

CAP-AND-TRADE NOT THE ANSWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I had a strange sense of *deja vu* as I stood here on the floor of the House and watched all of the self-congratulatory rhetoric a few moments ago on the passage of the cap-and-trade bill, and I feel the need to rise to issue an urgent warning from the west coast.

I stood on the floor of the Senate of California 3 years ago and watched a very similar bill adopted and watched the same sort of self-congratulatory celebrations as we just saw here, and I have watched over those years as that measure has dramatically deepened California's recession. It uses a slightly different mechanism than cap-and-trade, but the objective is exactly the same, to force a dramatic reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.

□ 2000

Now, up until that bill took effect, California's unemployment numbers tracked very closely with the national unemployment rate. But then, in January of 2007, California's unemployment rate began a steady upward divergence from the national jobless figures. Today, California's unemployment rate is more than two points above the national rate and is at its highest point since 1941.

What happened in January of 2007? AB 32 took effect and it began shutting down entire sectors of California's economy.

Let me give you just one example from my own district. The city of Truckee, California, was about to sign a long-term power contract to get its electricity from a new EPA-approved coal-fired plant way off in Utah. But AB 32 and companion legislation caused them to abandon that contract. The replacement power that they acquired literally doubled their electricity costs.

So when economists warn that we can expect electricity prices to double under the cap-and-trade bill, I can tell you from the bitter experience of my district that that is not some future prediction. That is a historical fact.

Governor Schwarzenegger assured us at the time that AB 32 would mean an explosion of new, green jobs—exactly the same promises that we heard on this floor today.

Well, in California exactly the opposite has happened. We have lost so many jobs that the UCSB economic forecast is now using the D word—depression—to describe California's job market.

Mr. Speaker, the cap-and-trade bill proposes what amounts to endlessly increasing taxes on any enterprises that produce carbon dioxide or other so-called greenhouse gases. We need to understand exactly what that means. It has profound implications for agriculture, construction, cargo and pas-

senger transportation, energy production, baking and brewing—all of which produce enormous quantities of this innocuous, ubiquitous compound. In fact, every human being produces 2.2 pounds of carbon dioxide every day—just by breathing.

So applying a tax to the economy designed to radically constrict carbon dioxide emissions means radically constricting the economy. And this brings us to the fine point of the matter.

When we look back on the folly of the Hoover administration and how it turned the recession of 1929 into the Depression of the 1930s, the first thing that economists point to is the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that imposed new taxes on 20,000 imported products.

The Waxman-Markey bill, I'm afraid, is our generation's Smoot-Hawley that imposes new taxes on an infinitely larger list of domestic products on a scale that utterly dwarfs Smoot-Hawley.

Let's ignore for the moment the fact that the planet's climate is constantly changing and that long-term global warming has been going on since the last ice age. Let's ignore the fact with-in recorded history we know of periods when the Earth's climate has been much warmer than it is today, and others when it's been much cooler. Let's ignore the thousands of climate scientists and meteorologists who've concluded that human-produced greenhouse gases are, at most, a negligible factor in global warming or climate change.

Ignore all of that and we're still left with one lousy sense of timing. In the most serious recession since the Great Depression, why is it that Members of this House want to repeat the same mistakes that produced the Great Depression?

Watching how California has just wrecked its own economy and destroyed its own finances, why would Members of this House want to do the same thing to our Nation?

Mr. Speaker, this is deadly serious stuff. It transcends ideology and politics. This House has just made the biggest economic mistake since the days of Herbert Hoover.

Two things are certain if this measure becomes law. First, our planet is going to continue to warm and cool, as it's been doing for billions of years. And, secondly, this House will have just delivered a staggering blow to our Nation's economy at precisely that moment when the economy has been the most vulnerable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BAD DAY FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Today is a bad day for America. We just passed and witnessed the passing of a bill that will have dramatic impact on our lives and our way of life for years to come if it should ever see the President's signature.

One matter of process. At 3:08, 3:09 this morning the Democrat majority landed on the Internet a 300-plus page amendment to the already bloated bill that was passed. Apparently, the bragging on the thousands and thousands of hours of work and hearings and process that had gone into the development of the bill that was filed on Monday left it a little short of the mark. In spite of all those thousands of hours, they were unable to get it right. So they had to use a little fine-tuning with a 300-pager that was dropped this morning. So, that issue aside, Mr. Speaker, it is a bad bill.

Science, Mr. Speaker, is never settled. Take the example of Galileo as an example. The consensus science of his time was that the Earth was the center of the universe. The Roman Catholic Church believed it and all the scientists who you and I have no clue who their names are believed it as well.

Galileo, on the other hand, bucked the system. He said, No, in fact the Sun was the center of the universe. He spent the last years of his life under house arrest because he bucked the consensus science.

You and I both know that both the consensus side of that day and Galileo were wrong. Most on the other side believe that Washington, D.C., is the center of the universe. But that's a different conversation.

Science is never settled. We should continue to ask the question; we should continue to ask whatever it is that's out there.

The sense of urgency that the other side used to try to pass this bill the way they have done it evaporates and is quite muted when you look at the details: 25-year exemptions for certain energy companies to allow them to get their power plants in under the wire to get support for this bill. Even the Ag amendment delays for 6 years the implementation of some of the provisions that will devastate Ag. And so this sense of urgency seems to evaporate as well.

The cost of this bill will be thousands of jobs, as has already been said over and over. The empirical data is the Spanish experiment of the last 12 years. A report there on their greening of their economy shows that for every single green job created, that two private sector jobs were destroyed. Of the green jobs created, only one in 10 were permanent jobs.

Our own President has said that his cap-and-trade bill, which is the one that just passed, will cause electricity rates to skyrocket. Skyrocket, Mr. Speaker. That does not sound good when you're talking about the cost of a