

abruptly is just not possible. We should pursue ways to clean it up. That includes sequestering carbon.

My State of Wyoming has the most advanced carbon sequestration laws in the country, which say that the pores under the surface where carbon can be sequestered—or captured and secured—belong to the surface owner, and that liability for the escape of hydrocarbons that are introduced into those pores are on the companies that put that carbon in the ground. So that creates a mechanism that other States are looking at right now, including Montana and others that are following Wyoming's lead.

In addition, we need to produce from coal liquid products that burn less. In addition, we need more nuclear energy. As we know, nuclear energy is not a carbon emitter, and it is producing 20 percent of our electricity now. So we absolutely cannot take nuclear energy off the table. It's very important that we add more nuclear.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, Congresswoman LUMMIS, what you're saying is really exciting. You're talking about what the Republicans have been pushing for now and since I've been here, which has been since 2001. It's an all-of-the-above strategy. It's saying let's let freedom work. Just get out of the way, and let's start developing hydrogen. If we've got places we ought to drill for oil, then do that. Fine. If we've got to do coal, let's figure out if you're going to sequester it or not. If we need nuclear and if you're really worried about that percentage of CO₂—I mean if you're really serious about that, then why not embrace the number 1 technology that doesn't make any CO₂, which is nuclear? We're saying do all of these things. Let the free marketplace work and let freedom basically run. Let American innovation—and let the resources that God gave us on this land—work, and we will have energy.

You know, there's an ironic thing that is just absolutely crazy about government. Do you know why the Department of Energy was created years and years ago? This is kind of a quiz question if any of my colleagues happen to know the answer. Why did we create the Department of Energy?

Dr. BROUN from Georgia, do you know why we created the Department of Energy?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Absolutely. It was created to make America energy independent.

Mr. AKIN. What has happened since we've created it, Congressman?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, it has not made America energy independent whatsoever.

Mr. AKIN. We are less that way.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. We are less.

Mr. AKIN. What has happened to the number of employees in the Department of Energy?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It has skyrocketed. They're really not fulfilling the obligation that they have under the charter of developing the Depart-

ment of Energy, so they've been an abject failure at what they were charged to do.

Mr. AKIN. In fact, you could almost say it's of inverse proportion. The more people they've hired and the bigger it has gotten, the more dependent we have become on foreign energy. That doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

I want to thank Congresswoman LUMMIS, and I also want to get back to Judge CARTER here.

I want to give you a chance to take a look at some of these things. We've got, I think, only just about another 5 minutes or so.

Mr. CARTER. First, if they're not doing their job, we ought to fire them. That's just really easy, okay?

Mr. AKIN. I think that was pretty straightforward. If they don't do the job, fire them.

Mr. CARTER. That's simple stuff. If they're not doing what we hired them to do, we've got to fire them.

Mr. AKIN. Now, Ronald Reagan wanted to close the department down.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. AKIN. Is that what you're advocating?

Mr. CARTER. That's fine. I don't have a problem with that at all, but let's get back to what we're doing.

You know, there's an old saying: "I won't tax you and I won't tax me. I'll tax that fellow behind the tree," okay? That's kind of what we heard from the Obama administration when we started off: Don't worry. Ninety-five percent of the people in America are not going to be taxed by this administration. Yet, as my colleague from Georgia said, there's not anything you can think of that doesn't have an energy cost in it. Nothing. I mean it's in everything. So I don't care how rich you are or how poor you are. You're going to be taxed by this.

Now, don't give me the excuse of, well, we're just taxing the company, and they're taxing you. That doesn't work. Everybody knows where this tax is going. They know it in the administration, and we know it in Congress. It's going to us, to the individual Americans, and we're going to pay this tax. Look at that. Shoes. Plastic. Food. Electricity. Housing. All that.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, these are all different places. If you're going to have to use it up, it's going to cost you \$1,900 per household just for the first year of this tax. This just tells you what you'd have to give up to save that money to pay that tax. This one here is all of the meat, poultry, fish, eggs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables that a family eats in 1 year.

□ 2030

That's what you've got to give up to compensate for this tax that's being proposed. Or, maybe you don't want to do that. You want to give up this—all furniture, appliances, carpet, and other furnishings. You can give that up for 1 year.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman would yield for just a minute. On that food

thing, you have forgotten the next tax they're coming up with is the flatulence tax on cows.

Mr. AKIN. Are you going to collect that in bags, gentlemen?

Mr. CARTER. Ask our farmers if they like that idea.

Mr. AKIN. I think we're getting close on time, but the good news is my good friend, Congressman KING from Iowa, is here. I think he is going to continue talking on the same subject. I think he might be willing to recognize some of the other Congressmen that want to weigh in on this absolutely crazy sort of tax system that's being proposed.

The funny thing is that, just to conclude, this chart right here, this is something the Democrats have been unwilling to deal with or talk about. But, see this little card? There's a little plastic thing here and there's a thing inside there that's the size of two mechanical pencil erasers. There's enough nuclear energy in that little pill right there to equal 149 gallons of oil, 1 ton of coal, or 17,000 cubic feet of natural gas. That's how much energy is in that one little tablet. Maybe we ought to be thinking about real technology.

Thank you all for joining me this evening.

AMERICA'S ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Iowa is pleased to be recognized to address you tonight in this 60-minute period of time.

Having recognized that the gentleman from Missouri was in the middle of a statement, and having recognized that there were gentlemen here on the floor, along with the gentleman from Wyoming, that are still full of information that America needs to hear, Mr. Speaker, I will just simply set the stage with a very short piece of this—and that is that I think we need to have the smoothest of transitions from Special Order to Special Order, and that would require that I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) who was in the middle of a statement when his 60-minute clock ran out.

Mr. AKIN. I thank you very much, gentlemen. Congressman KING is known for the Opportunity Society that he chairs. He brought in a speaker just a matter of a couple of weeks ago, an economist from Spain, talking about the exact same thing that's being proposed here in America. In fact, the President has referred to Spain as a great example of what we should do. And he informed us that it's a great example if you like 17½ percent unemployment.

What he described was—one of the things that was just amazing to me in terms of the contradiction that's involved was, they closed down nuclear

power plants in Spain because they're worried about CO₂. Yet, nuclear power plants don't make any CO₂ at all.

In fact, the chart next to my good friend from Iowa there, the chart is a blowup of that little tiny card in the top left corner that's clipped on there. That little tiny pellet that's the size of two pencil erasers, if you have a couple of those, it takes just—let's see, if you have two of those, it takes all of the energy you need to heat your house for 1 year. Two of those little tiny pellets. Yet, you're talking about two times 149 gallons of oil or 2 tons of coal or the equivalent of two times 17,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

And so if you're really serious about stopping CO₂, aside from the flatulence of the sheep in Australia and all, look, nuclear is clearly the logical thing for us to do.

If you could pop the next chart up there, too. These are the sources of emission-free electricity. If you take a look at it, nuclear right now, that's making no CO₂ emissions, is 73 percent. Yet, there's no discussion at all about what is going to be done with nuclear. That just seems to be—I mean, what we are really talking about is just a good excuse to tax people. And I'm afraid.

I don't want to ramble on too far, but it seems so odd that Spain would basically shut down nuclear in the name of trying to protect against CO₂. I mean the engineer in me just says these people have drunk some kind of Kool-Aid.

The thing that was frightening—and I will conclude with this—about the Spanish system, was that the country sold off licenses to people to make their clean energy that was solar and wind. And the government would guarantee you a really high rate of electricity if you bought solar panels if you bought one of these licenses.

So the people would give these licenses. You've got all these people with licenses. They're buying solar panels and windmills. As they do that, they feed that electricity into the grid, and they get paid a good chunk of change for it, which then of course is then passed on to the taxpayers.

They have had a 30 percent increase in electric rates in the last couple of years for the consumer. But for industry, in a year and a half, it's been a 100 percent increase. Here's the bad thing. When the wind and the solar don't cooperate, they tell the aluminum manufacturer, they tell the steel manufacturer, Shut your plant down.

Guess what those aluminum and steel manufacturers are doing? They're moving out of Spain. That's why they have got a 17½ percent unemployment over there.

And so I don't think we really want to follow Spain's example. They create this system where now, politically, they can't put the genie back in the bottle because you have all these people on the take and you politically can't say we're going to take away your lucrative business of making all

of this electricity because they bought windmills and solar panels which don't work when the sun isn't shining or the wind isn't blowing.

It's a really amazing thing. I sure hope America doesn't go down this big old tax thing. I yield back to my good friend from Iowa and your leadership.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thanking the gentleman from Missouri, and reclaiming my time, I would add to the statement he's made—and I'm quite impressed with the attention the gentleman must have paid at that presentation that morning—but to look at the situation in Spain, the highest unemployment in the industrialized world; 17½ percent, as the gentleman from Missouri has said. Over 100 percent increase in industries' electricity costs, and the idea that 20 percent of the electricity in Spain is generated by wind, which pushes up against the threshold of anybody in the country, anybody in the world that lays out these standards.

If you could produce 20 percent of your electricity by wind, that's way up against the threshold because we know that wind doesn't blow all the time. It lays down often at night, it doesn't always blow when you need the electricity. You have to have backup systems, you have to have gas-fired generators that can be fired up to take care of that demand when the wind is not blowing.

But, additionally, another statement that the gentleman from Missouri didn't make is how the Sicilian Mafia stepped in and was engaged in the brokering of licenses that determined who would be building the wind generation plants in Spain and the companies that would be building them and the inefficiencies that came from that, let alone the corruption that came from it.

Whenever you have government involved in brokering out licenses that has to do with who's going to be providing something that's not demanded by the market, I think exposes a great flaw in this. And the government of Spain about 7 or 8 years ago decided they wanted to be the world's leader in renewable energy. They set about going down that path.

Following that path to become the world's leader in renewable energy, they achieved it. But they also achieved the highest unemployment in the industrialized world—17½ half percent—a 100 percent increase in industries' electricity costs. They brought in the Mafia from Sicily, the Sicilian Mafia, that would be brokering the licenses along with some people in Spain, I'm convinced, and now they have a situation that so many people are bought into it that they can't step away and say that was a colossal mistake, and if we're going to save the economy of Spain, we have to pull the plug on this renewable energy idea.

This greenest of countries in the industrialized world, Spain, has the most stressed economy in the industrialized world and, in big part, because they have bought into this vast green concept of American energy.

So, as we flow with this, I see a posture of eagerness on the part of the gentlelady from Wyoming, Mrs. LUMMIS.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Mr. KING. You do such a nice job of laying out these issues. I want to thank Mr. AKIN for including me in his last hour as well.

The chart that was just placed up on the board illustrates something that is a new phenomenon in terms of the debate about renewable energies that I had not heard before arriving here in Washington—and that is objection by the environmental community to something called industrial-scale wind farms and industrial-scale solar farms.

So even the advocates of renewable energy in terms of wind and solar are saying, Yes, we embrace wind energy and solar energy, but we do not want them done in industrial scale because it consumes so much land, it creates view sheds that have too many wind turbines on it, too many solar panels on it, and that we don't want them.

And we are seeing efforts by Members of Congress when, coupled with environmental groups, to prevent large-scale wind farms and large-scale solar facilities in deserts and in areas where one might think would be appropriate for wind and solar, such as places where the wind blows and the sun shines. But, nevertheless, the problem seems to be the industrial scale that is being proposed for these facilities.

Well, as you and I know, Mr. KING, unless you do these on industrial scales, you can't possibly promote them as a larger component of our industrial energy mix. In fact, if you blanketed the entire State of Ohio with wind turbines, it would produce annually the equivalent amount of energy as one square mile of Wyoming coal.

Now, Wyoming coal comes in square miles, which is very unusual for those of you from the East who are used to underground mines. We have something called surface mines, where you may have 30 to 100 feet of overburden, which is essentially the soil on top of the coal. And then you will uncover 100-foot coal seams. They are 100 feet level of coal, with no striations of anything but coal in between.

So all you have to do is scrape off and save the overburden—the soil—pile it up, recover the coal, scoop it out, load it in trucks, load it in rail cars, and then put the top soil back in the same contours as it was before you began mining, reclaim the surface to a condition that is equivalent to or superior to the condition of the surface of the ground before you even began to recover the coal, and put it back to normal with ground for sage grouse, for rabbits, for snakes, and perfect, perfect ground cover.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. LUMMIS. So it is a wonderful resource.

Mr. KING of Iowa. For snakes?

Mrs. LUMMIS. Snakes and rabbits. They seem to go together. I was at a

field hearing 2 weeks ago for the Natural Resources Committee. We toured solar facilities in California. We were in Representative MARY BONO MACK's district and Representative JERRY LEWIS' district. We were on a Marine base at Twenty-Nine Palms with my committee cochairman, JIM COSTA, who is from California as well.

We got to tour their solar facilities. And they are about to put at a Marine base at Twenty-Nine Palms 240 acres of an abandoned lake bed—it is dry, there's absolutely nothing on it—in solar panels. And they will be able to do that in a way that improves the makeup, the mix of renewable and unrenewable resources on that base that will make it the leading base in the whole Marine system for renewables, because they have wind, solar, and some geothermal.

But they probably could not pull that off if they were not on a nearly 600,000-acre military base, because if you try to move that same facility onto public lands in the desert, you encounter environmental group resistance to having large solar and wind projects, industrial scale.

□ 2045

So there's nowhere to go without offending someone in this country. Oil and gas development offshore on the Outer Continental Shelf would be a magnificent resource for us, but there are environmental groups that have testified against that. Industrial-scale wind and solar on deserts in California, groups are testifying against that. Nuclear, groups are testifying against that. Any hydrocarbon, groups are testifying against that. Coal, there are groups saying there's no such thing as clean coal.

We have to meet our energy needs as human beings, and there are ways to do it by using all of the resources we've discussed in moderation. That is the Republican response to this issue. To do it cleaner, do it better, do it with all of the resources that we have at our disposal in America; disengage from our need for foreign oil, because that is a national security issue, and produce our own energy, our own security. Do it in a more environmentally sensitive manner, but don't diminish our standard of living at the time we do it because it falls more seriously on working-class Americans and poor Americans than it does on rich Americans when we do something like our national energy tax, which is proposed under the name of cap-and-tax.

Thank you very much for including me in your discussion this evening, and I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming.

It occurs to me that if this Congress is to have a nuclear carbon footprint—I remember the Speaker when she was, let me say, sworn into the third-highest constitutional office in the United States of America, third in line for the

presidency, she concluded that this Capitol Complex was going to be carbon neutral, which means greenhouse gas neutral, which means CO₂ gas neutral. And having a look at the generating equipment that produces the lights that illuminates us tonight, Mr. Speaker, it occurred to the gentlelady, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, that she would need to make a correction that would make it consistent with her left coast constituents. So it went on the Board of Trade and carbon credits were purchased at a cost to the American taxpayers of \$89,000 to buy these credits that were designed to pay people to change their behavior that was contributing to the greenhouse gas, CO₂, and the atmosphere over all of God's creation. That \$89,000 was invested in two areas. I checked this out, and I went to visit some of the sites. One of them was no-till farmers in South Dakota. They were no-till farmers before they got the check. They were no-till farmers after they got the check. If they actually tilled the ground afterwards, the carbon escaped anyway. So if they sell the farm, somebody comes in, puts a disk or a plow to it, it will go back into the atmosphere. So the sequestration was nullo, shall we say. That was the no-till farmers in South Dakota. There was also a nice check that was written to an electrical generating plant in Chillicothe, Iowa, that was to pay them to burn switchgrass in place of coal in order to make the CO₂ emissions carbon neutral as opposed to contributing to the CO₂ in the atmosphere, which would come from the net consumption of coal. Well, I don't know. This is a pretty interesting thing. So I went to Chillicothe, Iowa, and I visited the generating plant. I went into these buildings that were full of the switchgrass hay they had purchased several years earlier, at the cost to the Federal taxpayer and a government grant, the equipment to run these big round bails, 1,500-pound switchgrass bails, through a hammermill to chew them up into little itty-bitty pieces, to spit them into the incinerator and blend them with the coal dust that would come from the grinding of the coal that would allow it to combust at the most efficient rate. This switchgrass that was going to be carbon neutral had been burned to generate electricity a couple years earlier, but—here is something I know—when I'm looking at a shed full of switchgrass brown bails, and it's covered with coon manure—not cow flatulence but coon manure—they probably haven't burned much of that hay in a long time.

So the conclusion that one can draw was actually, 2 years earlier was when they shut down the switchgrass burning technique, but yet they were paid to burn the switchgrass and to do this carbon-neutral approach. So we have 89,000 taxpayer dollars invested in purchasing carbon credits to provide carbon-neutral emissions for the Capitol Complex, to buy these carbon credits

on the Board of Trade in Chicago, to encourage people to do more things that are more conducive to the environment and produce less CO₂ than they would have otherwise. I couldn't verify that anybody changed their behavior whatsoever for \$89,000. I can tell you, if somebody wrote me a check for \$89,000, I would at least consume less energy, let alone produce that energy in a more environmentally friendly fashion.

So that's the result of cap-and-trade that is being proposed by the Energy and Commerce Committee today and probably tomorrow and hopefully the next day and the next day and the next day ad infinitum until they decide that the science doesn't support this and the economics doesn't support it. But that comes to mind for me. And, by the way, the electricity that we consume in Iowa, a lot of it comes out of the Powder River Basin in Wyoming. I have been up there to look at that, where you could put a school bus in the bucket of the drag line. I'm still a little confused about square miles versus cubic miles of coal, but I know they have a lot of it in the Powder River Basin. I'm glad to have the power, and I appreciate the rail lines that come down. I really don't want captive shipping going on, but I appreciate the connection we have along with the renewable energy that comes out of the Missouri River and the seven dams that are on the Missouri River and the hydroelectric power that comes, which is carbon neutral, Madam Speaker. Our hydroelectric is carbon neutral but it does not get credit for being renewable energy because Bobby Kennedy Jr. and others think that however the rivers were is how they ought to be reverted back to and that we can't improve upon Mother Nature. I think God gave us these natural resources, and he's given us the ability to improve upon them. We've done so in many cases, and we should do so into the future.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the Secretary of our conference, Judge CARTER, as much time as he may consume.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend from Iowa.

As I listened to that story about switchgrass and that we paid those people money, I don't have anything against them, but it sure sounds like the inmates are running the asylum around here. I mean, I think anybody that heard that story would think, Good Lord, those people are crazy. I really want to say again—and I've said this before—if you're trying to stop CO₂, and I'm throwing off a bunch of CO₂ in my company, and I can go out and buy some carbon credits from you who happens to be running a real good clean company, I still keep putting the stuff in the atmosphere, right? I haven't cleaned up my act. I mean, they put a cap on me. I'm not meeting the cap, and I just bought an excuse. Kind of like Al Gore with his 100,000-foot house—or whatever it is he's got,

or two or three houses—he said, Oh, that's all right. I buy carbon credits. He's still putting the stuff up there in the air.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time for a moment, I would point out that the carbon credits are the modern-day equivalent of the reason that Martin Luther came forward and nailed his positions up on the Diet of Worms which is, the church was selling indulgences. Carbon credits are indulgences that allow a company to pay for the carbon emissions that they're emitting into the atmosphere. I think that's what the judge is talking about.

Mr. CARTER. I think indulgence is a perfect word because you are allowing the dirty people to indulge in staying dirty by paying for it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. For a price.

Mr. CARTER. Under this ingenious government program we have got now, all they're doing is just paying more taxes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Sin tax.

Mr. CARTER. It is a sin tax. That's exactly right. It's a sin tax. It is ludicrous to think it's going to reduce any carbon, CO₂ that goes into the atmosphere. Because as long as a guy wants to pay the taxes, he's in business. Let's face it, if I'm the guy that's paying the sin credit, the indulgence, well, if I can pass it on down to the neighbors down the street in their bill, that's where it's going to go. So those poor slobs are paying the tax. Why should I worry about it? Why is that going to keep me from putting CO₂ into the atmosphere? This is insanity, but that's where we are.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Passing it on to the consumer is what this is about. We have seen the numbers that show that an MIT professor has done the calculation on the costs of the proposal on this cap-and-tax that's out before this Congress and put a macronumber on the cost to our economy. Then some ingenious people who just simply took the average number of persons in a household, which is calculated to be 2.54, and divided that into the overall cost to our economy, the increased cost of energy that has to do with cap-and-tax. They concluded that each household would see their energy costs go up annually by \$3,128 a year. Then the professor at MIT said, Oh, wait a minute. I'm real sorry I released the number because I don't like the result of the conclusion that came about because of the division of the numbers of persons in a household and the cost per household that would be the increase in the cost of all of our energy, electrical, our heat, our gas bill, our gasoline bill and our fuel oil and all of those things that are required to keep each household going. That's what's going on here. This is almost to the point where it's a religion that believes in something that isn't based upon a science. Now I'm great with faith, but I'm not so good with faith that's based upon pseudo-science.

I would ask the Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROWN, another one of my friends and colleagues.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this whole cap-and-tax philosophy is a hoax. It's a hoax. It's a hoax on the American people, and it's a hoax because it's giving a promise that cannot be fulfilled. We are promised by the Democrats that this is going to create green jobs. Going back to what the gentleman from Spain said as Mr. AKIN and you, Mr. KING, were talking about, he said it cost jobs. Going back to the figure that you put out, Mr. KING, they had an unemployment rate of 17.5 percent because of their cap-and-tax, cap-and-trade policy that they put in place. The experts have looked at our economy, at our job market, and we're being promised green jobs. But the experts say that for every single green job that's produced, we're going to lose 2.2 other jobs, a net loss of 1.2 jobs for every job created in this false promise, this empty promise of creating jobs.

Now to buy off some certain groups, particularly the retirees and the poor people, they're going to give—who knows what, refundable tax credits—the President and Mr. WAXMAN and others are promising to give more money to the poor people to take care of this higher tax, higher food cost, higher cost for all goods and services. Where's that going to come from? It's going to steal from my grandchildren. It's stealing from their future. Don't be fooled by this hoax, by all the smoke and mirrors, by all this promise because it's not going to do anything but cost jobs. It's going to create a higher cost of living for everybody, and it's going to put us in a deeper recession, maybe even a depression if we continue down this road. Republicans have offered amendment after amendment in the committee, but they've been defeated by the Democrats. Amendments to even just stop this from going into place if the gas taxes or gas costs go too high or if electric prices go too high or if other prices go too high for the American people. But the Democrats have voted uniformly not to accept those amendments over and over again.

Congresswoman LUMMIS from Wyoming talked very eloquently about some of the ideas that Republicans are producing. The American people are told that the Republican Party is the Party of No. Well, I agree with that. We are the Party of No, but the know is K-N-O-W. We know how to solve this economic downturn. We know how to solve some of the financing problems in health care. We know how to create an all-of-the-above solution to the energy problem to make America energy independent.

□ 2100

But the Speaker of the House has been an obstructionist. She has been an obstructionist and not allowed any idea that we have proposed for all these things to stimulate the economy, to solve the problem we had with the housing market and to solve the banking problem. We have not been allowed. All of our ideas have been blocked by the leadership of this House and the leadership of the Senate.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would just ask: Have all of your ideas been blocked? How does this work? Can't you offer an amendment that would put up a recorded vote and tell America where you stand? What prevents you from at least telling America where you stand so that they can evaluate the votes of people on both sides of the aisle and make their decision in November of 2010? What is the obstruction there?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely. And I have offered an amendment to the non-stimulus bill. I offered an amendment that said, let's bail out the American people instead of bailing out all these favorable groups, the payback groups. In fact, the Democrats were bent on spending \$835 billion of our grandchildren's and children's future. I said, if we are going to do that, let's really do something that stimulates the economy. Let's send that money to the legal resident taxpayers in this country. And I introduced an amendment that would have sent a check for almost \$9,000 per legal resident taxpayer. A couple would have gotten \$18,000. That would have stimulated the economy because they would have paid off credit card bills. They would have saved it. They would have bought education or food.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would yield, then why didn't I see that amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives and have an opportunity to send a message to my constituents about how I would like to see this economy managed? Is there a reason that blocked that from coming to the floor?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely. And I thank you for asking because that is exactly what I was referring to. Every single idea, my idea as well as many others, have been blocked. They have been obstructed. My amendment was considered not to be valid. And they just totally would not allow my amendment to even be considered on this floor.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the Rules Committee, which is up there on the third floor, meets without the benefit of television cameras and often without the benefit of the news media even reporting it. They can decide whether your idea can be heard on the floor of the House of Representatives. And often the Rules Committee decides that your idea will not be heard and it will not see the light of day. Is that correct?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. You are absolutely correct, Mr. KING. That is exactly what has happened. That is what has happened over and over again. And I want to remind the gentleman from Iowa, my dear friend, that over and over again, we see these bills come to the floor with what is called a closed rule. Now we know here in the House what that means. That means we cannot amend the bill. They will not accept our amendments. They have their bills shoved down the throats of the American people. That is the reason I'm calling what is going on here a steamroller of socialism. That is being shoved down the throats of the American people and strangling the American economy.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Am I hearing that the Speaker of the House of the Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, is the one who has the power and does decide what will be voted on on the floor of the House of Representatives, and the people of America have no access to being able to know what your position is or what the position is of Democrats and Republicans because it is being blocked by the Speaker and by the Rules Committee? That is how I understand that.

And I would yield to the gentleman from Texas to clarify that point.

Mr. CARTER. Let me make this very clear. The Rules Committee is the Speaker's committee. The Speaker decides who is on the Rules Committee. So this Rules Committee is an arm of the Speaker's committee. Like one of my Democratic colleagues who went before the Rules Committee said just the other day, he was sort of nervous until he went in and he counted one, two, three, four, five, six; one, two, three, four, oh, I think I'm going to win because there are six Democrats and four Republicans. But the Speaker chooses that committee. They answer to the Speaker. And the chairman is set by the Speaker.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would make also three additional points to this process.

Mr. Speaker, the American people don't care about process. But I'm about to address process again. It has been raised by the gentleman from Georgia and addressed by the gentleman from Texas. And I will say this, that not only do we have a Rules Committee that decides what the American people get to know about the opinions by recorded vote here on the floor of the House of Representatives, because no matter what kind of logical improvement that may come to perfect legislation from the minds and hearts of the American people, as brought through the minds and hearts of their elected representatives, if the Speaker's Rules Committee doesn't think it is a good idea for that debate to take place, let alone the vote to take place, it will not happen, Mr. Speaker. That is what happens here in the House of Representatives. It is a distorted process. And the rules regulate how much, what is going

to be heard, what is going to be debated and what is going to be voted on here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And so I think that that is an educational process that needs to take place. And as I have gone before the Rules Committee, and I have found out that no matter how good my idea is, I actually have come down to the floor here and into the RECORD, it is a matter of record, I have said that we need to get television cameras up there so at least the American people can see the behavior of the Rules Committee carte blanche wiping out good idea after good idea.

Additionally, it isn't just the Rules Committee. It is the full committee process. And I can think of three occasions, Mr. Speaker, where the committee chair has either allowed his staff, or directed his staff, to change a bill after it passed out of committee to go to the floor. And I can think of the case of the stimulus package where there was a 12-hour markup in Energy and Commerce, the ranking member, former chairman, JOE BARTON, was livid that they spent 12 hours marking up, writing, trying to amend and seeking to perfect legislation that was the stimulus package that was initiated at the request of the President, having seen that bill finally pass out of the Energy and Commerce Committee and come to the Rules Committee and come to this floor in a different form, the committee had no say in the end. It was a mock markup in Energy and Commerce.

Subsequent to that, the bankruptcy bill came out of the Judiciary Committee, where I sit and where Judge CARTER and I used to sit arm to arm. I offered an amendment that would set up special provisions for people who went bankrupt because of their house mortgages. I offered an amendment that would have exempted those who have fraudulently misrepresented their income, their assets or the appraisal of the property. It would have exempted them from relief under the bankruptcy bill. That amendment was passed in the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 21-3. After the bill passed out of the Judiciary Committee, the language was changed before it came to the floor.

Then just a little over 1 week ago, on the Financial Services Committee, there was an amendment offered by MICHELE BACHMANN of Minnesota. I think she is Minnesota Number 5. And that amendment would have exempted any proceeds of the bill from going to ACORN, an organization that had been indicted and was under investigation by the Federal Government for election fraud. And that amendment passed unanimously out of the Financial Services Committee. It should have come to the floor as part of the bill. It was totally changed, I believe, at the direction of the chairman of the Financial Services Committee to limit it to only those companies that had been actually convicted of fraud, not those that had admitted to fraudulently filing over 400,000 voter registration forms.

This process is corrupted, Mr. Speaker, and it is because the process doesn't work. If it can change after it comes out of the committee, if it can change out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, if it can change out of the Judiciary Committee, if it can be changed at the direction of the chairman out of the Financial Services Committee, and if the Rules Committee can decide and the Speaker can direct them to decide what comes to this floor, then the American people don't even have the benefit of the debate, let alone the opportunity to improve and perfect legislation, which is a provision by our Founding Fathers.

And I would yield to the gentleman from Georgia to reiterate my point.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. KING, for bringing this up. The American people need to understand this. And I think this is something that you made very clear. What they did is all of your hard work, and all of Energy and Commerce's hard work, was just thrown in the trash can. And who was involved in doing that? It was the leadership of this House. It was thrown in the trash can. It didn't go through the normal process, normal "order" as we call it here. It was thrown in the trash can. And something else was produced by just a very small handful of people. And we had no way of changing that, no way of amending it and no way of doing anything with it. It was shoved down our throats.

That is an oligarchy type of rule. It is a dictatorial manner of running things. And the American people need to know that that's what is going on up here. And the Republicans are offering solution after solution to all these things. The American people need to start demanding something different. It is up to the American people. Because we are in a minority, we can be here talking tonight and every night, as we are, and Mr. AKIN has been here week after week, and you too have, Mr. KING. But the American people need to stand up and say "no" to the way this business is going on up here.

Let's go back to regular order. Let's go back to having debate and being able to bring forth ideas from both sides of the aisle. But we are not allowed to do that by the leadership of this House. It is wrong. It is immoral. It needs to stop. And the American people need to demand it to be stopped.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Georgia, I thank you for your statement on this matter. And I would reiterate that each of us represents somewhere between 600 and 700,000 Americans. The franchise is this, Mr. Speaker, we owe all our constituents our best effort and our best judgment. And a lot of that best judgment comes from our constituents who are tuned into those issues who funnel those ideas to us. And we need to sort those ideas, and then we need to bring them back into the process in the hearing process in the subcommittee and in the full committee markup process and in the

Rules Committee and in debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. And the vision of the Founding Fathers is this, that the best ideas of America get synthesized, they get compressed and encapsulated here through this process that I have described finally being debated and voted upon on the floor of the House of Representatives. And there the vigor of the American people can be presented to the United States Senate for them to cool the coffee in the saucer as opposed to the hotter cup that comes from the House. That is the vision of our Founding Fathers. That is the vision that is being usurped by the policies of our regal Speaker who has undermined our national security.

And I would yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. We should be very grateful that the Speaker promised us the most open, honest and ethical Congress in the history of the Republic because think how bad it would be if we didn't have that. We wouldn't even be here, would we? It is amazing what promises are made and what promises are broken in this House of Representatives. It is a shame. It is a shame that somebody besides us on the floor of the House, and hopefully some people are watching this, it is a shame, Mr. Speaker, that we are not getting that message out. This is wrong. It is not what the American people sent us here for.

Getting back to our hoax and our indulgences that we are talking about here, I want everybody to know that when Martin Luther hammered that up on the door of the church, he was informing the church that this was wrong to have these indulgences. We need to be pounding one on the front door of this Capitol Building. This is wrong to put this burden on the American people, some of whom really can't afford it, and many of whom are losing their jobs. And to give us a target of 17½ percent unemployment that we can see could come in a much less industrialized nation than we are and what happened there, think what can happen in this Nation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The President of the United States has said, why can't you learn from Spain?

Mr. CARTER. What we learned from Spain is 17½ percent unemployment. My gosh, back during the Clinton administration they kept saying 6½ percent, 6 percent unemployment was full employment. Well, we have learned that is not true. But there is nobody going to argue 17½ percent unemployment is full employment. We are going to be hurting.

We just spent, as my colleague says, our children and grandchildren and great grandchildren and maybe even for generations never even thought of, we just spent their inheritance just in the first 100 days of the Obama administration. We spent more money than all the history of the Republic put together. And we are wanting to put in a

program that can put almost 20 percent of the American workforce out of work? Isn't this the inmates running the asylum?

□ 2115

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time.

This sparks a little bit of a number of some data that I produced about not quite a week ago. I have been asking the question, How do you put this global warming in context, Mr. Speaker? And so I begin to ask these basic questions that any environmentalist that was creating the idea of limiting the amount of greenhouse gasses that could be emitted into the atmosphere, when asked this broader question of, well, how big is this atmosphere—I mean, that is like question number one: How big is the atmosphere? And I don't think anybody here knows the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker. And I would ask you this question directly, but I don't want to put you on the spot. I just want you to listen carefully. That is that our atmosphere, the total weight—this is how we measure it in metric tons—the total weight of our atmosphere is 5.150 quadrillion metric tons. That's the pressure of all of this atmosphere that's pushing down on the Earth's gravity. If you could put a scale on all of the surface of the Earth, they would say, Oh, 5.150 quadrillion metric tons. That's all the atmosphere we have.

Now, that's the idea or the content of the volume of our atmosphere.

Then the next question you've got to ask is, well, if you're going to set the Earth's thermostat by controlling the emissions into the atmosphere from the industry of the United States of America, wouldn't you want to know what the net cumulative total of the U.S. industry since the dawn of industrial revolution would actually be?

Well, I asked the question of the energy information agency that we have—and it's their job—and of course they don't have the answer to that because they never asked the second most obvious question. The first one is how big is the atmosphere. The second one is what has the Earth done or what has America done to contribute to the greenhouse gasses, the CO₂ within the atmosphere? The cumulative total contributed by the U.S. industrial giant since 1800 works out to be this: 178,792,900 metric tons of CO₂.

Now, what's that mean to anybody that's paying attention? I'm sure there is somebody out there that's run the calculator and already come to this conclusion. This would be .00347 percent of the overall atmosphere.

Now, what does that mean in terms we can understand? This way, Mr. Speaker. If you would draw a circle that represented the entire volume of the Earth's atmosphere and do it at a 48-inch radius, 8-foot circle—so two 4-by-8 sheets of drywall side to side, circle drawn, full amount, more than my full wingspan here, that's the circle

that you envision, Mr. Speaker. Now, how much of this overall volume of the U.S. atmosphere is the cumulative total of CO₂ contributed by the U.S. industrial might since the dawn of the industrial revolution? That little circle in the middle of that 8-foot circle would be about like that, .56 inches. The diameter of about a buffalo bullet is about all it would be in the center of that 8-foot circle, and that's the cumulative total.

And we are going to reduce the overall U.S. emissions by 20 percent for a while and then 40 percent for a while and 83 percent for a while. And sooner or later, the arrogance and the vanity of America is going to adjust the thermostat of God's green Earth with a ratio of less than half an inch on an 8-foot diameter circle. How could we possibly imagine that could work? Where is Al Gore when I need him to explain this to me?

I will say this. Al Gore, you were wrong on the science. And those of you who are busily marking up in Energy and Commerce a cap-and-tax bill today, tomorrow, the next day, and for eternity, are utterly wrong on the economics. You would handicap America's economy on some myopic idea, some vanity idea that we could control the Earth's temperature, set the thermostat of America by reducing the size of this .56 circle in the middle of the 8-foot diameter. That's what we are dealing with. That's Midwestern common sense. And we're dealing with the utter arrogance of people who believe this rather than the God that created this Earth.

Mr. CARTER. Well, you forgot that there is one other source of CO₂ that we haven't figured out how to tax on it, but I'm sure they're working on it. We've created some today as we've been in here.

I had a lady when I was doing a town-hall meeting. We were talking about energy, and she said, You know, I'm concerned about these emissions because I want my children to be able to breathe clean air. And I said, Do you ever lean over and kiss your kid goodnight? She said, Yeah, I do. I said, Do you realize when you breathe out you're breathing CO₂ into that child's face? She stopped. She said, You know? That is right. I said, You're going to have to stop breathing in the presence of your child.

This gas we're talking about we are all breathing out every breath and all animals are doing the same thing and all plants are loving it because they take it in. And guess what they give back? Oxygen for us. It's crazy. It's really crazy what we're talking about. But that number needs to be added in there. Maybe we should limit ourselves to 30 breaths a minute.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Or allow the miracle of photosynthesis to solve this problem of mothers kissing their children goodnight.

I will yield to the other judge from Texas, Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Iowa for yielding, and I appreciate being in the presence of my former judge, my friend Judge CARTER, and my doctor friend, Dr. BROWN.

Now, I was talking with a group from Baylor University working on their MBA here in Washington, and, of course, the rules are you don't acknowledge people in the gallery, so I won't do that.

But one thing they understand, as sophisticated as the Baylor MBA program is, they understand that if you find yourself in a hole, it's time to stop digging. And the economy is in a hole, and we've been digging. And we're spending so much, we're digging a bigger hole. And we've got manufacturers leaving the country because we're digging ourselves a bigger hole.

And when, as some of us have, you travel to China, Why did you move your industry here? they tell you—the number one answer I got was because the corporate tax is so—it's less than half of what it is in the U.S.—17 percent. And they will cut you a deal. If you bring them a big enough industry, they'll cut some off of that for years. We've got 35 percent, and I believe it's the most insidious tax that there is in this country because we tell the American people that you don't have to pay it. We'll tax these greedy, evil corporations, but you don't have to worry about it. And they don't realize, because the Congress misleads them, that they're the ones that pay it because if they don't, the corporation cannot stay in business.

So here we are with this insidious tax that hurts our corporations trying to compete worldwide, and we're losing jobs. The economy is in the crapper, and we are trying to bring it up. And we're bringing the economy back up, and what happens? Along comes this cap-and-trade idea that is going to further tax businesses that are producing the jobs in America that keep people working and keep people eating and living and surviving. And we're going to add another tax that those in China are not going to pay. And it is hurting the country.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

I would ask the gentleman from Texas, can you think of some program, a tax or any other program that would more effectively transfer jobs to China, India, and developing countries other than cap-and-tax here in the United States?

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend yielding.

I can't think of one. This will drive so many jobs overseas. It's like somebody is sitting back thinking, How can we further hurt the economy? Let's do that. And some genius came up with cap-and-tax.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time.

I want to pose this question, and this is the question I posed to the judge from Texas and I posed this to the

other judge from Texas and the doctor from Georgia. I pose this to all of my Democrat friends over on this side of the aisle. Can you envision any program that would transfer more jobs from America to the developing countries than cap-and-tax? Is there anything out there that would be worse for our economy? If you have an idea, stand. I will yield to you. I will be very happy to yield this microphone to anybody on this side of the aisle that believes that Judge GOHMERT would happen to be wrong or I happen to be wrong that there is any means that can more cripple America's industry or cost our economy more or transfer more jobs to foreign countries than cap-and-tax that's being debated right now in Energy and Commerce. I say none. You don't ask me to yield. That means you have no better idea.

I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia instead.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It's a great question.

In my district in Georgia, the 10th Congressional District in Georgia where many counties already have right now, today, right at a 14 percent unemployment rate, I've been told by a number of manufacturers that are still left here in this country that if this cap-and-tax bill goes through, they're shutting the doors. They're moving offshore. They cannot afford to continue to operate in this country. And they're going to do that. It's going to drive up the unemployment rate in my district that's already at 14 percent in many counties.

Mr. KING of Iowa. So the gentleman agrees with my conclusion.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely. Nothing could be worse except for maybe the budget that has been produced by this administration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me pose a question. What would be, in the history of the United States of America, today, including potentially a cap-and-tax bill that's before the Energy and Commerce Committee today, what would be the most colossal mistake ever made in the history of the United States Congress? In your opinion. And then I want to hear the opinion from the gentleman from Texas as well.

Mr. CARTER. We know the corporate tax drives people offshore looking for a better tax structure. We know right now in just a competitive market we have the Chinese offer cheaper natural gas than the Americans. So if you're powering your plant by natural gas and you're paying that corporate tax structure, just in today's world, there is a lure to go overseas to China.

Now, you come in and you're going to add 30 percent to the cost of everything. Why in the world would you not think it's the absolutely worst thing that could happen? We're probably going to get trampled if we don't get out of the way as they head for the west coast to get on a boat to go to China.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time.

Is there a bigger mistake that has been made in the history of the United States Congress other than handicapping the U.S. economy by applying a cap-and-tax program? Can you think of anything, Judge CARTER, that has happened in the last 200-and-some years?

Mr. CARTER. One of the things that comes to mind is tariffs. Tariffs brought on the Great Depression. I don't know what you're fishing for.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me make this statement that Smoot-Hawley didn't put on our economy nearly as much burden as we would have with cap-and-tax. This taxation is the most inefficient taxation ever devised in the history of the United States of America. It applies about \$5 worth of tax for every dollar that ends up in the Federal coffers, and otherwise it has no impact whatsoever. It is a tax. It is an 80 percent overburden for a 20 percent revenue stream. That's how bad cap-and-tax is. And I believe it's the most colossal mistake—if it's done—in the history of the United States Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I absolutely agree with you, Mr. KING. I don't believe there's been a bigger colossal failure to the American people than this proposed cap-and-tax—tax-and-cap, as I call it. It's going to be disastrous for our economy. It's going to be disastrous for everything that we believe in as a Nation.

Right now today, this government is spending too much money, it's taxing too much, as Judge CARTER was talking about. We have the highest corporate tax rate in the world, which is driving companies offshore and it's causing unemployment. We're borrowing too much. We're borrowing our children's and our grandchildren's future. They're going to live at a lower standard of living than we do today with the policies that we've seen just over the last about 120 days already today. And this cap-and-tax policy is going to make it magnified markedly.

We've got to stop the spending. We've got to stop the taxing. We've got to stop the borrowing, and we've got to put America back on track.

And what I want to say before I yield back is that the American people need to understand that the Republicans are the "party of know," k-n-o-w, because we know how to solve all these problems if we'll just be allowed to do so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and presuming that we have a couple of minutes left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the Speaker for that acknowledgment.

We have watched this free enterprise system be subverted, and it's been subverted almost systematically and in a Machiavellian fashion and a fashion so much faster than I ever would have imagined it could have done. I've watched class envy be implemented as

a political tool that pit Americans against Americans and say to them, You don't have to worry about your car payment, your utility bill, or your rent or house payment because sooner or later, the Federal Government is going to cover that.

□ 2130

We're going to take from those who produce more, and we are going to give it to people who produce less. It's a matter of a political tool that says you are not really entitled to what you earn but you are entitled to what you claim you need.

And so this statement was made this morning by Star Parker, who is a wonderful, wonderful American citizen. She said the policy, as exists now in America, is that if somebody has something that you want, you go hire politicians to take it from them and give it to you. That's what's going on in America today, this America that was a meritocracy, an America that when my grandmother came here from Germany a little over 100 years ago, people stood on their own two feet, provided for themselves, and reached out and helped others. Where my father and his family were raised off of the coins in the cookie jar, today it's the coins of those who are working being passed over to those who don't, Mr. Speaker.

We cannot be the most successful Nation in the history of the world if we do not refurbish the pillars of American exceptionalism. If we don't reestablish the merits of our free enterprise capitalistic system, if we don't refurbish the property rights that are there, if we fail to refurbish the rights that come from God, that are conferred through our Declaration and reiterated by our Founding Fathers, that these rights come from God and that they're natural rights and it falls under natural law, if we fail to refurbish the pillars of American exceptionalism, we have seen the apex of our civilization.

The charge is on all of us. The charge is on Democrats to wake up to this fact, and the charge is on Republicans to wake America up to this fact. And I am committed to this cause, as are my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, including the judge from Texas and the doctor from Georgia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of son's high school graduation.

Mrs. BACHMANN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of the passing of her father-in-law.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today and May 21.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today and May 21.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today and May 21.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 131. An act to establish the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission.

H.R. 627. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish fair and transparent practices relating to the extension of credit under an open end consumer credit plan, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 896.—An act to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1910. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Carbofuran; Final Tolerance Revocations [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0162; FRL-8413-3] received May 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1911. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Drug Applications and Abbreviated New Drug Applications; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2009-N-0099] received May 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1912. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Astringent Drug Products That Produce Aluminum Acetate; Skin Protectant Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Technical Amendment [[Docket No.: FDA-1978N-0007] (Formerly Docket No.: 78N-021A)] (RIN: 0910-AF42) received May 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1913. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Vitamin D2 [[Docket No.: FDA-2007-F-0274] (formerly Docket No. 2007F-0355)] received May 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1914. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Silver Nitrate and Hydrogen Peroxide [[Docket No.: FDA-2005-F-0505] (formerly Docket No.: 2005F-0138)] received May 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1915. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey Reasonable Further Progress Plans, Reasonably Available Control Technology, Reasonably Available Control Measures and Conformity Budgets [EPA-R02-OAR-2008-0497, FRL-8905-7] received May 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1916. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0860; FRL-8905-8] received May 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1917. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Bryan, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 09-34 RM-11522] received May 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1918. A letter from the General Counsel, Fed. Energy Regulatory Comm., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modification of Interchange and Transmission Loading Relief Reliability Standards; and Electric Reliability Organization Interpretation of Specific Requirements of Four Reliability Standards [Docket Nos.: RM08-7-000 and RM08-7-001; Order No.: 713-A] received May 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1919. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, transmitting the 2008 management reports and statements on the system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1920. A letter from the Director, Department of Justice, National Drug Intelligence Center, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "National Gang Threat Assessment 2009 (NGTA 2009)"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.