

fact that we need new transmission lines—and I will be able to come to the floor to explain in detail how this is not already occurring because of the problems with NIMBY, the fact that people do not want to have this occur in their back yard.

I commend the gentleman on his work here. And I look forward to elaborating on this in future floor remarks.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate my colleague joining me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to sit here on the floor and listen to my colleagues deal with their talking points about climate change, carbon pollution, and what they would like to debate. Sadly, they are a little bit out of phase with what, in fact, we are facing as a Nation. Luckily, the American people understand that there is a serious problem facing us dealing with carbon pollution, and they favor action to do something about it.

The American people know that ice disappearing in our polar regions, birds migrating further and further north because of the change in the temperatures, the weather that is being disruptive with drought and extreme weather events and the consensus of the scientific community all converge. We've got a problem, and it is threatening life as we know it.

The American public is not likely to be somebody who is told by 98 doctors that their child is seriously ill and needs a specific medicine or treatment. The American public would not be inclined to go search for a single doctor that disagrees, to take a chance. If you have engineering experts who tell you that you are living in a building that is likely to collapse, you think about that seriously. And if you get a second opinion and a third opinion and a fourth opinion and a fifth opinion and they all agree that the building is likely to fall down upon you and your family or your customers, you are not likely to keep searching for that one outlier who says don't worry about it.

The public knows that we have a serious problem. There is a consensus in the scientific community that we need to do something about it. And, indeed, everything that we are talking about doing to control carbon pollution and to reduce our dependence, particularly on petroleum, but especially foreign oil, all of these are things that we should be doing anyway, even if we weren't threatened by global warming and serious disruption from the carbon pollution.

Sadly, the last hour demonstrated again that too many on the other side

of the aisle have simply lost their ability to have a serious conversation about what the scientific community and the majority of the American public feel is a serious problem; indeed, maybe the greatest single threat to our way of life.

I am reminded of what happened 68 years ago in this Chamber. The world was being slowly engulfed in World War II. The Nazis had taken over most of Europe and Great Britain was at risk. The Japanese had moved throughout the South Pacific. The United States was looking at an international landscape that was increasingly more and more threatening. But 68 years ago, there were some in this Chamber—actually, a majority on the other side of the aisle—that weren't that concerned. They felt that we were still shaking off the events of a Great Depression and we couldn't afford money on a military buildup, that we shouldn't have the human resources in our military.

We were facing the expiration of the conscription, the military draft. There was a vote 68 years ago that by only one vote, 203-202, enabled us to have a military draft and have some semblance of the tools available when the inevitable happened. And on December 7, 1941, the day that President Roosevelt said before us in this Chamber would live in infamy, at least we had those tools available to be able to spring into action and fight to save our country from existential threats.

I feel very strongly that we are facing something similar today, and we are going to have too many people in this Chamber who are not going to be able to answer a question that will be posed by history 68 years from now. They are not going to be able to look their children and grandchildren in the eye 10 or 15 years from now and explain why they weren't part of a process to provide a solution to the threat of global warming.

Listen to the echoes that are still in this Chamber from our colleagues. One gentleman I like was talking about how there was a recent MIT study that showed that there was \$3,100 in cost from a program of preventing carbon pollution, a cap-and-trade program. And then he acknowledged, well, there are some controversies surrounding it. Absolutely there is controversy surrounding it. But then he went on to say, well, it appears as though the number is even higher than \$3,100. Absolutely false.

The author of that report, in fact, has written to the Republican leadership that has been misusing the study to say that it is wrong in so many ways he doesn't know how to count. It would be a tiny fraction of that amount, and that assumes that we are not giving things back directly from those resources to make a difference for people. It is embarrassing that people are still purposely misstating research like that, but it is typical.

Echoing in the Chamber now, there was somebody who was talking about

how important it is to support Republican legislation to prevent the EPA from doing its job under the Clean Air Act to deal with carbon pollution. I find that embarrassing. For the last 8 years, the Bush administration has abdicated its responsibility under the Clean Air Act to take action. Indeed, even this Supreme Court slapped them down for dragging their feet dealing with the auto tailpipe standards. What an outrageous response. Instead of joining in an effort to work to make sure that we are meeting the challenge, instead we are going to introduce legislation to prevent the EPA from doing its job if Congress fails to act.

We heard my friend from Illinois talk about how deeply concerned he was that, under the Speaker's leadership, we have changed the Capitol Hill Power Plant that for the 14 years that I have been in Congress has been belching cold smoke into the air—one of the most serious sources of air pollution here in Washington, D.C.—somehow the fact that the Speaker has acted with legislative leadership in the Senate to solve this problem by cutting the emissions in half and using natural gas instead of coal, that somehow that is bad. Well, as somebody who lives in Washington, D.C. over a third of the time, I am glad that we are not going to be polluting the air with carbon pollution. I think it is the least we should be doing for the millions of people who live in the metropolitan area, in terms of clean air, dealing with the awful substances that are part of the emissions from coal. And to think somehow that that is wrong gives you a sense of the mindset.

The new Representative from Pennsylvania was troubled by "a complete lack of an energy plan." Well, maybe he is so new to Congress that he hasn't noticed that George Bush and the Republicans have been running things here for the last 8 years and, in fact, have passed various pieces of legislation to the benefit of some of the polluting energy industries, but failed to come forward with a comprehensive energy proposal.

The notion somehow that we can't move forward in a thoughtful, comprehensive fashion to be able to design a system to reduce carbon pollution, I think, is, frankly, embarrassing. Luckily, the Democratic leadership is committed to moving forward. This is one of the top priorities of Speaker PELOSI.

We have work that is undertaken in the House Energy and Commerce Committee moving forward with draft legislation which hopefully will be moving on to us in a matter of weeks, if not days. We are poised to work with the House Ways and Means Committee as part of this partnership, and the Obama administration has set down markers and is prepared to act, either administratively or in cooperation with us, with legislation.

This country shook off the Great Depression by mobilizing the economy to fight World War II. We have an opportunity to mobilize against a threat at

least as great—that dealing with global warming—and to harness new technologies, new industries, new products and services to be able to put people to work.

Contrary to what has been suggested, alternative energy—wind, solar, biomass—across the globe are some of the fastest growing industries on Earth. Solar and wind power industries alone have sustained annual growth rates of 30 to 50 percent, creating tens of thousands of jobs while reducing reliance on foreign sources of oil and helping to shrink our carbon emissions.

Now, it is true that these renewable sources today account for less than 3 percent of the world's power generation, but the opportunity here is enormous. We expect that there will be increased energy demands in the United States and around the world, but only about a third of the generation capacity that will be needed to meet expected demand by 2030 has been built.

We have an opportunity to shape and direct how we manage that, to be able to direct it in a way that is going to make the greatest impact on our economy.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, there has been a fair amount of hyperbole about what will be the costs of controlling carbon pollution and moving into a new economic era. The IPCC has been in the forefront of this with the research that's coming forward, and we have had a chance to look at the parameters that they have suggested. In survey after survey of greenhouse gas reduction scenarios undertaken by respected and peer-reviewed modeling groups, there is a projected average GDP reduction of perhaps five-tenths of a percent to three-quarters of a percent to 2030 and 2050, respectively. The estimate is that by 2030, the overall United States gross domestic product is projected to double to some \$26 trillion. Without a cap on greenhouse gas emissions, the United States reaches that doubling by January 2030. With a cap, it reaches that goal 3 months later, April 2030. This is consistent with the research that we have done in Oregon at Portland State University. The State Carbon Allocation Task Force, looking only at the electrical sector, found that while carbon reductions to meet the State's 2020 goal of 10 percent below the 1990 levels would increase energy rates. Under most conditions, average consumer costs would be the same or lower due to cost savings from energy efficiency.

I want to be very clear about this because, contrary to the assumption of some critics sticking to their talking points, any money that is generated from fees on carbon pollution is not somehow buried, it's not shot into space, it's not locked in a vault someplace. This money is used to be able to strengthen our energy infrastructure, and higher prices are further going to encourage efficiency, and last but not least, we will be investing in new prod-

ucts and services in energy-efficient standards. So that as a net result, 20 years from now, at least in our community, it's clear that we're not going to have, as a result of the change in electricity, some massive burden on individual consumers because we will be smart with our investments and people will be smart in terms of what they do, and we anticipate there will be no net increase.

Now, one of the factors that is also important to point out is that we are going to be looking at new technologies and products that leapfrog ahead. Back when we were considering in the Northwest the plans that we were going to make in the 1980s, we didn't actually consider that compact fluorescent light bulbs were going to be a serious lighting efficiency choice, but by the year 2000, these CFLs were widely available. And now, even more efficient lighting technologies, the LEDs, were on the horizon and moving forward. There will be further technological innovation, exactly what we saw when there was a restriction to deal with another gas in the atmosphere, the CFCs, the chlorinated fluorocarbons, that were threatening the ozone. You will recall at that time companies like DuPont threatened that there would be massive disruption, a massive increase in costs, and people would be put out of work. Well, actually, that's not the case. The initiative was taken. Not only were there not massive dislocations, a large increase in unemployment, but companies like DuPont actually made money by producing alternative chemical refrigerants. And surely the same will occur now if we are diligent about our investments.

But more to the point, what's going to happen if we take the alternative that is offered by some and continue with business as usual, to not control carbon emissions, to fall victim to concern about temporary problems with the economy? The report by Sir Nicholas Stern for the Government of the United Kingdom suggests that the mid-rate growth for global emissions are projected to cost 5 percent of the global GDP. A 5 percent loss of the world economic output. Now, actually the trend line is a little more disturbing than what Sir Nicholas Stern came up with because he was just dealing with the mid level of the projections. We have seen that emissions in the last several years have been at or above the high projections in the IPCC fourth report from 2008. And as a result, we have to look at that higher range that was suggested by the Stern report, which could be a 20 percent reduction in global GDP.

The status quo, ignoring the problem, trying to score debate points, roll back the Clean Air Act, and wait poses much more serious problems in terms of what we are likely to see as a consequence. And many of these potential problems are not market related. The effects of this extreme variation, I

have had Members of Congress today joking about the unstable weather here in Washington, D.C., extreme rain, heat, cold. Well, we're seeing global weather instability increasing around the planet. And the droughts, the heavy rains, the windstorms, these carry with them a cost as well.

There are socially potentially disastrous effects that relate to unease and upheaval from drought, fighting over water. There's a whole range of social costs that people need to be thinking about.

There are, I think, very sober voices that should be heard above the talking points. One voice that I find most compelling is that of retired United States Army General Anthony Zinni, who has written: "We will pay to reduce greenhouse gas emissions today or we will pay the price later in military terms, and that will involve human lives."

We are already looking, in my State of Oregon, at the likely adaptation costs. We've got issues relating to flooding, landslides, forest fires, the potential need to relocate highways and other public works. We are facing real threats in our State like they are already being faced by coastal villages in Alaska and in the British countryside of being eaten away by the increase in sea level and storm surges. We are already facing the problems of competition for lower summer stream flows from hydroelectric power, irrigation, navigation, municipal water supplies, and system stream ecosystem needs. We're having a drama being played out now in the State of California with their prolonged drought. That's a taste of what we are looking at in the immediate future if we are unable to act.

We have brought that down in Oregon, a State that has been a leader in efforts to curb greenhouse gasses, to plan for energy futures, an intensely environmentally conscious State. We recently had a study published by the University of Oregon's Climate Leadership Initiative by Echo Northwest, a consulting firm located in Oregon, that estimates the cost to Oregonians by 2020 from the impacts on global warming of \$3.3 billion annually, almost \$2,000 per Oregon household or 2 percent of our current gross domestic product. Put in perspective, that would be the equivalent of a household annual electric rate increase of 175 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these are sobering facts that deal with the highly likely outcomes of our failure to get our arms around this problem and move forward to deal with the problems of greenhouse gas emissions. We need to be serious about opportunities dealing with the savings from energy efficiency. This is an area that we should be doing regardless of greenhouse gas emissions. This is something that is within our power right now.

Part of what is being ignored by critics and their talking points is that all of the major approaches to deal with

greenhouse gas emissions, with the cap-and-trade, would put much of this money back into a system to help people improve energy efficiency. Remember, I mentioned the one study that, in fact, estimates that people would actually be paying less by 2030 than they're paying today, even though electric rates would well go up, because of increased energy efficiency.

We are currently wasting more energy than any other country in the world. The United States is less carbon efficient than 75 out of 107 industrialized countries, and we use the most transportation fuel per passenger mile. There is absolutely no reason that we, as a society, as we are working to create new green collar jobs built on an energy-efficient, carbon-constrained economy for the future, can't take advantage of this to be able to not only reduce power rates in the future, saving Americans money, but put people to work now. We have seen this work in the United States. California has some of the highest electric rates in the country, but over the course of the last 30 years, electric energy efficiency has saved Californians \$56 billion while producing 1½ million new jobs.

□ 1915

The University of California at Berkeley projected savings in jobs from meeting California's Assembly Bill 32 carbon cap-and-trade law. By 2020, they project \$76 billion in saved energy costs at current rates and 400,000 new jobs in California.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunities to move forward to capitalize on energy efficiency is something we want everybody to look at. We have had experience in this area in the Pacific Northwest.

We have engaged in one of the most comprehensive efforts with our northwest power planning council, electric utilities in the Northwest, to try and deal with least-cost energy planning, looking at the big picture. I am proud to say that my hometown of Portland, Oregon, was the first American city with a comprehensive energy policy enacted in 1979.

There has been a lot going on in the Pacific Northwest dealing with energy efficiency. Between 1980 and 2000, the region invested almost \$2.5 billion in energy efficiency. It costs money to be able to move forward on that energy efficiency curve. But during that period of time, the region earned that total investment back once every 18 months.

Let me repeat that: over the course of that 20-year period of time, we invested \$2.4 billion in energy efficiency and the savings, as a result of that investment, were repaid every year and a half. That's a 67 percent average annual rate of return on investment.

This is what we are talking about in terms of being able to move this forward. Now, there are some that suggest, well, you can't do this because it's going to pull the plug on State and local economies; they can't survive

this aggressive push towards energy efficiency.

Well, looking at what has happened in the Pacific Northwest over the last 25 years. That's simply not the fact. Californians have actually had some reasonable economic growth in this period of time. We have had the same in Oregon. By not being intensely carbon based, investing in energy efficiency, we have been able to produce substantial economic benefit while we are growing in a sustainable fashion.

It has resulted in Oregonians, in the metropolitan area of Portland, exporting fewer of their dollars to Houston, Venezuela or Saudi Arabia and, in fact, they have almost \$2,500 a year more disposable income that they are not spending just on transportation alone. This makes a real difference in terms of the initiatives that were made.

In Oregon, we have been working to reduce carbon emissions. Our carbon emissions were 30 percent lower than the national average in 1990, and by working very hard, they are 36 percent lower than 2007. But it's been done without any reduction in our State gross domestic product.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are important points that need to be part of a serious discussion. The status quo, business as usual, head in the sand, we are not going to worry about it now, we are to going to make it a political football is, I think—there may be a time when politics could be played this way. I think the stakes are too high. The American public knows that.

I hope, sooner, rather than later, my friends on the other side of the aisle will understand that this is a serious problem and it invites a serious response.

I hope they will reject the advice of Republican Leader BOEHNER, who has been misusing, for instance, the MIT study repeatedly, despite having had a call to his office's attention how misleading that figure is. But his advice has been to Republicans to not be legislators, but to be communicators, to talk instead of act.

I sincerely hope that that approach will be rejected, because we will be better off, not as a, just as a Congress, we will be better off as a country and as a people if we have broad bipartisan interaction. They may not agree with each and every point, but at least have an honest debate, stop misrepresenting facts and give people permission to be involved with serious efforts to solve this problem.

Because, make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, this problem demands attention and it will get attention. One of the most important decisions of the Obama administration is that they were going to start following the law under the Clean Air Act and deal with carbon pollution. This is clear, we are heading down this path.

If Congress doesn't act, we will be dealing with carbon regulation through a combination of administrative action and legal action. It's one way to solve

the problem. I, personally, don't think it's the best, but it's one of the approaches that will be taken.

We find now that there is growing support from leaders in the business community to act seriously to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There is a growing consensus among business leaders that now is the time to act, and they are participating with us in serious discussions to craft a workable solution.

It's somewhat ironic that we hear the United States Chamber of Commerce being cited by some to cite that there are problems in opposition to dealing with greenhouse gas cap-and-trade initiatives. Actually, the best research I have seen is that there are only four companies on the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce that are in support of this "just say no" attitude.

Of those companies that have taken a position on the board of directors, 80 percent support Federal regulations with goals to reduce total U.S. global warming pollution, not all in agreement on precisely the response, but Alcoa, Caterpillar, Deere and Company, Dow Chemical Company, Duke Energy, Eastman Kodak Company, Entergy, Fox Entertainment Group, IBM, Lockheed Martin, Nike, PepsiCo, PNM Resources, the Robertson Foundation, Rolls Royce North America, Siemens Corporation, Southern Company, Toyota Motor North America, Xerox. These are all companies that have realized, in many cases, because they are global in nature, that Europe is moving, Japan is moving. Even China is moving on areas of energy efficiency, and there are opportunities for us to work with them, even as they move to be the leader in wind, solar and electric cars.

So major businesses, 80 percent of those on the Chamber board of directors that have taken a position, favor Federal regulation. This is the wave of the future. This is what we as a society need to do.

I am encouraged with the progress that we have made already here in the work under the leadership of the Speaker, of our various committee Chairs, and an active group of Members in the Democratic Caucus moving forward and advancing this debate.

I look forward to having legislation on the floor this year that we can deal with and hopefully enact, working with the administration. I look forward to the United States when it comes to coming together with the global community to deal with climate change in Copenhagen in December.

I look forward to our being there with the United States no longer being missing in action, but, instead, assume its rightful leadership role as the most powerful Nation in the world, as the strongest economy, and, frankly, as the largest emitter of greenhouse gases in history that we accept our responsibility, our leadership and move this forward.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here this evening to share

some thoughts. I look forward to our being able to continue the discussion on the floor of the House. I hope, I sincerely hope that we will be able to engage in a thoughtful, deliberate discussion of alternatives that will reduce greenhouse gases, the threat to the planet, strengthen our economy and make a more liveable world for our children and grandchildren.

DEFINING MOMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I appreciate being joined here with my colleague from Illinois to talk about somewhat of a new issue, I think, in the Congress, but more of a broad overview of the situation here in the United States and the situation of the Congress where we might be headed as a country and some new ideas that might be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think during this special time of the references of our current situation to the Great Depression in the 1930s and the FDR administration, how Franklin Roosevelt dealt with those issues and a contract, a social contract that was written during those times that was felt to be necessary in order to deal with the trying times of the day.

And I am not suggesting that the Depression is anything like what we are facing now. We are lucky to not be dealing with 30 percent unemployment, although there are some places in California that have that. Nationally we are not there. But there are some similarities.

And I was reading a book the other day by Jonathan Alter, a very interesting book, called "The Defining Moment." And it was that time during the first 150 days of the FDR administration that it dawned on FDR that he was writing a new social contract.

Jonathan Alter said it well when he wrote: "FDR knew he was on the verge of proposing nothing less than a rewriting of the American social contract. Instead of every man being the captain of his own fate, he envisioned the ship of state carrying a safety net. He favored what he called cradle-to-grave coverage, including national health insurance. But he knew that trying to insulate average Americans from the ravages of the market was a long-term process." So, in public, he borrowed a term from the private sector and spoke vaguely of social insurance.

□ 1930

It dawned on me that having been here a number of years, having had a Republican majority for about 12 years, having thought of reading the signals back in 1994 that the American people wanted a change in their government, and less government, the fact that perhaps during that time a new social contract would have been something that

could have succeeded in achieving those goals while we were in office.

Now, the Republicans, when they came in charge, didn't do what they had promised to do in reducing government, and that has led to us being in the minority now. I think the Republicans get that, and I think we are in a position now where we are trying to assess, where do we go from here? And it dawned on me that it is probably no surprise that we are drawing up these similarities to the Depression and the time for a new deal. We have a President in the White House who has been characterized as the next FDR and very popular and spending money like FDR, but I think that leaves to Republicans the opportunity to define a new social contract, and that interests me.

And I have to go back to times of the contract with America; and that was a contract, but it wasn't necessarily a social contract. It was a political contract. If the American people gave the majority in the House to the Republicans, they would bring 10 bills to the floor, and that was it. It didn't really speak of a social contract in that what government would do and then the rest of society would do as a response to that. It didn't really define a new social contract that we need today.

So I would like to encourage some conversation about that or along those lines. I am so proud to be joined by my friend from Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, and also my friend from South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS, to discuss it.

Mr. ROSKAM. If the gentleman would yield. I thank the gentleman for gathering us today and for his leadership, and really having a conversation that I think is very important, Mr. Speaker, to talk about where we are, because my sense is that we are at a very pivotal point in our public life right now and when the types of changes and the types of choices that are being presented to the public are choices that we are going to reflect back in 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40 years and say that was the time.

I remember my mother grew up in Oak Park, Illinois, and she was born in 1930. She remembers and I remember her telling me about what it was like for her as a little girl turning on the radio and hearing the voice of Adolph Hitler, and just that sort of ominous feel. And now I am kind of projecting here, but I am imagining that my mother as a little girl sort of knew that there was something that was going on, and that time that she was involved in was formative.

And I would suggest to you, take the World War II reference and abandon it now, and this time that we are in just has a feel about it. It has a poignancy to it, and it has a sense that decisions that are going to be made are going to be made and have long-term implications, and I think that one of a couple of things is going to happen.

My hope and expectation is that we are going to make decisions and we will say, thank goodness that there

were clear-thinking people in Washington at the time that the wheels were coming off the cart. But the alternative is that we surrender so much freedom and we give up so much to a benevolent government that sort of pats us on the head and says: We are going to take care of all your problems. And then we wake up, and when the government fails—and we've seen that time and time and time again lately. We wake up and we don't have those tools that should be ours, and instead they were squandered and they were given away at a time of panic and at a time of legitimate fear.

So here we are on the floor of the House of Representatives, and we are in the midst of this conversation as a country and we have got to look carefully at where we have been and then figure out where we are going. And I think any honest assessment of where we have been takes a look back and says: Okay, United States of America, you have been given an inspired Declaration of Independence. You have been given a Constitution that is the envy of the world. You, as a Nation, and your predecessors have gone through the Civil War. You have gone through the turmoil of slavery. You have gone through world wars. You have gone through a Depression like we were talking about a minute ago. You defeated communism. You defeated fascism, and here you are at this moment where great decisions need to be made. But do so as a Nation with a proud heritage, as a Nation that has understood where it has come from and where it needs to go.

But don't panic. Don't underreact. Don't act as if there are no problems, because there are problems. We know there are great difficulties. We know we have a health care system that is unsustainable. We know that the world is an increasingly dangerous place. We know that the amount of money that is being spent here in Washington begins to feel like generational theft. It really is too much. So we are rightly sobered by these things. But as we are contemplating solutions, we ought not be dismissive of this incredible heritage that we have been given.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think what you just said is very true. The thing I would add to it is that it is also important that we not abandon hope in the midst of that awareness. You just talked about the important awareness of the trials that we are in. We need to be very much aware.

We also, I think, need to approach them with a hope that—well, it depends on where you come from. From my perspective, it is this: The reason I have hope is I believe there is a sovereign God who is in control of all things and, furthermore, I think he is good. So if you put those two things together, I have every reason to be optimistic. Now, I do need to be aware of