The California Energy Efficiency Industry Council; The Center for the Celebration of Creation; The Stella Group, Ltd.; United States Green Building Council; United Technologies Corporation; Urban Green Council; Utah Clean Energy; William C. Velasquez Institute; Windustry; Wisconsin Environment.

JULY 6, 2011.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write to urge you to vote against H.R. 91, (the "BULB Act"), or any other legislation that would repeal efficiency standards for lighting which were adopted by the Congress in 2007. Repealing these standards would increase consumer energy costs, waste energy, and diminish consumers' lighting choices.

The new lighting standards do NOT ban incandescent bulbs. Rather, these standards are technology-neutral, and manufacturers have already developed more efficient incandescent bulbs that are available and on the market today. Efficient options that meet the new standard include a wide variety of technologies and high quality bulbs, many of which are dimmable, can withstand cold, are long-lasting, and come in a range of intensity and colors. Efficiency standards have enhanced the numerous lighting options for consumers to choose from, as inefficient models have been scheduled to phase out of the market and new options to replace them have been developed.

Lighting accounts for 10-15% of household electricity use, and is one of the cheapest efficiency upgrades available to consumers. Repealing lighting standards would undermine consumer savings, drive up costs for efficient lighting, and increase demand on the

power grid, which increases the cost of electricity.

Consumers Union, Consumer Federation of America, National Consumer Law Center, Public Citizen, and National Consumers League strongly believe that Congress should continue to move efficiency standards forward, not backward. We thank you for your attention to this important consumer matter and urge you to vote against any legislation that would repeal lighting efficiency standards.

Sincerely,

SHANNON BAKER-BRANSTETTER,
Consumers Union.

SALLY GREENBERG,
National Consumers League

MEL HALL-CRAWFORD,
Consumer Federation of America.

TYSON SLOCUM,
Public Citizen.

CHARLIE HARAK,
National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of its low-income clients.

JULY 8, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House is scheduled to vote this Monday on the BULB Act (H.R. 2417), which would repeal energy efficiency standards for light bulbs. On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we urge you to oppose this bill. The standards were enacted in 2007 with strong bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush.

Many proponents of legislation to repeal the standards claim that they ban the incandescent light bulb, which is simply not true. The standards just require the bulbs to be more efficient. Manufacturers are already making a variety of bulbs that meet the new standards, including incandescent bulbs that are 28-33 percent more efficient than the traditional incandescent bulb that has changed little over the past 125 years. These new incandescent bulbs look, light, and turn on like the old bulbs. Consumers also have the option to buy compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) and light emitting diodes (LEDs), which provide even greater cost and energy savings.

Repealing the standards would jeopardize their benefits, which include:

Annual energy bill savings of about \$100 for the average American family and approximately \$12 billion nationwide.

Decreased energy demand, which would avoid the need for 30 large power plants, decreasing levels of harmful air pollution.

American jobs making better, more efficient light bulbs that meet the new standards. More than 2,000 jobs have already been created at lighting facilities in the U.S., and the standards are key factor in this development.

The light bulb energy efficiency standards will help bring light bulb technology from the days of the horse and buggy to the 21st Century, which will save consumers money, create jobs, and reduce pollution. We urge you to oppose legislation that would repeal these standards.

Sincerely,

Carol Andress, Legislative Director, Climate and Air Program, Environmental Defense Fund.

Anna Aurilio, Washington, D.C. Office Director, Environment America.

Dan Becker, Director, Safe Climate Campaign.

Melanie Beller, Vice President, Public Policy, The Wilderness Society.

Joy Bergey, Federal Policy Manager, Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future (Penn Future).

Joy Bergey, Executive Director, The Center for the Celebration of Creation.

Marty Hayden, Vice President, Policy and Legislation, Earthjustice.

Bryan Howard, Legislative Director, U.S. Green Building Council.

Seth Kaplan, Vice President for Policy and Climate Advocacy, Conservation Law Foundation.

Scott Kovarovics, Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America.

Nat Mund, Legislative Director, Southern Environmental Law Center.

Sandy Newman, President, Voices for Progress.

Elsa Ramirez, Board Member, Voces Verdes.

Kathleen Rogers, President, Earth Day Network.

Lexi Shultz, Legislative Director, Climate and Energy Program, Union of Concerned Scientists.

Debbie Sease, Director, National Campaigns, Sierra Club.

Scott Slesinger, Legislative Director, Natural Resources Defense Council.

Tyson Slocum, Director, Energy Program, Public Citizen.

Stephen A. Smith, DVM, Executive Director, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy.

Bill Snape, Senior Counsel, Center for Biological Diversity.

Lynn Thorp, National Campaigns Coordinator, Clean Water Action.

Karen E. Torrent, Federal Legislative Director, Environmental Law and Policy Center.

Brooks Yeager, Executive Vice President, Clean Air-Cool Planet.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,

Washington, DC, July 8, 2011.

Re Oppose H.R. 2417, the BULB Act of 2011.

House of Representatives,

Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on H.R. 2417, the so-called Better Use of Light Bulbs Act of 2011. This bill would eliminate the common-sense energy efficiency standards for light bulbs that passed with strong bipartisan and industry support and were signed into law by President Bush in 2007. It would roll back the financial and public health benefits of these standards that will contribute to billions of dollars in savings for American families, thousands of new jobs in the manufacturing sector, and energy savings equivalent to 30 large power plants. This legislation also preempts the rights of states to issue their own energy efficiency standards for light bulbs.

Supporters of H.R. 2417 have falsely claimed that new standards would ban conventional incandescent light bulbs and require consumers to purchase compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs). The standards simply require that light bulbs be more energy efficient. In fact, manufacturers, including GE, Philips, and Osram, are already making a number of bulbs, including incandescent bulbs that meet this new standard. These common-sense standards will continue to provide American families with a choice for their lighting needs, but with lower energy bills and estimated savings of about \$100 per year for the average family.

The economic and public health benefits of these standards are already being demonstrated. Manufacturers are expanding or opening lighting plants, creating thousands of new, quality jobs here in the U.S. Once fully implemented, the standards will sig-

nificantly decrease both energy demand and harmful pollution.

We urge you to REJECT H.R. 2417: this assault on common-sense efficiency standards will only increase American families' energy bills, cost jobs, and increase pollution. We will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2011 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call Tiernan Sittenfeld, Sara Chieffo, or Alex Taurel in my office at (202) 785-8683.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
NATIONAL ADVOCACY CENTER,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Wildlife Federation and our over 4 million members and supporters nationwide, I urge you to oppose the "Better Use of Light Bulbs (BULB) Act" (H.R. 2417), or any similar legislation that would repeal energy efficiency standards for light bulbs that were enacted in 2007 with strong bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush.

Despite claims by critics of the provision, the standard is not a ban on the incandescent light bulb. U.S. lighting manufacturers are already producing advanced incandescent light bulbs that meet the EISA energy efficiency standards. These fully dimmable, instant-on bulbs look like and provide the same quality of bright, white light consumers are use to—while consuming nearly 30 percent less energy. The difference between the newer high-tech bulbs and the venerable 135-year-old incandescent is \$15.8 billion annually—saving each U.S. family of four more than \$200 a year.

Energy efficiency measures are one of the cheapest and quickest ways to reduce carbon pollution that contributes to climate change. The light bulb efficiency standards will reduce pollution that harms our public health, including emissions of mercury and carbon pollution. The standards will prevent more than 100 million tons of carbon pollution per year—the equivalent of taking 17 million cars off the road. Coal-fired power plants are the number 1 man-made source of mercury emissions in the US and put public health and wildlife at risk. When fully implemented, the new lighting standards would eliminate 60 percent of the mercury emissions caused by common household lighting. New energy-efficient incandescent bulbs and LEDs contain no mercury and while CFLs do contain a very small amount of mercury—equivalent in size to the tip of a ballpoint pen and one-fifth the amount of mercury in a watch battery on your wrist—they result in less than half the overall mercury emissions as traditional incandescent bulbs.

The light bulb energy efficiency standards are backed by the lighting industry! The industry has already made very significant investments to develop and produce more efficient bulbs. Repealing this standard will create uncertainty for manufacturers and threaten jobs. Now is the time to implement common-sense measures, like efficiency standards, to save consumers money, create jobs, and reduce pollution. The National Wildlife Federation urges you to oppose legislation that would repeal these standards.

Sincerely,

LARRY SCHWEIGER,
President & CEO.

REPUBLICANS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS OFFICE,

Oakton, VA, July 11, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Republicans for Environmental Protection (REP), a national

grassroots organization of Republican voters and elected officials, respectfully urges you to vote against the "BULB Act" (H.R. 91) or any other legislation that scuttles the common-sense efficiency standards for light bulbs that were enacted in the 2007 energy bill.

This irresponsible and embarrassing legislation is entirely based on the false premise that the new standards phase out or ban incandescent screw-base light bulbs. A simple trip to Home Depot would reveal just how false that premise is.

All major lighting manufacturers, including Philips, Sylvania and GE, currently produce and sell incandescent light bulbs that meet or exceed the new standards. In fact, the lighting industry helped craft the 2007 legislation with the full understanding that they could produce incandescent bulbs that meet the new standards.

Also, contrary to the claims made by sponsors of the "BULB Act," these new incandescent bulbs are not expensive. A Philips bulb that meets the new standards sells for \$1.49, lasts about 50 percent longer than older incandescent bulbs, and saves consumers roughly \$10 in energy cost.

If passed this legislation would not only waste energy and cost consumers money, it would also threaten the millions of dollars lighting manufacturers have invested in retooling their factories to produce bulbs that meet the new standards.

There is nothing new or unusual about federal legislation setting efficiency standards for energy-using equipment. The first such legislation was signed into law 25 years ago by President Ronald Reagan. Thanks to the standards in the Reagan legislation and similar laws signed by his successors, Americans are saving billions of dollars on their utility bills.

Anyone who has been misled by the irresponsible untruths being spread about the new standards will find their concerns to be totally unfounded once January of 2012 rolls around.

The only thing this legislation will accomplish is the waste of energy and money. Waste is not conservative, and passing legislation that is based on a totally fictitious premise is not prudent.

How does peddling inefficient lighting that throws off more heat than light help our nation's energy security? How does it help consumers save money? It doesn't.

The iconic conservative author and theorist Russell Kirk correctly pointed out: "Nothing is more conservative than conservation."

Please stand up for energy efficiency and saving money. Please oppose this bizarre legislation to repeal industry-supported lighting efficiency standards. It is an embarrassment to Congress and to our party.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DAVID JENKINS,
*Vice President for Government
and Political Affairs.*

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
STATE CAPITOL,
Sacramento, CA, July 11, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*The Capitol,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned leaders of the California State Legislature strongly oppose federal efforts to invalidate California energy efficiency standards and urge you to vote "no" on H.R. 2417 or any other measure

that strips states of their authority to pursue clean energy policies that benefit their citizens.

Effective January 1, 2011—a year earlier than the rest of the nation—California began implementing state standards that require light bulbs to be 30 percent more efficient. H.R. 2417 expressly invalidates these California standards and repeals similar federal standards set to take effect on January 1, 2012.

For decades, California has led the nation in energy efficiency standards for buildings and appliances, and now light bulbs, as part of an overall strategy to reduce energy use, lower consumers' utility bills, and create good jobs for a clean energy economy. California's standards have resulted in tens of billions of dollars in utility bill savings for its citizens. It is estimated that California's early implementation of the light bulb standards will avoid the sale of 10.5 million inefficient bulbs that would cost consumers \$35.6 million in unnecessarily higher electricity bills. Studies indicate that using more efficient bulbs would save the average California household about \$125 per year.

In addition, California's light bulb standards have spurred innovation and economic growth, providing consumers new, more efficient lighting options, including advanced incandescent bulbs, light-emitting diode bulbs, and compact fluorescent bulbs. The standards are technology-neutral and do not ban incandescent bulbs.

H.R. 2417 is a direct attack on California's energy efficiency strategy and would harm our citizens. We urge you, the California delegation, and all Members of Congress to protect states' rights to pursue clean energy policies and vote "no" on H.R. 2417.

Sincerely,

SENATOR DARRELL
STEINBERG,
*President pro Tem-
pore.*

SENATOR ALEX PADILLA
*Chair, Senate Com-
mittee on Energy,
Utilities and Com-
munications.*

SENATOR FRAN PAVLEY,
*Chair, Senate Com-
mittee on Natural
Resources and
Water.*

JULY 8, 2011.

Support a Constitutional Repeal of the Incandescent Light Bulb Ban—Strike Section 4 from H.R. 2417.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The federal ban on incandescent light bulbs is the perfect example of government overreach and intrusion into our daily lives. That is why we applauded the introduction of H.R. 91, the Better Use of Light Bulbs Act. This legislation would have simply repealed the ban on incandescent light bulbs and returned freedom of choice to consumers throughout the United States.

However, the bill has been reintroduced (H.R. 2417) and will likely be considered under suspension on Monday, July 11. H.R. 2417 contains a new provision that violates the 10th Amendment and the spirit of federalism. Section 4 of H.R. 2417 would prohibit states from re-imposing the ban on incandescent light bulbs. It reads:

"No State or local regulation, or revision thereof, concerning the energy efficiency or energy use of medium screw base general service incandescent lamps shall be effective."

While it is arguably unwise for a state to restrict consumers' choice for a product such as a light bulb, such a federal prohibition infringes upon states' rights and the principles of federalism. Most importantly, it is a vio-

lation of the Constitution that we have sworn an oath to uphold.

Congress should repeal the federal ban on the incandescent light bulb and should do so in a manner that is consistent with the Constitution.

If you would like to sign onto the letter urging Chairman Upton and Representative Barton to strike Section 4 of H.R. 2417 (on reverse), please contact John Maniscalco at 5-4465 or john.maniscalco@mail.house.gov.

Sincerely,

SCOTT GARRETT,
Member of Congress.
ROB BISHOP,
Member of Congress.
MARLIN STUTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

JULY 8, 2011.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
*Chairman, House Energy and Commerce Com-
mittee, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.*

Hon. JOE BARTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON AND REPRESENTATIVE BARTON: The 2010 elections demonstrated that Americans are fed up with government intrusion. The federal government has crept so deep into our lives that federal agencies now determine what kind of light bulbs the American people are allowed to purchase.

That is why we applauded the introduction of H.R. 91, the Better Use of Light Bulbs Act. This legislation would simply repeal the ban on incandescent light bulbs and would have returned freedom of choice to consumers throughout the United States. However; the bill has been reintroduced (H.R. 2417) and contains a new provision that violates the 10th Amendment and the spirit of federalism that was so important to our nation's founding.

Section 4 of H.R. 2417 would prohibit states from re-imposing the ban on incandescent light bulbs. While it is arguably unwise for a state to restrict consumers' choice for a product such as a light bulb, such a federal prohibition infringes upon states' rights and the principles of federalism. Most importantly, it is a violation of the Constitution that we have sworn an oath to uphold.

If Congress is to repeal the ban on incandescent light bulbs, it should do so in a manner that is consistent with the Constitution and the founding principles of the United States. We strongly urge you to strike Section 4 of H.R. 2417.

Sincerely,

SCOTT GARRETT,
Member of Congress.
ROB BISHOP,
Member of Congress
MARLIN STUTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1810

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have listened, Mr. Speaker, with interest to what my friends on the Democrat side have said about this bill. And I think in the interest of fairness, we ought to call a spade a spade. It is true that the law that they are defending does not automatically ban incandescent light bulbs. That is a true statement. What it does is set efficiency standards that the existing 100-watt and 60-watt and 75-watt bulbs can't meet. So they are effectively banned

because they cannot meet the standard.

As has been pointed out by Mr. DOYLE and several of the other speakers, it is also true that industry has developed new incandescent light bulbs that do meet the standard. What they haven't done is develop a new incandescent light bulb that meets the standard at existing cost. What gets left out of the equation by my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle is the cost to purchase these new bulbs, whether they are the squiggly tailed CFLs or the new, more energy-efficient incandescents.

We're not opposed, I'm not opposed to CFL lighting. I'm not opposed to the new incandescents. But I am opposed to telling my constituents that they have no choice at all, that they have to go and fork over \$1.50 or \$2.50 or \$6. Or in the case of the LEDs that Mr. WAXMAN just referred to, a minimum of \$12, and the average price of the new LED lighting at Home Depot or Lowe's is \$40 a bulb.

Now, I'm young enough to remember when I was a renter and I would move into an apartment, and when I went into the apartment, there were no light bulbs. The people who left took the light bulbs with them. So I would have to go out and buy 20 or 30 or 40 light bulbs. Well, if light bulbs are 20 cents apiece, or 25 or 30 or even 40 cents apiece, that is an expense but it's not exorbitant. You go out and replace 40 light bulbs at \$6 a pop, you're spending some money that, to our constituency, to our voters, Mr. Speaker, that's real money.

Again, we're not opposed to new technology. We're not opposed to more energy-efficient incandescents. But why take the low end of the market off the market? Why not give our constituents, i.e., our consumers, our voters, the choice? If you're Al Gore and you want to spend \$10 a light bulb, more power to you. More power to you. But if you're a young family that's just getting started, give us the option to go out and spend for a package of four or a package of six the equivalent of 25 cents apiece, or 30 cents apiece, or as I purchased last week at a food store here in Virginia, 37.5 cents apiece for four 60-watt light bulbs.

We're saying let the market work. We're saying let people make their own choices. Why in the world does the Federal Government have to tell people what kind of lights to use in their home? That's not anywhere in the constitutional requirement of the Federal Government.

And this bill that was passed in 2007 had a lot of preemptions of State and local. It preempted State and local building codes. It required historical buildings to meet certain standards by the year 2050. It had so many bad things in it that this one, while offensive, was kind of the least of the evils.

But it is also, Mr. Speaker, what the average voter, the average consumer understands. When I go to the grocery

store or to Wal-Mart or to Home Depot, let me decide what kind of lighting, let me decide what kind of energy efficiency I want.

Now, it is a true statement that these new bulbs are more energy efficient; but if it takes you 10 years to realize the efficiency and the only way you do it is by leaving it on all of the time, it is spending money to save money that some people don't have. Again, purchase a classic 100-watt or 60-watt incandescent light bulb for less than 50 cents, you might use it, you might not. But if you use it all week, it is going to cost you less than a nickel. And if you use it like the average consumer, it is going to cost you a penny to 2 cents a week to use.

So do you save money? The CFL that I bought last week for \$6 or \$5.99 is guaranteed for 10 years and says it will save over \$40, but you've got to use it for 10 years. You know, I don't think that's a very good deal, with all due respect to my friends on the other side.

What we're saying is let's get the Federal Government out of something that they shouldn't have gotten into in the first place. Let's go back and let the market operate. If these new CFLs and these new incandescents are as good as they claim to be, people are going to want to buy them. But if they are not or if they can't afford the upfront cost, don't force them to. Don't take off the market the very thing that provides price competition in the market. Even the new incandescents cost on average \$1.50 to \$2 a pop. And I haven't seen a CFL—I've seen them for \$10 or \$12, the average price is around \$6 or \$7—I haven't seen them even in the most energy-efficient package for less than about \$2.50 or \$3 apiece. And, again, if you're buying a lot of light bulbs at one time, that's real money, Mr. Speaker.

What we say is let's repeal this part of the bill. Let's also say with regards to mercury that you cannot mandate mercury. That's the section that Mr. WAXMAN was apparently referring to. We're not banning fluorescents. We are simply saying you cannot require mercury to be used in the CFLs.

So I would urge an "aye" vote on the pending legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that the Republican majority in the House would even craft a bill such as the BULB Act, much less actually bring it to the floor for a vote. This bill is based on inaccurate and downright false claims like the one made by the Wall Street Journal when it outrageously tried to say that by setting energy efficiency standards for light bulbs, "Washington will effectively ban the sale of conventional incandescent light bulbs." Nothing could be further from the truth.

The lighting efficiency standards enacted by Congress in 2007 do not ban incandescent light bulbs, they simply make those bulbs 25 to 30 percent more efficient and help incentivize the development of even more efficient lighting using alternative technologies, such as compact fluorescent lighting or light emitting diodes.

Major light bulb manufacturers such as Philips, Osram Sylvania, and General Electric have already developed more efficient incandescent bulbs that consumers can purchase in the store today that meet the new standards. Clearly, statements like the one made by the Wall Street Journal are incorrect, because incandescent bulbs to meet the standard already exist developed solely because the standard is in place.

The standard is also spurring manufacturers to develop even more efficient lighting options than just these new incandescent bulbs, creating R&D and high-tech manufacturing jobs in the U.S. In Silicon Valley alone, Philips employs over 700 people and hired more than 100 people at its LED facility in San Jose, California in 2010. We need to encourage this kind of work, not roll back standards that led to the shipping of bulb manufacturing overseas.

The standard is good for the environment, too—it will save the amount of electricity generated by more than 30 large power plants, and prevent the emission of global warming pollution equivalent to the amount released by 14 million cars and light trucks each year. Critics may argue that by promoting the use of compact fluorescent bulbs, the standard would increase exposure to mercury, but on this they are also wrong—the reduction in mercury emissions from coal power plants that would be achieved because less electricity is needed for lighting is ten times greater than the mercury that could escape from a compact fluorescent bulb in a landfill.

Repealing the lighting efficiency standard would cost the typical consumer around \$100 per year in additional energy costs. In essence, Republicans want to institute an energy tax on consumers in order to cling to some antiquated vision of the past.

As a representative of Silicon Valley, I know that we must look to the future and do everything that we can to promote the development and domestic manufacture of new technologies that will help us use less energy and grow our economy. That is why I support the new lighting efficiency standards and vehemently oppose H.R. 2147, the BULB Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2417.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.