

**Opening Statement**  
**The Honorable Ralph M. Hall (R-TX), Full Committee Ranking Member**  
Subcommittee on Energy & Environment  
*A Rational Discussion of Climate Change: the Science, the Evidence, the Response*  
U.S. House of Representatives  
November 17, 2010

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing and I welcome all of the witnesses testifying on today's three panels.

Today, our country finds itself at a crossroads. We face a staggering national debt of more than \$13.7 trillion, almost one in ten people are out of work, and a bloated federal government. These are serious problems that require solutions that are defined by restraint and discipline. No longer should the economy be strained by writing checks we cannot afford and a burdensome regulatory regime brought about by policies that serve to hamper industry and productivity across America.

Despite this economic reality, the Administration is proceeding with regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, a policy to supplant the "cap and trade" proposal that failed to win Congressional approval. The Secretary of Energy testified before this committee that such a policy would raise energy prices for every American. The Energy Information Administration conducted an analysis of the "cap and trade" bill that passed the House in June. It was projected that this legislation would increase energy prices for consumers anywhere between 20% and 77%.

The Administration claims that we must cut our emissions of carbon dioxide, despite the costs, so that we stave off "global climate disruption". First of all, this new terminology pronounced by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy is just another example of this Administration attempting to rebrand events to suit their policy objectives. There is no more war, now we have overseas contingency operations. There are no more terrorist acts; we now have man-caused disasters. Changing the name does not change what it is. It's high time the Administration learn, as we say, to call a bluebird blue.

Secondly, this Administration argues that cutting greenhouse gas emissions is a policy direction that is justified by the science. I think this hearing today will demonstrate that reasonable people have serious questions about our knowledge of the state of the science, the evidence and what constitutes a proportional response.

Furthermore, there has been an escalating sense of public betrayal by those who would claim the science justifies these policy choices. The emails posted last November from the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in England exposed a dishonest undercurrent within the scientific community. This incident ignited a renewed public interest in the level of uncertainty of the scientific pronouncements and an increased concern that the policy of "cap and trade" may not achieve its objective of reducing the impacts of climate change.

While there were only a few scientists involved in this unethical behavior, it only takes a few bad apples to spoil the whole bunch. It has created a general atmosphere of doubt with regards to all

scientific endeavors involving the government. We need only to look at how the Administration responded to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill to see how scientific information was distorted to promote a specific policy agenda or to change people's perception of the government's competence. To add insult to injury, this Administration has neglected to follow through on promises to issue basic guidelines for scientific integrity, a failure that has only served to further erode the public trust.

Given these persistent problems, the public has even more questions and concerns about how federal officials use science to inform policy debates. Sorting scientific fact from rhetoric is essential, and we have a long way to go on this topic. We must insist on information derived from objective and transparent scientific practices. And, we must hold this Administration accountable for meeting a level of scientific integrity the public expects from their government.

Above all, we cannot afford to enact policies that destroy jobs, hinder economic growth and whittle away our competitiveness. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today, and I yield back the remainder of my time.