

Excerpts from the Congressional Record – House, February 15, 2011, pp. H902

AMENDMENT NO. 297 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. *McCLINTOCK*. Mr. Chairman, this is a poster child for I guess what could best be described as “` Greens Gone Wild.” As part of the so-called **Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement**, it is proposed to use taxpayer funds to tear down four perfectly good hydroelectric dams on the Klamath that are producing 155 megawatts of the cleanest, cheapest electricity on the planet--that's enough to power over 150,000 homes--because, we're told, of catastrophic declines in salmon.

When I suggested building a salmon hatchery instead, I was informed there already is one. It produces 5 million salmon smolt each year, 17,000 of which return to that river as fully grown adults to spawn, but they are deliberately ignored in the population counts. To add insult to insanity, as they tear down these dams in the name of saving the salmon, they are actually tearing down the fish hatchery that actually is saving the salmon.

This amendment targets the study that is underway to do so. A policy that is as manifestly insane as this should not require \$2 million of additional funding.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. *FRELINGHUYSEN*. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept the gentleman from California's amendment.

Mr. *PASTOR* of Arizona. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting *CHAIR*. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. *PASTOR* of Arizona. I rise in support.

This amendment simply reduces the water and related resources account by \$1.9 million. Given the limited nature of the amendment, I do not object to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting *CHAIR*. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. *McClintock*).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 315 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. *McCLINTOCK*. Mr. Chairman, this amendment saves \$247 million by relieving taxpayers of having to subsidize solar energy research and development.

I am tempted to point out that solar power is not a new technology. Photovoltaic electricity generation was invented by Edmond Becquerel in 1836. That was 175 years ago. And in 175 years of continuing research and development and technological advancement, we have not yet been able to invent a more expensive way of generating electricity. Yet we're perfectly comfortable telling our constituents that we're taking another \$250 million from their families to throw at this 175-year-old technology for no particular reason other than it makes us feel good.

I'm also tempted to point out that not only is this the most expensive way that we have ever invented to generate electricity, but it also adds nothing--I repeat, nothing--to our baseline power. Our electricity systems operate on an integrated grid, meaning that we have to constantly match the power going onto the grid with the power coming off the grid. And since there is no way to tell when a cloud passing over a solar array will immediately drop the output to zero, we have to construct an equal amount of reliable conventional power to back up that solar power. In other words, for every kilowatt of solar power we add to the grid, we also have to pay to add an additional kilowatt of backup power.

But the principal objection I have is this: This technology was truly on the verge of a breakthrough. After 175 years, investors would be tripping over themselves to get a piece of the action. If they are, there's no need to subsidize it. And if they're not, we have no right to force American taxpayers to make investments that no investor in his right mind would make.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the continuing resolution before us enacts historic spending reductions but it does so by striking a careful balance between deficit reduction and other important goals.

I regret the gentleman's amendment goes far beyond the point of balance, and thus, I must oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, deficit reduction is the bill's top priority, and our bill already significantly reduces the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Account. As written, our bill cuts that account to 35 percent below current levels and 38 percent, or nearly \$900 million, below the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

Our bill cuts the excess and provides only enough funding to continue past commitments, leaving little room left to cut.

While I support the intent of the gentleman's amendment, as it aims to reduce further spending, we must do so responsibly and with a careful balance among deficit reduction, jobs, and our Nation's energy security. The gentleman's amendment fails to maintain this balance and would, to my mind, create undue job losses which would be considerable and irreversibly damage this particular program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I join the chairman. We need a mix of energy to gain energy independence. We cannot just rely on the mix of energy we have today, where 70 percent of our energy is generated through coal or natural gas.

Rather than sacrifice our future, we should be looking at methods of closing loopholes for the oil and gas industry.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. *McClintock*).

The amendment was rejected.