

jobs like similar to what Spain has done, and I have a report from the Institute For Energy Research, which talks about other countries.

And what has happened is they have spent billions of dollars of taxpayer resources to subsidize renewable energy programs and to add more greening within their societies. And as they passed some carbon tax-type legislation, it was showing that, according to their results, compared to what the United States could expect, that the U.S. can expect 2.2 jobs destroyed for every one renewable job that is financed by government-based bond, what has happened in Spain. Only one of 10 jobs actually creating a green investment would be permanent. They'd be temporary jobs.

Mr. LATTI. I thank the gentledady.

#### IMPACT OF CAP-AND-TRADE ON MANUFACTURING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, we've just concluded an hour of debate on manufacturing and the impact that this cap-and-trade system will have on manufacturing. I wanted to add a footnote from the congressional district that I represent. It's the top of the State of Illinois.

And near east of Dubuque, on the Mississippi River, is a company called Rentech that makes hydrous ammonia urea and products for agriculture. They were in the process of switching to what's called the Fischer-Tropsch process—it's an old German process—substituting natural gas and in its place putting coal, bringing coal up the Mississippi River.

And one of the byproducts of that coal would be diesel fuel, in addition to the hydrous ammonia, urea, et cetera, that could come from that facility.

Once the owners found out about a proposed cap-and-trade system, that stopped that half-billion-dollar investment in the congressional district that's smarting with unemployment, running as high as 14 and 15 percent. Just the talk, just the threat of a cap-and-trade has already stifled innovation.

And that's why it's extraordinarily important that we take a look at alternatives such as the ones suggested by GAO that can accomplish the same things without these onerous requirements and regulations on the backs of our American manufacturers.

And so those of us who were really concerned about the loss of manufacturing in this country, those of us who really want to see us become less dependent upon the Chinese and the Indians and the Mexicans and other countries around the world and to look to ourselves for self-sufficiency, to restore manufacturing in America, we cannot have this cap-and-trade system because

that has already stifled a half-billion-dollar investment in the congressional district that I represent.

#### CHANGING OUR ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it's been very interesting to have engaged in discussions over the last few months about changing our energy policy, and it's been particularly interesting listening to my colleagues on the other side talk about their vision of where this country goes or, rather, their lack of vision as to where this country will go in energy.

This debate began several years ago. It was very prominent during the Presidential campaign in 2008, and there began to emerge a very clear distinction about two very different visions about what we need to do in this country.

We heard last summer the mantra coming from the Republicans: "Drill, baby, drill! Drill, baby, drill!" That was, in essence, the sum and substance of the Republican Party's energy policy: continue to drill for oil, continue to emit carbon CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere, continue to avoid the tough choices about changing our goals in energy policy in this country, trying to achieve energy independence and, again, relying on the same technologies that we've used in this country for 100 years.

Fortunately, we elected a President who has a very different vision of where we go in energy, a very progressive vision of where we go in energy, a policy that he has proposed, that this Congress is proposing to enact, that will end our dependence on oil and carbon-based fuels, will set a new course to where we are actually using the great gifts of the natural world, such as wind and solar energy, creating the kinds of incentives for businesses to create new jobs and new industries, so that we can create a future that is not only clean but prosperous.

Now, what's interesting in listening to my colleagues from the other side, all very well-intentioned men and women, and I've listened to some over the last hour, is this constant emphasis on the cost of changing direction, the cost of cleaning the air, the cost of truly creating an alternative energy policy in this country. And I'm glad they do that because, as with any good thing, there is a cost to doing it, but what we would like to emphasize in pursuing a new direction is the cost of not acting and not pursuing that new direction.

What have we seen, for instance, in this country over the last decade? We've seen the average citizen's energy costs rise by well over \$1,000 a year, and last summer alone, we saw gas

prices at \$4 a gallon, which certainly is an additional tax on every American citizen who drives a car or who powers anything.

As we project onward, we know that diminishing resources in carbon-based fuel, diminishing supplies of petroleum, the price of gas is going to continue to go up. The price of natural gas is going to rise. So the cost of pursuing the same old status quo is significant.

On the other hand, we can make an investment now. We can make an investment that will save us money, will continue to save us money toward infinity. We can actually harness the power of the sun, the power of the wind, hydroelectric power, geothermal power, all of the alternative sources which we know are available to us. If we can do that—and this bill that we are contemplating right now sets us in that direction, provides the type of incentives and stimulus that will get us to that era—then we will have an era in which we dramatically cut our energy costs. We will save trillions and trillions of dollars as we move forward.

I know just in my own district, I've gone to see some of the new techniques for building homes, for utilizing all of the LEED-certified processes that can cut a 3000-square-foot home's utility costs to under \$100 a month. These are the potentials that are out there for us, and these are the potentials that this proposal that we are dealing with now and considering in Congress can bring to reality.

So this is a debate that's important for this country. In a very real sense, it represents the future of this country, and there are very real differences between the Democratic Caucus and the administration and our colleagues on the other side who again prefer to pursue a 20th-century energy policy, rather than a 21st-century energy policy.

So I'm joined here by someone who has great interest in this subject and many others, who is part of that class of 2006 which changed control of the Congress and set us in a new direction. I'm proud to introduce my good friend and colleague, RON KLEIN from Florida.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman and thank him for his leadership.

As a Member from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, obviously you have a great deal of understanding about energy needs. The cities in Kentucky, the rural areas of Kentucky, the great equestrian and horse industry in Kentucky, all of those require the types of energy that we know are future energy sources for America.

I think this is just such a moment in time that really allows for an excitement. Now, these are challenging times, make no mistake about it. In my lifetime—and I'm 51 years old. Mr. YARMUTH is probably somewhere in that range as well.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for his flattery.