

than reducing electricity rates. Whether the bill's additional layers of administration, oversight, and bureaucracy will be effective at preventing this from happening here is an experiment I would rather not impose on my constituents in western Wisconsin.

I am also concerned that the ACES bill is skewed against regions like mine that are rural and heavily dependent on coal for energy. The formula it establishes for doling out the free allowances to utilities provides more to those areas that need them the least—those that have a lot of zero-emission hydro or nuclear power—rather than those areas like Wisconsin that need the allowances because of their higher emissions. The federal government helped subsidize the hydro and nuclear plants in other parts of the country; ratepayers in my district should not have to send more money their way while we seek to realize the same low-carbon generation.

Finally, the bill allocates funds derived from consumers and spends it on such things as international deforestation, investments in technology, and wildlife adaptation. While these are worthwhile goals that will need to be addressed in the context of combating climate change, I do not think we should do so by putting an additional financial burden on those who can least afford it.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2757, the Consumer Assistance Rebate for Energy, or CARE, Act. This bill would have ensured that any money raised by the government as a result of climate change legislation would be given back to consumers directly to help them cope with any price increases for energy and consumer goods. The EPA stated in its analysis of the ACES bill that this type of approach is the least burdensome on low-income consumers, and that it achieves greenhouse gas reductions at a lower overall cost than the ACES system of free allowances to businesses and utilities.

While I wish my concerns about consumer protection had been addressed more fully in the bill before us, the legislation has changed for the better since being reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and there is enough in the bill to recommend it that I am willing to support its passage today so that it will move to the Senate where it can be improved further.

The American Clean Energy Security Act will live up to its name in many ways. It will transition our energy systems away from unsustainable, polluting fossil fuels and toward clean, renewable resources such as wind, solar, biomass, and hydrogen. It will provide an unprecedented investment in the technologies and industries of tomorrow, creating more than 4,000 jobs in my Congressional District alone, and millions nationwide.

America is the nation that invented solar cell technology decades ago, and the investments we make in the coming years will allow us to regain our leadership in the world and be the center of innovation and industry that will drive the clean energy revolution.

The bill also includes funding to help our natural resources, and fish and wildlife in particular, adapt to the changes in their habitat that have already begun.

Finally, the bill includes opportunities for farmers, ranchers, and foresters to be a part of the climate solution, which is critical for my district, where agriculture remains the largest industry. The USDA, in consultation with EPA,

will establish a program where businesses and utilities can meet their greenhouse gas obligations by paying farmers who help sequester carbon. This new revenue stream will be very important in helping the agriculture sector cope with higher costs for energy, fuel, and fertilizer.

Again, I wish we had had more time to deliberate on this extremely large and complex piece of legislation. I wish the bill contained more direct, more transparent ways of compensating consumers. I wish the bill treated regions equitably. But I support strong action on climate change and the creation of millions of new jobs, and I will vote to move this bill forward in the hope that the Senate will pass a bill that works better for more Americans.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2454, the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009.

I believe that climate change is occurring, and that increased greenhouse gas emissions have profoundly impacted our climate and our resources. To combat these changes, we need to develop a sustainable energy policy that will meet our energy needs today without compromising the ability of our children and grandchildren to meet their energy needs tomorrow.

For these reasons, I support a balanced energy plan that will increase our energy independence by promoting the development and deployment of 1) renewable domestic sources of energy, such as ethanol and biodiesel, and 2) technology that will use traditional fuels in a cleaner way, such as clean coal carbon capture and storage. These energy sources eventually may satisfy the needs of the entire country, but they are still being developed and expanded. We must ensure that Americans maintain access to affordable and reliable energy until these sources are broadly available.

I oppose H.R. 2454 because it does not provide a bridge for coal and other fossil fuels to develop and demonstrate new technologies to provide reliable energy and meet the necessary reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The timelines contained in this legislation do not provide sufficient time to put these technologies in place. Manufacturers and utility companies will be forced to stop using the affordable, abundant fuels they use today and transition to far more expensive energy sources. As a result, this bill will force our most affordable domestic energy source, coal, into extinction. Energy costs will skyrocket and workers will face layoffs and plant closures. American families cannot face these additional burdens during these difficult economic times.

In addition, we cannot ignore the fact that climate change is a global problem and requires a global solution. We must consider the consequences of enacting this legislation when other countries, like China and India, have not taken steps to reduce their own carbon emissions. Without some measure of equity on this issue, our emissions may appear to decrease, but they will simply shift overseas, taking jobs and industries with them.

Madam Speaker, I oppose H.R. 2454 because it does not do enough to bridge the transition to clean energy sources, to prevent spikes in electricity costs, to protect workers from new layoffs, or to provide a global solution to climate change. Quite simply, it is the wrong bill at the wrong time. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this measure.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2454, the so-called

American Clean Energy and Security Act. Throughout my time in Congress I have supported protecting America's environment and climate as well as incentives for clean alternative energy, including solar, wind, and biofuels. It is in our country's best interest environmentally, economically, and for our national security to transition away from imported oil to domestically available, renewable, and clean sources of alternative energy.

For instance, I have supported efforts by the City of St. Petersburg to power 40 of the city's parks entirely using a sustainable solar energy network which will allow these parks to be removed from the city's power grid.

In the 110th Congress I was a cosponsor of the Clean Energy Tax Stimulus Act of 2008. This measure would have provided for the continuation of eight clean energy production and efficiency tax benefits in order to incentivize important alternative energy investment and production.

I am also supportive of initiatives to require auto manufacturers to increase the fuel efficiency of the cars sold in America. In fact, in March I signed a letter to President Obama to urge him to take the strongest stand possible to increase the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards. Last Congress I was a cosponsor of the Fuel Economy Reform Act which would have raised CAFE standards to 35 miles per gallon over the next decade.

And I have long been supportive of protecting Florida's environment and our military's training needs by opposing offshore drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico.

I also believe in creating and supporting new green jobs. At the same time that we encourage conservation and the production of renewable resources, we must also help prepare Americans to work in these new green jobs. That is why I voted in favor of the Green Energy Education Act. This legislation would authorize funds to be made available to support advanced energy and green building training and graduate programs throughout the country.

Despite my support for clean energy and a clean environment, I must oppose this cap and trade legislation which will impose increased costs on American citizens who have done nothing wrong. At a time when the people of Pinellas County and our nation are hurting, it is incomprehensible that the House will knowingly approve legislation that will impose a new energy tax on American citizens, will put American companies at a competitive disadvantage, and will endanger the jobs of American workers.

Supporters of this legislation have tried to claim that the cap and trade scheme will only cost some negligible amount, a postage stamp per day or \$15 per month. They claim that a report by the Congressional Budget Office backs up this statement. However, if you actually take the time to read the CBO's report, you will understand that this is simply not true. The analysis only includes one limited portion of the 1,201 page bill. The analysis does not include the effects from the lower incomes and lost jobs that the CBO predicts will occur. The analysis does not include the effects from the decreased retirement accounts that will be realized as the value of stocks decline, as the CBO predicts. The analysis does not include the increased costs of producing goods in the United States, as the CBO predicts. In short, to say that this legislation will not hurt American families is simply misleading.

If this legislation is signed into law, energy costs are going to rise. Even the President acknowledges that electricity rates are going to “necessarily skyrocket.” Britain’s Taxpayer Alliance estimates that families there are paying \$1,300 more in taxes after the implementation of a similar program only a few short years ago. In drafting this legislation, proposals were offered to suspend the cap and trade program if gas prices rose above \$5 per gallon, if electricity prices rose by 10 percent, or if the unemployment rate hits an unthinkable 15 percent. All three of these sensible ideas were voted down by supporters of this bill. All Americans will be impacted by these higher energy prices, but the hardest hit will be the low income and the many of my constituents are seniors who live on fixed incomes.

I do not think that I need to remind any of my colleagues of the energy crisis of last summer. I remember all too well the stories from my constituents of the difficulty they had in dealing with \$4 per gallon gasoline. However, a study conducted by the American Petroleum Institute has found that the impact from this legislation will add an additional 77 cents to the price of a gallon of gasoline, and even higher costs for critical diesel fuel. In the last two years alone more than 5,000 trucking companies with at least five trucks went out of business, costing a countless number of jobs. Is this really the type of result we want?

Inexplicably, this legislation would spend seven percent of the cap and trade allowances—paid for by American consumers—in foreign countries. Let me repeat that: this bill will send \$302 billion U.S. tax dollars under cap and trade to foreign countries. Most of this money is set aside to plant trees. The Congressional Budget Office has said that “the allowances spent overseas would impose a net cost on U.S. households: They would bear the cost of the allowances but would not receive the value.”

The cap and trade scheme also creates a new tradable commodity that Wall Street investors will be able to buy and manipulate. The pollution allowances will be traded and sold on the open market to the highest bidder. Companies who will be forced to buy these to provide necessary energy and products will pass on these costs to consumers. Even worse, this bill sets a minimum price for which the allowances can be sold for, not a maximum price to prevent the fleecing of American consumers. After the financial collapse of last year, we should not allow Wall Street speculators and commodity traders to hold the American people hostage in this way. I thought the purpose of this legislation was to protect the environment, not to help Wall Street get richer.

Also included in this bill is a one-size-fits-all nationwide renewable energy standard that favors certain regions of the country at the expense of others. It is estimated that residents in Florida will be forced to pay an additional \$339 million in their energy bills within only a few years, while the residents of some states in the northeast and the west coast will be heavily subsidized. Fundamentally, I believe that the federal government must get out of the business of picking winners and losers.

These are just some of the things that we actually know are in the bill. But there is no way for Members to understand everything that is included. The bill itself is 1,201 pages that few, if any of us have read. Then only this

morning, the Democrat leadership unveiled and added on a 309 page manager’s amendment. The Washington Post says that this is a “1,201 page measure filled with political compromises, directives, subsidies and selections of winners and losers that members won’t be able to analyze before the vote and that leaves us wondering how effective it will be.” The St. Petersburg Times, which supports the legislation, admits that the bill is “imperfect”, “not ideal,” and that it includes “weasel language.” Even the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee COLIN PETERSON, who was one of the principal negotiators of the final bill that we are discussing today, said, “The truth is, nobody knows for sure how this is going to work.” Despite the importance of this issue, only one amendment has been allowed to even be considered by the House. The fact of the matter is, this legislation sets emission standards from now until 2050, and will affect our American way of life even further out from there. The initial reaction from my constituents in Pinellas County is that there is no need to rush through this process without understanding the effect on our nation the over the next 40 years. About 80 percent of the calls and e-mails that I have received have opposed this cap and trade bill.

We all agree that the United States must begin the transition to domestically available, renewable, and clean sources of energy. We should work to make it easier for this change to happen, and it is appropriate for the government to provide incentives, not penalties, on those who do the right thing by investing in new sources of energy. We can do this by following in the tradition of the Manhattan Project, where the United States government brought our best and brightest minds together to create the atomic bomb to win World War II. The New Manhattan Project for Energy Independence, which my colleagues and I will have an opportunity to support, will provide funding for American universities, scientists, and inventors to come together and create more energy efficient and affordable cars, buildings, advanced power plants, advanced biofuels, and carbon capturing technology to help clean our air. This can be accomplished without imposing new tax increases on the American people while taking the steps necessary to secure a clean and secure future. We can take this important step by including Democrats and Republicans working together, rather than refusing to even consider suggestions from Republican members or even letting us know of details of this cap and trade bill as it was being written.

This is the right way to approach our future energy and environmental needs. The wrong way is to punish average American citizens simply for going about their everyday lives—picking their children up from school, starting a small business, keeping their family cool in the summer and warm in the winter, or trying to make ends meet. And that’s who this bill taxes and punishes.

Madam Speaker, if this was truly an energy bill, there is little doubt in my mind that both sides could come together, as we have done so many times in the past, to find a bipartisan solution that will help this country move in the right direction and reduce our dependence on imported oil, lower our energy costs, and reduce carbon emissions without punishing American families. Unfortunately, this legislation only amounts to imposing a new burden

on the American people at a time when they are already overburdened and I cannot support what the Wall Street Journal has called “the biggest tax in American history.” Let’s vote this down so we can go back and work together and do what’s right for America.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I stand for the creation of new American jobs, for less dependence on foreign energy, and for a reduction in the carbon pollution that causes global warming.

This bill is about national security, creating jobs in a new energy economy, and defending consumers through a fiscally responsible bill with consumer protections.

These investments will also spur new jobs. The Political Economy Research Institute estimates that 3.5 jobs will be created in the new green job sector for every 1 job that is fossil fuel source based in Florida. This could mean over 94,000 jobs in Florida alone.

Too often our foreign policy decisions are affected by the regional stability of oil producing countries. In Iraq we are paying for our oil-centric obsession and Floridians have paid over \$37 billion for the war there. This legislation offers incentives that promote energy efficiency and that will break our addiction to foreign oil. We must be focused on research and development for green technologies and end the obsession with crude oil that is fueling too much of our economy.

The bill is not perfect—few landmark bills are. Once the Senate takes up the bill later this year, this bill will be further improved and will address the shortcomings that exist in this version. My mission will be to ensure that the final legislation that is passed will include the necessary consumer protections to minimize price increases.

We cannot wait to act on climate change legislation. Florida is already experiencing eroding shorelines, flooding and dying coral reefs. In particular, the Everglades face severely altered water flows and harmful invasive species. This will also have a devastating impact on Florida’s economy. In 2007, tourists flocking to Florida’s beaches and other priceless environmental areas spent over \$65 billion in Florida.

Without aggressively capping carbon emissions, the earth’s temperature will continue to rise, causing more extreme storms and altered ocean conditions which will have a devastating effect on Florida’s ecosystem.

The American Clean Energy and Security Act (ACES) works to minimize price increases for consumers. On average the EPA estimates that this bill will cost an average household \$98 to \$140 per year in price increases, while holding those in the lowest income quintile harmless.

Without carbon emissions caps, we have seen energy prices fluctuate drastically. By regulating carbon intensive goods and creating a transparent market this bill will help to stabilize those prices and help protect consumers.

By investing in conservation, efficiency and renewables, Florida residents will see lower costs in energy through building weatherization improvement benefits, and energy efficiency savings.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Speaker, as most of my colleague know by this point, I’m an oil man.

Always have been.

Always will be.