

order to look like a hero to one part of their constituency, this cap and tax bill is being pushed through Congress, and forced on the American people, much to their detriment.

Which brings me to the third problem with Chairman WAXMAN's cap and tax bill—it's just bad policy. Earlier this week, *Investor's Business Daily* had a front page article about the failures of Europe's program, called the Emissions Trading Scheme, or ETS. The article cites numerous studies finding that the ETS has significantly increased energy prices, "with 'uncertain' effects on greenhouse gas emissions." That hardly sounds like a model of success that we should be emulating here in the United States.

Proponents of the cap and tax bill claim that they have learned from Europe's mistakes, but I disagree, Madam Speaker. The article identifies the giving away of the program's carbon allowances as the largest reason for the program's failure. This bill follows that same model, giving away roughly 85 percent of the emissions allowances.

The entire idea of a cap and trade program fails in practice. We are told, "The cost of polluting will be paid by the polluters." And believe me, the authors of this bill expect them to pay a hefty price. In fact, President Obama's budget assumes that even with the sale of only 15 percent of the total emissions permits, the federal government will still take in more than \$650 billion. As the cap gets lower, and there are fewer permits available, the cost for "polluters" is going to grow ever higher. But that is exactly what the authors want. President Obama recently stated that the only way for a cap-and-trade system to work is for energy prices to "skyrocket."

There is nothing in the bill to keep the "polluters" from passing those skyrocketing costs on to the consumers. In fact, they will be forced to do so. Any business that cannot pass the costs on to consumers runs the risk of being driven out of business. In the end, it will be the American taxpayer that foots the bill for this program, in the form of higher prices at the pump, higher home energy bills, and lost economic growth. But don't just take my word for it. Even the director of the Congressional Budget Office has said that, "under a cap-and-trade program, consumers would ultimately bear most of the costs of emission reductions."

One analysis of this bill found that if the standards within the bill are met, by 2035 Americans will see gas prices rise 74 percent, electricity prices increase by 90 percent, and a loss of at least 850,000 jobs every year. The average American household will see its annual energy bill go up by nearly \$1,500. For my home state of Kansas in particular, we are going to have to purchase an estimated \$206.8 million worth of carbon credits. That is \$206 million more that Kansans are going to have to pay in energy costs every year. My district will be particularly hard-hit, as estimates show my district standing to lose nearly half a billion dollars of production in 2012, and more than 5,000 non-agriculture jobs. It's this kind of economic pain that advocates are counting on to force a reduction in carbon emissions.

The European system proves this idea doesn't work. With no signs of a reduction in carbon emissions, Europeans have seen their household energy costs rise by 16 percent, and the industrial energy costs increase by 32 percent.

Spain is an especially poignant example of the failure of the European system. They committed to reaching the benchmarks set out by the Kyoto Protocol, with renewable energy standards, so-called green-collar jobs, and a commitment to reduce their carbon emission levels. But the high cost of energy in Spain has destroyed their economy, which is currently facing a 17.5 percent unemployment rate. Proponents of this bill say that we will be creating new, green jobs. But most of these jobs are temporary construction jobs that go away once facilities, like wind farms for example, are built. In Spain, for every 4 jobs that were created, 9 were lost due to the higher cost of doing business under the Emissions Scheme. We should avoid going down this same path.

There is huge potential for exploitation of the system, on multiple levels. Especially with permits being given out, rather than auctioned, government officials are in a prime position to divert additional credits towards industries or companies of their choice. There is also the possibility that utilities here in the United States could follow the lead of one European company that immediately raised their rate by 70 percent, explaining to customers that the rate hike was necessary to cover the costs of cap-and-trade. But this utility company was given more credits than it needed, and sold them on the open market.

Tack on a renewables standard to this bill, and we have the perfect recipe for failure. No place that has implemented a renewable standard has ever been able to meet the required levels. And there is little to indicate that a federal standard would be any different. As a 2008 article in the *Energy Law Journal* stated, "The DOE has little, if any, experience in administering a program on the scale of a national RPS, and has shown no indication that enforcement of a major program is within the agency's capabilities...[this is] an area in which the DOE has already failed to show effective leadership."

So what we have here is a bill that has been rammed through with no minority input, to create a system that is ripe for abuse, costs the American taxpayer thousands of dollars, cripples our businesses, and in the end, has no measureable result. This is a bill I cannot support, and urge my colleagues to reject as well. Instead, I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the American Energy Act, a comprehensive energy bill that increases access to domestic energy sources, encourages conservation, and promotes the increased use of renewable sources of energy.

Across this country, we are, once again, seeing gas prices rise. Since the beginning of the year, gas prices are up 60 cents, and crude oil has raised more than \$20 a barrel, with no end in sight. Just last week, Russian oil executives predicted that crude prices could reach \$250 per barrel.

It is possible for us to relieve some of this pressure by tapping into our own vast resources. The Department of Energy estimates that nearly 20 billion barrels of recoverable oil lie offshore beneath restricted waters, the equivalent to nearly 30 years worth of current imports from Saudi Arabia. Substantial offshore natural gas reserves are also restricted. Even though longstanding restrictions on offshore energy production were lifted last year, the process of leasing these areas falls under

the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Unfortunately, new Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar refuses to allow additional drilling permits, dredging up every excuse not to produce energy in these areas. The Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge, reported to hold more than 10 billion barrels of oil continues to remain off-limits. He has also sought to block progress on oil shale, a promising source of oil trapped in rock under parts of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. The Department of the Interior has even cancelled some existing oil and gas leases.

Often, environmental concerns are cited as the reason for opposing additional drilling. However, technological advances have greatly increased the safety of drilling. During hurricanes Rita and Katrina, less than one cup of oil was spilled in the Gulf of Mexico, despite damage to more than 120 drilling platforms. There is absolutely no reason why permits for additional drilling should be denied. Furthermore, revenue generated by these oil leases will be invested in the development of cleaner, alternative sources of energy. The end result is a reduced dependency on foreign oil, lower levels of pollution, and new jobs for Americans, all without crippling our economy.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, the American Energy Act includes one key source that could provide clean energy without emissions—nuclear power. The Department of Energy has stated that the best way for energy companies to reduce their carbon emissions is to increase their use of nuclear energy. Despite encouragement from DoE, and the fact that that it has been proven safe by countries like France, where more than 80 percent of their electricity is generated by nuclear power, the Waxman-Markey bill does nothing to encourage nuclear power.

Instead, this administration has begun to walk away from the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on the nuclear storage facility at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. The American Energy Act would provide the Nuclear Regulatory Commission authority to complete its review of the Yucca Mountain facility, repeal the limitations on Yucca's Mountain's storage capacity, and establishes a method for recycling spent nuclear fuel in the U.S. Furthermore, it would reduce the bureaucratic hoops and length of time required to receive a permit for the construction of new nuclear plants.

In conclusion, let me again encourage my colleagues to join me in rejecting the Waxman-Markey cap-and-tax bill that would cripple our economy, without addressing their environmental concerns. Instead, let's support the American Energy Act, which provides real solutions for our energy problems in an economically, and environmentally sound manner.

#### EARMARK DECLARATION

**HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 24, 2009*

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information for regarding the earmark I secured as part of H.R. 2892, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010.

My request, totaling \$350,000, will come from the Predisaster Mitigation account at the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, within the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, for the County of DeKalb, Illinois. This request will assist in the permanent relocation of the residents who currently live in the Evergreen Village mobile home park to protect them from future floods along the southeast branch of the Kishwaukee River. Severe storms and flooding have hit DeKalb County, Illinois, four times over the past 40 years, causing extensive property damage. Evergreen Village, which is located in an unincorporated area of DeKalb County, has been severely affected by flooding. Evergreen Village is a 19.9-acre, 130-unit mobile home park, just east of Sycamore, Illinois, and located in the southeast branch of the Kishwaukee River floodway. During major flood events, DeKalb County must evacuate Evergreen Village, which imposes high costs on the county and the residents of Evergreen Village.

DeKalb County has examined alternatives to mitigate this issue, including the construction of a levee, and concluded that the relocation and acquisition of Evergreen Village is the only viable option for protecting residents from future floods. The acquisition would involve the purchase of the mobile homes, the 19.69 acre parcel of land, three permanent buildings, and the relocation of the residents. While most residents of Evergreen Village own their mobile homes, they are nevertheless technically renters on the land they currently occupy. Thus, under the Uniform Relocation Act, URA, these mobile home owners cannot receive full relocation assistance given to other owners of primary residences in similarly situated circumstances. Factoring in the approximate appraised \$30,000 cost for each mobile home and land acquisition in Evergreen Village, DeKalb County estimates that the total cost of the relocation effort will be \$6.781 million. State and local resources will contribute more than the minimum matching Federal requirement to complete the project. The entity to receive funding for the Evergreen Village relocation project is the County of DeKalb, Illinois, which is located at 200 North Main Street in Sycamore, Illinois 60178.

Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative DAVID OBEY, and the Ranking Minority Member, Representative JERRY LEWIS, and the Chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative DAVID PRICE, and the Ranking Minority Member, Representative HAL ROGERS, for working with me in a bipartisan manner to include this critical request in this spending bill.

---

#### EARMARK DECLARATION

**HON. JOHN L. MICA**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 24, 2009*

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I received as part of H.R. 2892, legislation that makes appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security

for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010. I have received \$750,000 in the FEMA, Predisaster Mitigation Account for the City of Flagler Beach located at P.O. Box 70, Flagler Beach, FL 32136. To the best of my knowledge, the funding would be used for the construction of a new EOC facility in Flagler Beach, FL.

As the population of the City of Flagler Beach has grown, the demand for services has increased. The City Hall and Emergency Operations Center share the same building, creating a constrained environment when responding to emergency situations. The city needs assistance to build a new facility that will accommodate not only current staff, but also the emergency response teams that will use the facility to respond to natural disasters, such as hurricanes that frequent Florida. The new building will expand the necessary space for city departments which will more adequately and efficiently serve the people of the community.

---

#### EARMARK DECLARATION

**HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 24, 2009*

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership guidelines on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I requested that were included as part of H.R. 2996, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

Requesting Member: Congressman KEVIN MCCARTHY

Bill Number: H.R. 2996

Account: Environmental Protection Agency, STAG Water and Wastewater Infrastructure

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: City of Ridgecrest, California

Address of Requesting Entity: 100 West California Avenue, Ridgecrest, California 93555

Description of Request: \$400,000 is included for the City of Ridgecrest, California, to help fund Phase I (planning, environmental studies, engineering design and construction monitoring, and legal and administrative issues) of the city's new wastewater treatment facility. Ridgecrest, located in northeast Kern County, serves as a support community to the Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division at China Lake (NAWCWD), and receives and treats all of the base's wastewater, which accounts for more than one-third of the water treated at the existing facility. As the existing plant has limited capacity and with additional personnel expected on the naval base in the future, the current wastewater treatment facility will reach and exceed its capacity requiring another treatment plant in the next few years. The city recognizes the challenges it faces on this front and is proactively working to address this issue before acceptable discharge limitations are exceeded at the current plant.

#### EARMARK DECLARATION

**HON. ANH "JOSEPH" CAO**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 24, 2009*

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I received as part of H.R. 2892—the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010:

As requested by me, Rep. ANH "JOSEPH" CAO, H.R. 2892—the Department of Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010, provides for the Audubon Institute, New Orleans, LA in support of an Endangered Whooping Crane Propagation Facility. This is in the Fish and Wildlife Service—Resource Management Account in the amount of \$500,000. This will benefit the Audubon Nature Institute, P.O. Box 4327, New Orleans, LA 70178 in the form of additional specially-designed whooper breeding pens to hold new crane pairs, increasing Audubon's egg production capacity by 20% and contributing greatly to whooping crane preservation. In addition to benefitting Louisiana, Audubon's success in breeding cranes prompted the USFWS to select Audubon to hold 10 whooping cranes from the captive flock for potential breeding. The project will help preserve an endangered species native to Louisiana and inform similar projects on a national level.

---

#### EARMARK DECLARATION

**HON. STEVE SCALISE**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 24, 2009*

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on Congressionally-directed project funding, I am submitting the following information regarding project funding I requested for Southeast Louisiana as part of the Fiscal Year 2010 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Requesting Member: Congressman STEVE SCALISE

Bill Number: Fiscal Year 2010 Interior and Environment Appropriations Bill

Account: Environmental Protection Agency—STAG Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Project

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: St. Tammany Parish

Address of Requesting Entity: St. Tammany Parish, 21490 Koop Drive, Mandeville, LA 70471

Description of Request: I have secured \$500,000 for St. Tammany Parish. This funding will be used to create an on-line retention pond at the western intersection of Bayou Chinchuba and U.S. Highway 59. This will reduce floodwater heights in order to reduce risk to homes, streets, highway flooding, and protect over 16,000 citizens in the Bayou Chinchuba area of St. Tammany Parish. I certify that neither I nor my spouse has any financial interest in this project.