

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS  
**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE  
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225-2927  
Minority (202) 225-3641

**Statement of Rep. Henry A. Waxman**  
**Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce**  
**“EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations and Their Effect on American Jobs”**  
**Subcommittee on Energy and Power**  
**March 1, 2011**

Mr. Chairman, this hearing reminds me of an article that appeared in *The New York Times Magazine* on Sunday. The article was titled “Fact-Free Science,” and it describes how Washington has been infected by “a mainstreaming and radicalization of antiscientific thought.”

Today’s hearing could be “example A” of antiscientific thought in the House of Representatives. We are falling down a rabbit hole into Wonderland, where facts are turned upside down and fiction is accepted as reality.

The premise of this hearing is that climate change is a hoax and EPA’s modest efforts to reduce carbon pollution will imperil our economy.

These claims remind me of William James, who once said: “There is nothing so absurd that it cannot be believed as truth if repeated often enough.”

These are the facts: Climate change is real and our future economic prosperity depends on investing in a new clean energy economy.

If we don’t act to reduce carbon pollution and promote clean energy, we will lose millions of clean energy jobs to the countries that do.

China understands this. The Chinese have been investing over \$2 billion each week in renewable and other green technologies.

And so does Europe, which is racing ahead of us in reducing carbon emissions and developing advances in solar energy and green buildings.

Last Congress, CEOs from our nation’s leading companies like General Electric and Duke Energy told us that billions of dollars in private capital has been frozen because the United States does not have a long-term plan for reducing carbon emissions.

The CEO of PG&E, one of the nation's largest utilities, warned of "an incredible lost opportunity if we don't act now." He said: "there are these amazing, developing new technology centers across the United States, and we see those jobs going overseas and technology superiority going overseas."

The cost of inaction is not just the loss of leadership in the global economy. We also risk irreversible and potentially catastrophic impacts.

Our weather is getting more extreme and more dangerous every year. Last year, was the hottest and wettest on record. Floods in Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee killed dozens. They submerged much of Pakistan and Australia. And droughts in Russia and China are driving food prices to records levels.

The risks to our economy from climate change are real and are potentially enormous. That is why we cannot have an informed debate about the economic costs of EPA regulation if we ignore these impacts. If we look only at the costs of regulation without considering the costs of doing nothing, we are looking at only half of the equation.

Ranking Member Rush and I have been urging that the Subcommittee consider the scientific evidence. We asked for a leading scientific expert to be invited to testify today, but this request was denied.

We asked for a hearing on two new studies linking severe weather events to man-made climate change. But we have not received a response.

For this reason, we are invoking our rights under the House rules to request a minority hearing with scientists. Last month, we heard testimony from Senator Inhofe that climate change is a hoax. We need to hear from real scientists before we markup the Upton-Inhofe bill.

I ask that our letter requesting this hearing be made part of today's hearing.

I have one other concern about today's hearing. That is the decision to put the EPA Assistant Administrator, Gina McCarthy, on the second panel. This is inconsistent with the practices of our Committee. I raised my concern with Chairman Upton earlier today. He agreed that the general rule should be that Administration witnesses testify first on their own panel. He said it was too late to change the order of today's hearing, but that the Committee would proceed differently in future hearings. I thank him and Subcommittee Chairman Whitfield for this courtesy.