



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2008

No. 118

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 17, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JESSIE L. JACKSON, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Rabbi Stuart L. Berman, Police-Clergy Liaison, New York City Police Department, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, guardian of the people of Thy covenant, help us to reflect clearly and strive conscientiously in the performance of our responsibilities this day. Let us be permeated by the time-tested ideals of our society, and may our days be blessed with the enduring accomplishments of this, the 110th Congress. We may be of different faiths, but we share a common love of this great land.

Let us direct all our efforts toward the eradication of hatred, prejudice and blindness of mind. Grant us breadth of vision to build bridges of understanding among all the citizens in our communities back home. May we never forget the common bond of kinship that unites all who were created in Thy divine image.

Grant us strength of body and health of mind. Enable us to face the challenges of life with faith and courage. Teach us, O Lord, the power of love, not the love of power.

In moments of doubt, strengthen us in our convictions. In hours of gloom, illumine our paths. In adversity and

frustration, gird us with patience and tolerance. Above all, O Lord, imbue us with the wisdom to count our blessings.

And we all say Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed and agreed to without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1553. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to information regarding pediatric cancers and current treatments for such cancers, establish a national childhood cancer registry, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancer.

H. Con. Res. 381. Concurrent resolution honoring and recognizing the dedication and achievements of Thurgood Marshall on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment

in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5501. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes.

### WELCOMING RABBI STUART BERMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 1 minute.)

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor for me today to welcome our guest chaplain, Rabbi Stuart Berman, and to thank him for such a wonderful prayer this morning.

New York, and my community in particular, have been fortunate to have had someone so dedicated presiding in our area. Most recently, Rabbi Berman served at the Woodside Jewish Center. However, he has had a very accomplished and profound career throughout his lifetime.

The rabbi nobly served on the Presidential Inaugural Committee, the Presidential Transition Committee, the White House Conference on Children and Youth Drug Abuse Panel, as well as the White House Conference on Aging.

In 1985, Rabbi Berman made history in the State of Florida and became the first rabbi to ever be appointed a prison chaplain.

In New York, he again placed the community first and was appointed police-clergy liaison, City of New York Police Department, and Sanitation Department Chaplain. He is also a prolific author of numerous publications and articles, and he previously hosted a weekly television talk show on FAN-TV.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6677

I would also point out that Rabbi Berman offered a prayer at the dedication of the post office renaming for my predecessor and his friend, our mutual friend, Congressman Tom Manton, when it was being named in his honor.

Rabbi Berman is joined today by his son, Nathaniel, and his sister, Zell. Audrey, his wife, who is an early childhood specialist with the New York City Board of Education, unfortunately could not be here with us and with him today. But we all know that she is very, very proud of her rabbi.

Thank you, Rabbi, for being here.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### CONGRATULATING JERRY NORTHEY

(Mr. BRALEY of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Jerry Northey, on his retirement after 12 years as president of UAW Local 838, and after 36 years of working at John Deere in Waterloo. Jerry has served four terms as president of the local 838 in my hometown, making him the longest-serving president in the local's history. In fact, he served as president more than twice as long as any of his predecessors.

As president of Local 838, with over 3,000 members, the largest union local in Iowa, Jerry has been a strong and effective advocate for workers. Under his leadership, the local has seen a net gain of more than 500 jobs over the life of the current contract. Thanks to Jerry's leadership, the union and John Deere have successfully settled every collective bargaining agreement since 1987.

Jerry has also led corporate ventures between John Deere and the UAW, including recently coming together to raise an impressive \$1 million for the Cedar Valley United Way campaign.

I know that Jerry will be greatly missed at the local hall and at John Deere, and I would like to thank him for his tremendous service, congratulate him on his many accomplishments, and wish him the best of luck in his retirement.

#### CONGRESS NEEDS TO LISTEN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, President Bush listened to the American people this week, and he lifted the executive

moratorium on energy exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf. Unfortunately, a congressional ban still exists and remains in place.

Congress needs to listen to the American people. Whether it is the folks back in central Texas that I represent, or the people on the coast of Maine or Southern California, Americans want to explore safely and properly for American energy. 67 percent of the American people want sound exploration using safe practices, and to have American industry.

There is only one obstacle that stands in the way, and that is Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats in Congress. Americans are counting on Congress to work together to lift this ban.

Republicans are ready to work with Democrats to do just that. Give us a chance to have a vote on this, and we will have American energy for the American people.

#### PHOTO-OP IN THE ARCTIC

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are soon going to be greeted by a photo-op in the Arctic with some of our Republican friends doing a little fly-over. It is an example of their "drillusion."

We have been fighting the Republican energy policy that is trapped in the 1950s. For the first 12 years I was in Congress they made it impossible, indeed, sometimes even illegal to even study improving fuel efficiency standards for cars.

For the last 7½ years, we have had two Texas oilmen in the White House, their secret energy task force, their disastrous 2005 Energy Act and, by the way, their Dept. of Energy which missed all 34 deadlines to improve appliance efficiency.

And what do we get from years of Republican control and their energy policy? \$4.35 cent a gallon gasoline.

Democrats, from the beginning, have provided new energy incentives. We have improved auto fuel efficiency standards for the first time in 30 years. And today we are going to have the Drill Responsibly on Leased Lands Act, the DRILL Act, to use the millions of acres they already have to be able to provide oil for this country. Together we can solve this gas price crisis which is the result of the President's failed energy policy and our addiction to foreign oil.

#### THE GUILTY GO FREE BECAUSE OUR GOVERNMENT HAS BLUN- DERED

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Border Agent Luis Aguilar, Jr. was on patrol in January on the Arizona border chasing two vehicles of suspected drug deal-

ers. As the vehicles, a Hummer and a pickup, realized they had been discovered and fled back to the Mexican border, Agent Aguilar put road spikes in front of the vehicles. The Hummer, however, went off the road and ran over and killed Agent Aguilar.

The driver, Jesus Navarro Montes, was quickly arrested by the Mexican government and held on unrelated drug charges. However, he was released 6 months later because the U.S. Government never requested extradition proceedings.

Members of Congress have asked the Justice Department what happened. We received a standard bureaucratic, nonsensical letter saying, "we're not telling you." In other words, our Justice Department blundered by not requesting extradition, and now won't admit it.

This is incompetence. Montes, meanwhile, is still probably running drugs into the United States.

We owe it to all border agents and the family of Agent Aguilar to capture this killer. Maybe we should offer an old fashioned reward for his capture, and let our friends in Mexico do the job our government won't do.

And that's just the way it is.

#### INTRODUCTION OF FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE PREVENTION ACT

(Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to protect our Nation's food supply and rural economies. This bill, the Foot and Mouth Disease Prevention Act of 2008, will block meat imports from Argentina until the USDA can certify to Congress that every region of that country is free of FMD.

The USDA is currently considering opening the U.S. protein market to select regions of Argentina, a country with a history of FMD outbreaks. This plan is flawed. It assumes that a highly infectious, airborne disease like FMD would stop at imaginary borders, and it trusts Argentina to effectively police itself.

Argentina is a country that lacks the infrastructure to handle FMD outbreaks. The USDA hasn't conducted a safety assessment in Argentina since the 2006 outbreak there, yet it is still moving with their plan to regionalize the country. This doesn't make sense, and it is not sound policy.

FMD has the potential to wipe out our livestock industry overnight, as it did to the British economy, which lost nearly \$20 billion with their outbreak in 2001, resulting in 6 million animals destroyed. A similar outbreak here would cripple the livestock industry, shut down exports of American beef, and send meat prices through the roof.

I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this bill to block the USDA's plan to regionalize Argentina.

## NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Today my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are bringing up legislation promoting drilling in the National Petroleum Reserve, a large desolate tract of land to the west of ANWR in Alaska. It is nice that they finally acknowledge we need to access more of our own energy resources right here at home. But I do find it strange that they are willing to advocate drilling in the National Petroleum Reserve, which was originally set aside for the use of our military in an emergency, yet they continue to oppose oil exploration in ANWR.

The National Reserve contains about 440 barrels of oil per acre, compared to ANWR's 5,475 barrels per acre. The National Reserve's oil and gas fields are more than 250 miles from existing pipeline infrastructure, compared to ANWR's 75-mile distance. The National Reserve's oil and gas fields are spread out over 23 million acres, compared to 1.9 million acres in ANWR.

It is strange that my colleagues, who are supposed to be more environmentally conscious, would wish to drill for oil that is more spread out and will require a much larger footprint to access instead of using the more concentrated oil and natural gas resources in ANWR.

## DRILL ACT PROMOTES DRILLING ON 311 MILLION ACRES OF OPEN LAND

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, with high gas prices crippling the American economy, this country needs a long-term energy plan to lower gas prices, make America more secure, create green jobs, and reduce global warming.

House Democrats support responsible drilling as part of our comprehensive strategy, but many Republicans in Washington say we need to do more drilling in our pristine oceans and wilderness areas, even though 300 million acres of public land, more than three times the size of California, are already open for leasing. They want us to give more public land to Big Oil, even though 68 million acres of land are already leased and not being developed.

Today, the House will consider the DRILL Act. I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this vital legislation that will speed up development of NPRA, require Big Oil to use the land they have leased or lose it, and ban foreign export of Alaskan oil to ensure our oil stays in America.

Mr. Speaker, this is commonsense legislation that does exactly what many are asking for, more drilling. So why don't they support a bill that re-

quires Big Oil to drill and not just stockpile more leases?

□ 1015

## A START TO LOWERING GAS PRICES

(Mr. BOUSTANY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, this week the President took a small but important step to lowering the price at the pump for American families. Lifting his ban on Outer Continental Shelf energy exploration was the right thing to do, and I applaud him for it. Now, Congress must act.

We can help increase American supply, lower the price at the pump, and create good American jobs. The ball's in our court. Will Congress listen to our constituents who are struggling with tough decisions about where and when they can drive? Or will congressional leadership remain beholden to environmental extremists?

In Louisiana, energy production is done in a responsible way. After two devastating hurricanes, employees of our energy industry worked hard to get rigs back up and running knowing they were a very important part of our recovery efforts. OCS does not represent a magic bullet. However, it's one piece of a responsible comprehensive energy plan to lower the price at the pump. Innovative technology, better conservation, and new fuels are critical, too. So let's start all of them. What is holding us up? By harnessing all of America's vast resources and genius, we can give Americans, in the short term and long term, a good energy policy.

Let's do the responsible thing. Let's have a comprehensive energy policy.

## CHOICE AND FREEDOM IN OIL ADDICTION

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, slavery in this country did not end in the 1860s. It still exists because we all are still enslaved by oil. It is an addiction. George Bush himself said we are addicted to oil. But his answer is to increase the addiction, to go back to the dealer just for one more stick of the needle. That is not a long-term energy supply response to this crisis.

Americans need a choice of new energy supplies beyond oil, which is the only way to break this addiction, which is the only way to drive down price, which is the only way to have an alternative to oil.

I had in my office yesterday the Interdale Company, building one of the first lithium ion batteries, and the A123 Battery Company; they are going to provide the battery for the GM-VOLT. We have to provide freedom

from this oil addiction by having a policy that gives Americans choice of new electric cars, new algae-based biofuels. That's a vision for choice and freedom in this country. That's what we should be doing. And we will be starting today.

## CONSEQUENCES OF FOREIGN OIL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's economic and national security is being threatened by our continued reliance on foreign oil. The pain at the pump is having a terrible impact on the wallets of American families. Simultaneously, we are sending billions of dollars overseas to buy the foreign oil we pay far too much for here at home.

Exploration of American oil and natural gas right here at home means we can rely less on unstable regimes and break the monopoly of foreign oil. The more American-made energy we use means less of our money going to line the pockets of dictators like Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. We have the resources and the technology to get these resources in an environmentally sound way.

We must face the fact there are real consequences to congressional inaction just as there would be substantial benefits to adopting an all-of-the-above energy policy, which I and many of my Republican colleagues support.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

## BIG OIL IS NOT DRILLING

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Back when George Bush was elected in 2001, gas was \$1.48 a gallon, and we imported 52 percent of our oil. Today, gas is \$4.39 a gallon in my district, and we're importing 58 percent of our oil. In the meantime, what's been done?

Well, we adopted the Republican energy plan, formulated in secret by DICK CHENEY—yet another oilman along with George Bush—and some people say, Well, it's not working. I think it's working. Record profits for the oil industry and their friends, \$551 billion since George Bush took office and more dependence on imported oil from Saudi Arabia and other friends of the President.

We need a new energy policy in this country, and we're striking out in that direction. We've already passed new mandates for fuel efficiency. We tried to move us towards renewables. But we need some interim supply. That's why we have the DRILL Act up today. We need interim supply, but Big Oil is sitting on leases that can access 80 percent of our estimated reserves in Alaska and the Outer Continental Shelf, and they're not drilling it.

## ENERGY PLAN NOW

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the House floor asking the majority party if they've been hearing from the citizens about their financial struggles with high gas prices because I have.

This month, I mailed a survey to families in my district asking for their comments about the energy crisis. I wanted to hear from them about their opinions, their ideas of what we, as Members of Congress, should be doing to ease the high gas prices.

In response to the survey I sent to these citizens, we had tremendous responses: some things like find alternatives to oil; move the country beyond that; we need to support conservative changes in lifestyle; waste less; we have to change; develop new technologies, to get us off oil; drill now; drill everywhere; encourage automakers to make vehicles not powered by gasoline. Yeah. They're right. We need to do it all, and we need to do it now.

Is the majority party not hearing what I'm hearing? Worse, if they are, are they not choosing to help these people and bring energy legislation to the floor?

Mr. Speaker, we need energy legislation on the floor, and we need it now.

## THE DRILL ACT PROMOTES DRILLING ON 311 MILLION ACRES OF OPEN LAND

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, the Bush-Cheney energy plan is now 95 percent implemented and we are paying for it at the pump. It's no mystery how it happened. Two oilmen in the White House let Big Oil literally write the energy plan. And while Republicans continue to demand opening up more areas for drilling, Democrats are asking why not drill on 311 million acres of Federal land already open for energy production?

Day after day Republicans say drill, drill, drill. But they haven't once asked why oil companies are sitting on 68 million acres of already-leased land.

This country needs a comprehensive plan for energy independence, and responsible drilling is part of that plan. Why not open new areas for development that will save consumers little at the pump decades down the road when there are 68 million acres of land ready for drilling?

Mr. Speaker, Democrats don't want to make the American consumer wait another 10 to 20 years for any relief. Today we hope that the Republicans will join us in demanding that Big Oil start drilling on the leases they already have, otherwise lose the leases. It's time to tell Big Oil, "Use it or lose it."

## OFFSHORE EXPLORATION VERSUS LEASES

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I'm glad that President Bush turned up the heat on Congress when he lifted an executive order barring offshore energy exploration off almost 90 percent of U.S. coastlines.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that raising the decibel level of the debate in this Chamber does not solve the problem. A good, comprehensive, broad-based energy supply is what solves the problem. Instead of acting to help consumers with high gas prices, Congress still has not taken up legislation which will actually help fight rising gas prices even as the price at the pump rockets past \$4.11 a gallon. Instead, we hear the other side of the aisle about use-it-or-lose-it current policy, that oil companies are sitting on 68 million acres, or maybe even more, of land which could be used for energy exploration.

We need to ask ourselves the question then, Why would anyone in the private sector want to engage in even greater expenses than in acquiring more petroleum resources for the American people?

But even a Democratic colleague of mine said, "You can't produce on every acre or even every 100 acres. I think those numbers come from people who don't understand the business."

We can do better; we should do better, Mr. Speaker.

## POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF IMMIGRANTS

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I speak on behalf of the 12 to 14 million immigrants here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the memory of Lance Corporal Jose Gutierrez will always remain in our hearts. Gutierrez, an undocumented immigrant who came here as an orphan from Guatemala, graduated from high school despite many obstacles. While in community college, he enlisted as a marine to show his patriotism and love for this Nation.

On March 31, 2003, Gutierrez became the first combat casualty of the war of Iraq. His belief in the American dream of a better life is a testament of what many others who come to this country wish to have. Gutierrez will forever be a symbol of patriotism, hard work, and commitment.

Sadly, his sacrifices are lost in the hateful anti-immigrant rhetoric. Every day, 12 to 14 million immigrants work from sunset to sundown to reach the American dream—all positively contributing to America's economic health.

I urge my colleagues to keep in mind these contributions and make a firm commitment to work towards comprehensive immigration reform.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF PRAYER IN AMERICA AND IN CONGRESS

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we did today, 234 years ago Congress heard its first prayer as they opened their Congress. And I wanted to read that prayer this morning because I think it's a prayer for America and this Congress today:

Be Thou present; O God of Wisdom, and direct the councils of this Honorable Assembly. Enable them to settle all things on the best and surest foundations; that the scene of blood may be speedily closed; that Order, Harmony, and Peace may be effectually restored, and Truth, and Justice, Religion, and Piety prevail and flourish among the people. Preserve the health of their bodies and the vigor of their minds. Shower down on them, and the millions they here represent, such temporal blessings as Thou seest expedient for them in this world, and crown them with everlasting Glory in the world to come. All this we ask in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ Thy son and Our Savior. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, may prayer always be a part of this body, and may prayer always be a part of America.

## JOHN U. LLOYD BEACH STATE PARK

(Mr. KLEIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an area of exceptional natural beauty in my congressional district. The John U. Lloyd Beach State Park was honored on the national news program Good Morning America as one of the four most unique and scenic parks in the entire country.

We're lucky in south Florida to have miles of beautiful coastline, but the John U. Lloyd Beach State Park truly stands out. In addition to sandy beaches, the State park features a coral reef ecosystem just 100 yards offshore and a mangrove swamp with a variety of plant species. Wildlife sightings are common for visitors to the park, and few will forget watching sea turtle hatchlings crawl down the beach.

I would like to commend the hard-working park rangers who care for our State park, as well as Bob and Barbara Magill, who submitted footage of the beach for national recognition.

Mr. Speaker, the John U. Lloyd Beach State Park is truly a national pleasure, and we are committed to preserving this site for future generations to enjoy. We welcome all Americans to come down and visit.

WELCOMING REPUBLICANS TO  
THE NATIONAL RENEWABLE EN-  
ERGY LAB IN COLORADO

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, good morning.

Tomorrow, several of my Republican colleagues are coming to Golden, Colorado, which is my home, to visit the National Renewable Energy Lab, and I want to welcome them, and I want to thank them for coming out to take a look at that laboratory. It's the finest laboratory in the world to come up with energy efficiency and renewable energy alternatives.

In this day and age with gas at \$4 a gallon, we have to look forward. We cannot remain hooked and addicted to oil and dependent on the Middle East. And so by them coming out to Colorado—they've never really favored renewable energy and energy efficiency—but it's time that we stop this addiction that we face.

And so we all know, and I'm beginning to hear my friends on the Republican side of the aisle recognize the need for renewable energy and energy efficiency because it's good for national security, it's good for the climate, and it is good for jobs; and I welcome them to my home in Golden, Colorado, and I look forward to them looking and visiting the National Renewable Energy Lab.

□ 1030

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES  
ON S. 2062, NATIVE AMERICAN  
HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND  
SELF-DETERMINATION REAU-  
THORIZATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Roskam moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 2062 be instructed to include in the conference agreement the provision in section 202(2)(A) of the Senate bill providing that development and rehabilitation of utilities and utility services shall be eligible affordable housing activities under the Indian Housing Block Grant Program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of full disclosure, my side of the aisle is looking at every conceivable opportunity under the House rules and in any reasonable parlance of conversation to talk about energy.

So when we're beginning this conversation today, follow me along, because we're going to start about Native

American housing, but eventually, the conversation is going to turn to energy. And why is that?

It's true, Mr. Speaker, because that's what the entire country is talking about, and that's what the entire country, I would submit, wants the House to focus its, no pun intended, energy on. So follow me, if you will.

When the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 was passed, it reorganized housing assistance for Native Americans by eliminating several disparate Federal assistance programs and replacing them with the Indian Housing Block Grant program.

In the underlying statute, section 202 specifies eligible affordable housing activities for the block grant program, with the goal of developing, operating, maintaining, or supporting affordable housing or homeownership.

Further, section 202(2)(A) of S. 2062 amends current law and expands the eligible affordable housing activities under the statute. The language of the aforementioned bill would give tribes more flexibility under the Act by allowing a recipient to utilize funds not only for the acquisition and new construction of affordable housing, but it would also allow tribes to utilize block grant funds for the development and rehabilitation of utilities and necessary infrastructure to achieve greater energy efficiency.

Native Americans in this country are facing serious housing problems. Last Congress, the Financial Services Committee held several hearings to investigate the housing situation in Indian lands, which are the result of widespread poverty, high unemployment, homelessness, and a lack of affordable housing on Native American lands. In addition to reorganizing the program, the statute sought to provide Native Americans the right to self-determination and self-governance by allowing tribes to have greater freedom over their tribal housing. Reauthorization is an important step in addressing many of these issues.

Like every American today, Mr. Speaker, Native Americans are struggling with the high cost of energy. Whether on tribal lands or in suburban America, families are grappling with the escalating cost of energy in today's economy and the effect it has on maintaining housing affordability. Rising energy costs associated with renting or owning a home and the transportation cost of traveling back and forth from home to work are having a devastating impact on everyone's budget, including families in Indian country.

So the conversation then surrounds itself around greater flexibility and enhancing, literally, the opportunity for Native Americans to pursue energy solutions, particularly as it relates to utilities. And why is this important?

This is important, Mr. Speaker, because we need to take a holistic approach. We need to pursue every conceivable, reasonable energy alter-

native, Mr. Speaker. We've got to make sure that we don't leave any solutions on the table and we pursue everything.

So, for example, yesterday we had a hearing in the Financial Services Committee where the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Chairman Bernanke, came in and commented on a wide range of elements of the economy. But what was particularly interesting, I found, among other things, was the assertion that he made when he said this: that if we increase production of oil by 1 percent, he anticipates a 10 percent drop in price. Let me say that again. I'm going to say that two more times, it's so unbelievable. A 1 percent increase in production, according to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who we defer on many things in our economy, he said would create a 10 percent decrease in price. A 1 percent increase in production would create a 10 percent decrease in price.

That is a staggering assertion from the person that both sides of the aisle give a great deal of deference to, both sides of the aisle listen to and consult with and are very interested in his comments. And he says, again, a 1 percent increase in production creates a 10 percent decrease in price.

So how does the motion to instruct weave into this? The motion to instruct is part of a broader conversation on energy, and I think what my side of the aisle is trying to assert in this and in other bills obviously that have come before the floor in the past several days, Mr. Speaker, is that when it comes to energy and when it comes to solutions, we need a holistic approach, and not to allow ourselves to be hidebound by an orthodoxy that has developed among some elements that are driving the other side of the aisle, to say, well, we're not going to pursue those things, those are not on the table, we're not going to pursue enhanced production, we're not going to pursue clean coal technologies, we're not going to pursue some of these other technologies that are so dynamic and are so vibrant.

So I have done my best, Mr. Speaker, to weave the energy debate into this motion to instruct.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first, let me say that I think this is a very reasonable motion to instruct, and I urge all Members to vote for it.

I do want to take a moment, since we are talking about the Native American housing benefit, to explain to people what the major issue is. It's not the subject of a matter of discussion. It wasn't that controversial in our committee, and it has to do with the action of the Cherokee Tribe.

The Cherokee Tribe was one of several tribes that owned slaves in the 19th century and fought on the side of the South in the Civil War. When the Civil War was concluded, treaties were signed, not just with the Confederacy.

There was a treaty. Treaties were signed with these Indian tribes that were independent in which they agreed to incorporate into the tribe from that day forward the former slaves, known as the Freedmen, and their descendants.

To my great disappointment, the Cherokee Tribe has decided that they don't want to continue that arrangement. I think it is a violation of their tribal obligations, their treaty obligations. The Bureau of Indian Affairs agreed. They're a fairly small number of people. The question is not what blood people have but this treaty obligation that the Cherokees undertook.

Our committee voted to exclude the Cherokees from the housing benefit as long as they are out of compliance here. Now, it's interesting, some defenders of the Cherokees have said, well, let's let it go to the courts. But I've read the Cherokee's brief on this subject. It's been in a court case, and they say to the court, stay out of this, it's up to Congress. Well, I agree with the brief, and that's an important part of this bill. And that's one reason why we have asked for the appointment of conferees, and the conferees are people who strongly believe it's a fairly small number of people to talk about, that the Cherokee Tribe should not be allowed to expel them.

Now, as to the energy piece, we very much agree with this. I think it's probably the case that we have more to learn from the Native Americans about energy use and conservation than they from us, and it is, therefore, entirely appropriate that we say that the funding that is available be available for them to use in this way. As I said, I don't think this is a group that we have to force this on, but I think it's a useful one.

Indeed, it's a principle that we think very important, and in fact, later this month, the Committee on Financial Services will be voting on a bill. The gentleman from Colorado is the prime author. The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) has worked with the gentleman, Mr. PERLMUTTER, on it, and we very much agree with this principle, and indeed, we want to incorporate it in Federal housing policy in general.

Essentially our view is that where the Federal Government is funding housing in a fairly direct way, then we ought to require energy efficiency, and where the Federal Government is not funding it but helping enable it, we ought to encourage it. Of course, as we know, if you do energy efficiency into the building of the housing, you may have an increase in immediate cost and a long-term saving, not just in energy efficiency but in funding.

So I'm going to be yielding time to the gentleman from Colorado because we agree that this is a very useful, broad principle, and we agree with the approach of the gentleman from Illinois which is, since this instruction itself isn't controversial, we'll all use

it to talk about other things that we want to talk about. That's perfectly reasonable. We have nothing else to do this morning.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the chairman's encouragement on this motion and the clarity with which he spoke and articulated the need for it, and I think I want to follow up on a couple of the things that he highlighted, and I think they're important, and I think they're a first step.

But I would encourage all Members to take that first step and not stop walking, and I think the first step that the chairman talked about—and he mentioned the gentleman from Colorado and his efforts as it relates to energy efficiency and creating incentives, Mr. Speaker, in the Federal housing market, a tremendous goal, no question about it, pursuing efficiency, pursuing conservation efforts.

This whole energy debate that we're having, it seems to me, is a time at which there should be a sense of unanimity within our country about moving forward. We should be now a Congress that is listening to the overwhelming majority of Americans that are just hamstrung by the high price of energy. It's having a disproportionate impact on the poor, who are very concerned about it. It's having a disproportionate impact, creating a disadvantage for American businesses as they're struggling to compete overseas.

This should be the one issue that is able to transcend sort of regionalism. It should transcend other past alliances, frankly, because the crisis is so great.

In past national crises, what happens is that legislative bodies tend to get over themselves, and rather than looking inwardly, they look outside of the walls of the legislative body and say we've got a responsibility here; 435 people, we can do this, we can move forward.

Part of what the gentleman from Massachusetts talked about is part of that equation, that is, conservation, that is, energy efficiencies. But that's not enough.

Part of what the gentleman from Colorado mentioned a couple of minutes ago in renewables in his 1-minute speech is part of the equation, too, but you know what, that's not enough.

□ 1045

If we choose to go to the Financial Services Committee hearing and we choose selectively to listen to what the Chairman of the Fed says, then I think we're deluding ourselves and we're not serving the public well. What we've got to do is listen to when the Chairman of the Federal Reserve comments about energy production and the de minimis amount of production that has to be created and its impact on price. It was a staggering, staggering figure; 1 percent in increased production yields a 10

percent decrease in price. That is a bargain any day of the week. And the idea that this Congress, that somehow 435 people can't come together and come up with a plan to increase oil production by 1 percent, that's just ridiculous that we can't meet that challenge. One percent increase in production, a 10 percent decrease in price.

And so what you're seeing manifested here today, I think, is part of the conversation that this side of the aisle wants to have—wants to have on almost every conceivable bill—because what we're hearing back in our districts is I think what everybody's hearing back in their districts, and that is, the crushing weight of energy.

When there is that much pressure, we've got to make sure that we are not the generation of a Congress that simply chooses to kick the can down the lane. As Americans, we have a history of doing this, don't we, Mr. Speaker? We have a history. When we got the wake-up call in the mid-1970s that our energy policy at that point was dysfunctional and we had a real vulnerability as it relates to manipulations by actors overseas who have a low view of us and want to put foreign policy pressure on us—that is, the OPEC oil embargo—rather than dealing with that, what did we do as a country in the mid-seventies? We kicked the can down the lane. Prices sort of receded a little bit, the lines for gasoline went away and shortened, and rather than dealing with it, we kicked the can down the lane. So here we are, decades later, not only in the same place, but, in fact, at a more vulnerable place.

And so I sense that the country is hungry, Mr. Speaker, for this Congress to act, for this Congress to come together and say, you know what? There is not one side of the aisle that's got all the answers on this. You've got to completely move the ball. And I know it was sort of a foolish throw-away line that was quoted in the press by a Democrat staffer a couple weeks ago, but when he said the strategy is drive small cars and wait for the wind, I hope that that is not speaking for the majority.

And I hope that the majority is willing to say, you know what? When the Chairman of the Federal Reserve comes in and makes an assertion of the relationship between production and price, we need to listen to that. We need to pivot off of the past orthodoxy that has said we're not going to allow new production, we're simply going to close our ears and not allow the conversation to shift to new production.

There are some that say we're not going to drill our way out of this. Well, that's a thought. But certainly, responsible exploration has to be a part of this equation, Mr. Speaker, it has to be a part of this equation.

Some of our colleagues, as the gentleman from Colorado mentioned a couple minutes ago, they're going to go to Colorado and look at essentially the next generation of technology that is

clearly part of this. But they're also going to go up to ANWR and begin to really see what that's all about. Had we not been in the situation where the ANWR bill was vetoed in the mid-nineties, it would be, by conservative estimates, now pumping and producing at least a million barrels a day. Can you imagine what that does to the price equation?

Ultimately, what our job is, as Members of Congress, if we are united in our desire to get off of foreign oil, then what we've got to do is come up with 9 million barrels a day, or the equivalent, in terms of energy, or savings and conservation, efficiency and so forth. Nine million barrels a day. We can do this. We can absolutely do this. Far greater challenges have been laid out that our country has looked in the eye and has risen to, as the United States of America, and taken on that challenge.

I think that we cannot let this Congress adjourn, we can't go home for the August recess until we wholeheartedly take this challenge on. And if it means discharge petitions, if it means all kinds of procedural things to continue to drive the debate, I think we really have no other choice.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, preliminarily I would say that not only do I agree with the gentleman that we should not rule out any new production, I know of no Member of the House who takes that position. And even later today we will be dealing with legislation that the Committee on Resources brings forward that tries to increase and encourage production.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), a member of the committee and a leader in the committee on matters of energy, be allowed to control the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Illinois, who has assisted me on what we call the Green Energy Act in the Financial Services Committee. And that really is an act—which we will hear in that committee in a week or 10 days—designed to improve energy efficiency and renewable energy in various housing across the United States. Because he recognizes, as do I, as do millions and millions of Americans, that if we save a Btu, if we save a gallon of gas, it's earned; a gallon of gas saved is a gallon of gas earned, a Btu saved is a Btu earned. We can do much better, Mr. Speaker, than we've been doing when it comes to energy efficiency and adding renewable energy sources. And that's what the Green Energy Act is all about. And it

applies to Native American housing, as does the motion to instruct, so that all Federal housing that's underwritten, supported by the Federal Government will be improved to energy efficient standards.

That's what we need to be doing, looking at efficiency, looking at renewable energy types of approaches. Because as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve said yesterday to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) when he asked the question, well, what do we need to do to improve our energy situation? The Chairman of the Federal Reserve said we have to be more efficient in the way we use our energy and we have to start with renewable energy sources.

But I agree with my friend from Illinois, it's a comprehensive approach. We need to have drilling in the 68 million acres that currently is under lease by the oil companies and is not being used. And we have the bill that comes up this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, called the DRILL Act, "Drill Responsibly In Leased Lands," that will go forward this afternoon so that oil companies take advantage of all the acreage that they have. Sixty-eight million acres is the size of New England plus, I think, New Jersey added on. It's a huge piece of property both on land and in the Outer Continental Shelf. That land and that water is already available for drilling.

So part of it is drilling, in terms of what we have right now. And I would encourage all my friends on the Republican side of the aisle to support the DRILL Act this afternoon because what we want to make sure is that oil companies don't just hold the property, but they use it. So they use it or they lose the lease; and we get it on to somebody else who's willing to proceed with drilling. Because we know we need to have oil—that's really a transitional fuel for the next 10 years—but we need to then move to energy efficiency and renewable energy sources so we're not addicted to one commodity.

This country has to have other ways to power itself. And as the gentleman from Illinois remarked, tomorrow some of my friends from the Republican side of the aisle are going to discover Golden, Colorado. It's the finest place on this planet. That's my home, that's my neighborhood. And I would recommend that everybody come visit Golden, Colorado, but the reason they're coming is to visit the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, which is the finest laboratory for alternative energy and sustainable development in energy efficiency in the world. And at that laboratory we are working on those next generation of energy and fuels and the way to power this Nation in solar, in wind, in biofuels, in hydrogen, in geothermal, and all sorts of other things. And I congratulate my friends for coming over to visit the National Renewable Energy Lab, which they really have never supported much until now.

But I do see some unanimity coming among both sides of the aisle and a

consensus coming among all of us that we have to really work on all phases of an energy plan, whether it's drilling, renewable energy, or energy efficiency.

Now, I've sort of boiled it down to three things, and I call it the three P's: Produce what we've got. We haven't talked about this second part, which is punish the people who are hoarding and gouging and speculating. And the third P is promoting energy efficiency and alternative energy. We can do that. And this country will be better off because it will be good for national security, it will be good for the climate, and it will be good for jobs. Thousands and thousands and thousands of "green energy" jobs will be available through promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency.

One of the things that my friend from Illinois just talked about, which is drilling in ANWR, which is a reserve, a refuge, that's 10 years off. And the greatest projections are that that's 3 months' worth of United States supply of oil. So we're going to wait 10 years to drill for 3 months' worth of supply.

Now, one of my friends who I just saw on the floor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), calculated that an average American family will spend \$57,000 on fuel costs before the Republican plan to drill in ANWR would ever take effect. We've got to be working on other things before that. And the first one is to drill on the 68 million acres that are under lease and ready to go today. The second is to punish the people who continue to drive up the futures prices if, in fact, there is speculating or gouging going on. And the third is to promote alternative energy and energy efficiency.

But I support the bill that will come up before the House this morning, as does my friend from Illinois, and I would urge an "aye" vote.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 19½ minutes remaining.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to instruct conferees on S. 2062.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response to the gentleman from Colorado, a slight word of caution. I think it was maybe an overstatement to say that the National Renewable Energy Lab didn't enjoy any support from this side of the aisle until now. I find that difficult to believe. I don't have any roll calls in my presence, but

my hunch is that a program that big and that expansive didn't just get that way because of support from one side of the aisle.

But be that as it may, I think there is an opportunity here, because the opportunity is a recognition of all Members of Congress that we are at a pivotal point as it relates to energy policy. And the pivotal point is one that should bring us together.

Regardless of what one's motivation is, there is a desire to have a long-term energy solution. And part of that has to be an increase in our supply, Mr. Speaker; part of it has to be an increase in renewables. It has to be pushing new technologies, as the gentleman from Colorado talked about, conservation and efficiency measures.

There is a whole host of bills that, unfortunately, the Speaker is not allowing to come to the floor. For the life of me I don't understand it when, at the beginning of her assuming the office of Speaker, she talked about really having a desire for a bipartisan solution to most problems. She was going to change the tone. Unfortunately, we just haven't seen that.

Let me go through a couple of these bills that are literally pending that are bottled up in committee that the majority party, and its leadership, I sense—and I don't want to speak for the rank-and-file, but I do know several rank-and-file members of the majority that are terribly frustrated right now and have a desire to have some bills voted on that are sensible and that the overwhelming majority of the American public says would be a good idea.

□ 1100

For example, H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act of 2007. Here is what it does. It reduces the price of gasoline by opening new oil refineries. That's something we haven't talked about this afternoon or this morning. We've not had a new oil refinery put in place in the United States in 30 years. Investing in clean energy sources such as wind, nuclear and captured carbon dioxide and making available more homegrown energy through environmentally sensitive exploration of the Arctic Energy Slope and America's deep-sea energy reserves, that's one bill.

Why isn't that bill on the floor in an open rule with amendments and with the ability to have a conversation about it? Well, unfortunately, the New York Times today gives us part of the answer, and the answer is not really a pretty one.

According to today's New York Times, in a report, it says: "Ms. Pelosi, who is now House Speaker, can prevent a vote on expanded drilling from reaching the floor." Further quoting: "She and Senator Harry Reid of Nevada, the majority leader, appear intent on holding the line against calls to approve drilling in areas now off limits." Then further—and this is actually, I think,

the darkest part of this report—"In a private meeting last week, according to some in attendance, Ms. Pelosi told members of her leadership team that a decision to relent on the drilling ban would amount to capitulation to Republicans in the White House and that she was having none of it."

Is that what this has come down to? Is that what this has come down to? Depending on how you're calculating, 70-plus percent of the American public says, "Give us more energy. Please, put these tools on the table." Then we have a meeting that this is about "capitulation" and not wanting to give someone a political advantage. Is that what this has come down to?

I can't even tell you, Mr. Speaker, how incredibly disappointing that is to me that someone would say that it is a matter of political pride that's going to keep an idea off the table. Why can't we have the bill on the floor that I just mentioned?

How about this, H.R. 2279, to Expand American Refining Capacity on Closed Military Installations. That is nothing but a good idea. We've got distressed military installations. They're not well utilized. Let's use them. It reduces the price of gasoline by streamlining the refinery application process and by requiring the President to open at least three closed military installations for the purpose of siting new and reliable American refineries. We have not had a new refinery for 30 years in this country, and this is our opportunity to change that dynamic.

There is H.R. 5656, to Repeal the Ban on Acquiring Alternative Fuels. It reduces the price of gasoline by allowing the Federal Government to procure advanced alternative fuels derived from diverse sources such as oil shale, tar sands and coal-to-liquid technology.

In my State and in your State, Mr. Speaker, in southern Illinois, there are more British Thermal Units of energy in the coalfields of southern Illinois, in those gigantic fields, than in the entire Saudi oil fields. Imagine that. There are more BTUs of energy, more energy in southern Illinois, than in all of the oil fields of Saudi Arabia. Yet it is largely untapped.

Why is it untapped? Well, it's untapped, in part, because it's high sulfur coal, and it's pretty nasty stuff to burn and to have emitted.

I have referred to this word "orthodoxy." There has developed this thinking that has become so hidebound that, regardless of the facts that are around, it eventually says we don't even want to have a conversation about coal. We don't even want to contemplate coal because certain interest groups have told us that all coal is always bad all the time. Well, maybe not so.

Maybe this Congress should be part of the solution. This Congress could be part of the conversation that says no, no, no, that we're not going to listen to the bumper stickers. We're going to be policymakers, and we're going to unleash the potential to begin to transform a region.

Mr. Speaker, you and I represent Illinois. You know southern Illinois, and you know how challenged that area is. Can you imagine if in this country we began to unleash resources and, with that, the type of dynamic social and economic change that could come about in an incredibly challenged rural area? It begins to transform everything. As a State legislature, we struggled constantly with diverting State money to those areas, to diverting Medicaid money to those areas. Why? Because they were devastated from an economic point of view.

What do we have here? What is the opportunity here? The opportunity here is not only to create more energy but ultimately to transform regions to make them prosperous and to make them environmentally sensitive. Absolutely. It is to get them to the point where they're producing and where they're on their own two feet. We ought not to squander that opportunity.

There is H.R. 2208, the Coal Liquid Fuel Act, which reduces the price of gasoline by encouraging the use of clean coal-to-liquid technology, authorizing the Secretary of Energy to enter into loan agreements with coal-to-liquid projects that produce innovative transportation fuels.

These are all bills where there are discharged motions either pending or coming. A "discharge motion" is where 218 of us come together, where 218 of us come together and say: You know what? We're not going to be limited. We're not going to be limited to secret meetings where this is about capitulation and political agendas. We're not going to be limited to that. We're going to break free of that. Two hundred eighteen of us are all it takes for us to sign those discharge petitions. Whether one is a Republican or a Democrat, it doesn't matter. All that has to happen is that 218 Members go down to the well and sign their names. Then you know what? The bills are on the floor. Then we can talk about them, and we don't have to whisper about them in the corridors. We don't have to be held hostage to secret meetings where agendas are about—and this is the characterization—capitulation. I mean I can't even begin to tell you how disappointing that is.

There is H.R. 2493, the Fuel Mandate Reduction Act of 2007. It reduces the price of gasoline by removing fuel blend requirements and onerous government mandates if they contribute to unaffordable gas prices.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents are in crisis. They are crying out to us. They want us to lead. They want us to get over past grievances. They are tired of this place. Haven't we all seen the polls? Haven't we all seen the low view that they have of the United States Congress? Why? Because of meetings like this that characterize solutions as capitulations. We can do much better than that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume for a couple of comments.

I want to respond to my friend from Illinois concerning the support of the National Renewable Energy Lab. We'll start with that one.

I would concur that there certainly has been some support, but the two things I would point out to my friend are one, last in 2007 was the first time, really, the budget had been increased to the National Renewable Energy Lab in years and years and years under a Democratic majority. My friends who are going to go visit the National Renewable Energy Lab all voted against that, number one.

Number two, in the prior Republican Congress, there were cuts to the National Renewable Energy Lab where, in fact, scientists and engineers were going to be laid off. They were, in fact, laid off until the President went out to visit the National Renewable Energy Lab, and the department scrambled and reinstated those engineers and scientists who were going to be laid off in the face of the need for coming up with other ways to power this Nation. So I know that my friend from Illinois and I are in agreement that we need to change the way we power this Nation, and there is a transition to get there.

Then we need to be efficient in the way we use our energy, and we need to come up with other ways so we're not beholden to just one commodity. When we're beholden to one commodity, oil, we're beholden to eight oil countries, many of which don't like the United States, and to five oil companies. We have to change that picture or we're always going to face this problem. It's time for us to learn from our past.

The other thing I'd like to say in response to my friend from Illinois is that he talked about secret meetings. Well, the secret meeting that we really need to be talking about is the secret meeting held by Vice President DICK CHENEY to create the energy policy that now has resulted in \$4-a-gallon gasoline.

When the Bush administration took office, the price of oil per barrel was less than \$30. Today, it's \$150 or thereabouts. Maybe it has come down a little bit in the last few days, but is it any wonder that that happened with two oilmen running the White House? I don't think so.

With that, I'll yield 5 minutes, or such time as my friend may consume, to Congressman YARMUTH from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Colorado, and I appreciate his excellent work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that's encouraging about this debate is that we all agree in this Chamber that we need to do something about high gas prices. We need to do something to reduce our dependence on oil. We need to do something pretty quickly because the American people are hurting. The economy

is feeling the impact of these prices, and immediate action is required.

Now, let's consider the two options that we have before us. We have the option that has been put forward by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, which basically is to open up new areas of potential oil reserves for drilling, which everyone agrees is a solution that will not manifest itself until years down the road. The Bush Energy Department, itself, says no appreciable reduction in gas prices will occur from drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf or in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge until 2030.

As attested by my colleague from Colorado, the average American family will spend \$57,000 on gasoline before the Republican plan saves them a penny. That is hardly the kind of relief that the American people are looking for.

There was a very wise man once who said the significant problems we face today will never be solved by the same level of thinking that got us into those problems. That was Albert Einstein, a pretty smart guy, and that's what the Republican plan is. It's to do more of the same to solve the problems that we're now in. I think the American people are much smarter than to fall for that type of proposition.

On the other hand, the Democratic majority has a plan that can reduce oil prices virtually immediately. We call it Free America's Oil because we do have plenty of oil at our disposal to use to bring down prices immediately. That is only half the problem, though, because, as my colleague from Colorado mentioned, we've got a long-range proposition to deal with. We don't want to find ourselves year after year after year in the same dilemma in which we find ourselves now. We've got to look in a different direction. I'll return to that in a second, but let's talk about the immediate action we can take.

We have 700 million barrels of oil right now that the United States owns that are sitting in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, 700 million barrels. When we invaded Iraq, we took that down to 600 million. When we had the Katrina disaster, we went to about 600 million barrels. We have far more oil in the Reserve than we will ever need for any eventuality. If we were to release just 10 percent of the oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, 70 million barrels, into the market over the next few months, history has shown us that we can immediately impact the price of oil.

There are three times in the last 17 years that we've done it. The first was in 1991. The most recent was in 2005. Each time we did it, the price of oil dropped, in 2005 by 10 percent, in 1991 by a third. Wouldn't it be great to have oil down under \$100 a barrel. Again, it seems hard to imagine that we're actually thinking that would be a desirable goal, but at \$140, it would be very desirable.

□ 1115

We can do that if the President just uses his authority to release that oil.

We own it. It's ours. We have paid for it. We can use it to benefit the American people and get action now.

Two other things we're proposing can bring relief in the relatively short term. First, we have 68 million acres onshore and offshore already under lease to oil companies. They can drill virtually immediately. They don't need to do exploration. They don't need to clear environmental hurdles as they would in these other areas they want to drill. They can drill tomorrow. We have a proposal. We call it "use it or lose it." It's part of our "free America's oil" proposal that if we pressure the oil companies by threatening to take those leases away if they don't make a good-faith effort to produce on them, we can encourage them, again, to use the resources we already have to get oil onto the market, increase the supply and bring the price down.

Finally, we have in Alaska, west of the area that they want us to drill in, the wildlife refuge, 23 million acres that are already available for drilling. It's called, ironically enough, the National Petroleum Reserve area because there is petroleum there, estimates up to 10.6 billion barrels of oil, more than would ever be in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We want them to drill there, not in a pristine area where we don't know how much oil exists. So again, we have options. We have oil on American soil. We have oil we own that we can use to bring prices down in the very short term. And we ought to be embracing that policy.

One other mention about the long-term effects. President Bush said the other day that the reason we need to open up all these other oil areas, potential oil areas, is because of the psychological effect, because if the oil speculators know that down the road there is this massive supply coming on, the price will drop. If that is what we are relying on, I say we have a much better chance to affect the psychology of the market if we change our emphasis from oil to alternative and renewable fuels, alternative sources of power. We know the technology is there. We just have to invest in it, develop it and refine it. But that is the kind of psychological effect, the knowledge among speculators not just that there will be more oil on the market 20 years from now, but we won't need any oil 20 years from now because we're going to go in another direction. The psychological effect of that will be compelling and will be devastating to oil prices.

So I say we have a plan both for short-term and long-term energy policy that does make sense, that is not the same old rhetoric and that is not the same level of thinking, as Einstein said, that we had that got us into this problem. And I think the American people know that this is the direction we need to go on. And I think that by responding today, by passing the DRILL Act, that we can take the first step towards energy independence and toward helping the American consumer deal with these incredibly high prices.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time does each side have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 11 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois has 7½ minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard about this rise in oil prices that is related to this meeting. And I would like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado to tell us about this meeting that took place and why he can make the accusation that George Bush and DICK CHENEY as a result of this private meeting have raised oil prices. That meeting took place years ago. I would like to hear about this.

I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I appreciate my friend from Texas yielding to me. If people knew what happened in this secret meeting, we might know today why oil is at \$4.35 a gallon, why it has gone from under \$30 a barrel to almost \$150 a barrel. But the Vice President has refused to provide any information to the public or to the Congress about that meeting.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, it is obvious that the gentleman made a statement saying gas prices have risen because of this private meeting. And now the gentleman has not only no clue what took place in the meeting, as I don't either, but now makes the leap of assumption that 8 years later that gasoline is going to rise in price.

The facts of the case are this. The facts of the case are that this Congress refuses to provide the energy companies, the oil companies, with what they need where they say the oil exists. And this Democrat Congress is refusing to help consumers. And since this Democrat Congress, this new Democratic Congress has taken over, prices have risen dramatically.

There is not some plan that exists. There is no secret plan. There is no plan because the plan that is happening is what the Democrat plan is. It's working exactly as the Democratic Party wanted. Prices are rising significantly. And that is their plan. What I think would be disingenuous is to say, oh, my gosh, we wish prices would go down. That is just disingenuous if you don't back it up with facts of the case of how that could be done.

To go to the emergency petroleum reserves would be a disaster. And it would be a disaster because that is there in an extreme national emergency. We've heard this morning, we can think of no reason why that would not be used. Well, there are people who can think of reasons. And it's called if a group of terrorists wiped out every tanker that was coming to the United States and our military did not have any energy or oil. That could be a good reason not to go to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, is the new Democrat majority does

not intend to do anything to help the American consumer to get more oil supplies and thus reduce the price of gasoline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ROSKAM. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. The fact of the matter is that this entire body, on virtually every single piece of legislation, sees where the energy and oil issue comes up because the Republican Party is trying to get the new Democrat majority to change the rules that are hamstringing consumers all across this country.

And what we're trying to say, whether it be an appropriations bill up in Rules Committee or here today, is that the American consumers, the American people deserve and want this Congress to act. And all we hear are excuses. We hear about all this land that is available out there. There sure is. Oil companies don't want to drill dry holes. They want to drill where the oil is. And we are coming here to the floor, virtually every piece of legislation, every single committee in this House of Representatives is asking for the opportunity to be for the American consumer as opposed to some special interest group.

And what we're told is that we need to change the way we do business and we need to be more like Europe. Well, being more like Europe is not an answer for America. We're not just a country. We're the greatest nation on the face of this world. And we need the ability—and the American people are asking all over this country for the new Democrat majority to quit what they're doing and allow our free enterprise system and the oil companies to bring to bear those oil resources that we have. And arguing all day every day that they have all that land is not the right answer.

What is the right answer is we need to go offshore. And we need to be able to go to ANWR. The amount of the acreage is 19 million acres in ANWR. But all they need is 2,000 acres. They don't need the other 18½ million. They need that 2,000. It is one-ninth the size of DFW Airport, my airport that I land at every week. That is all we need. We will not rest our case.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

First, I would just like to say to my friend from Texas that with two of them in the White House and both Houses of the Congress in Republican hands up until 2006 when we started changing the direction of this nation, we saw that oil price going up and up and up and up. And it didn't change under them. If we always continue to drill and don't look at that as a transitional fuel and move to alternative energies, we're going to be in trouble. And we're going to have to learn this lesson over and over and over again.

With that, I will yield 4 minutes to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, today's impossible prices for oil have finally forced America to ask the essential question: "Where's the plan?" We're in a situation where every business, every homeowner, every retiree, every local and State government and every United States citizen is being forced to live under crisis management which is a recipe for failure.

To become an energy-independent nation, the first step we must take together is to develop a plan, but not behind closed doors, but to do it right here in the open. So let's stop pointing fingers and start holding hands. Let's join hands. Let's begin to think together because we're really all in this together.

And let's agree. Let's begin by agreeing that a successful energy plan must begin to include three essential elements. First, drill for new oil right here in America with any such oil obtained from within our territorial waters or national boundaries being sold to American citizens first. And the Oil for America Act will do just that. Secondly, we must invest in every form of renewable energy available and provide the tax incentives for wind, for solar, geothermal, biomass, cellulosic and every form of clean, home-grown energy. We have to provide those incentives so private industry will take charge and take the lead. And third, we must act to prevent any price manipulation anywhere in the world in our oil marketplace.

Now we have already passed legislation. We passed H.R. 6377. This was to direct the CFTC to do immediate oversight to prevent manipulation. We passed a farm bill that moves us towards energy independence, towards home-grown ethanol and energy. But we can't grow our way out of this problem. We also closed the Enron loophole, guaranteeing that the marketplace will work more effectively.

Drill for new oil in America, invest in renewable forms of energy and prevent energy price manipulation. But our economy is still dependent on fossil fuels today and foreign sources of energy, unfortunately. But oil is still one of our most precious assets. So let's make certain that the more than 140 billion barrels of oil that are underneath America go to Americans first.

Now you have a choice here. We have to work together. Under your approach, we will have a solution 10 years from now. Under our approach, we will have a solution in 10 days, because the SPR, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, was opened up several times in the past. In 1991 there was a 33 percent decline in the price of oil almost immediately. In 2000, it went down nearly 19 percent. The oil price went down 9 percent in 2005. We can bring about rapid short-term relief even as we plan for the future. But we cannot solve this problem by drilling alone. We cannot solve it by growing corn alone. We have to work together. We have to drill for new oil, invest in renewable sources of energy

and prevent any marketplace speculation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. ROSKAM. I have no other speaker seeking recognition. I will reserve the balance of my time and have the right to close.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I had to come to the floor when I heard the gentleman from Texas and he talked about the Democrats' plan is working. No, actually, we're living under the Republican energy plan. Remember that in 2001 DICK CHENEY had secret meetings with all the executives in the oil industry and other energy producers. And in 2005—the gentleman has a short memory—the Republicans, after 4 years, passed an all-Republican energy policy written by DICK CHENEY, passed by the Republican House and the Republican Senate and signed by George Bush.

And it is working exactly as some of us predicted. We said it would make us more dependent on Saudi oil. It did. Fifty-two percent imports when George Bush took office, 58 percent of our oil is imported today. We said it would raise the price. It did. When George Bush took office, gas was a \$1.47 a gallon. Today it is \$4.39 a gallon in my district.

But it raised one other thing that is vitally important to the Republican Party. Their friends in the oil industry have made a pile of money since George Bush took office. Five hundred eleven billion with a "B" dollars profit for the oil industry since George Bush took office. So, yes, this is intentional. And yes, it was designed, signed, sealed and delivered by the Republican Party when they controlled all of Washington, D.C. We are living under their energy policy.

We are trying to set a new, sustainable energy future for this country. And in the interim, yes, we want to develop domestic resources with the DRILL Act to help us with that transition. But we want to break the dependence. You don't. You made it worse.

□ 1130

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to refer people to the photograph that was just on display when the gentleman from Oregon was speaking. It showed the President of the United States hand in hand with King Abdullah as they were about to go into a meeting to discuss oil. And the President of the United States had a mission, and it was to ask the leader of another country, not particularly a friendly country to us, to solve our problem by increasing production of oil

in Saudi Arabia in order to get us out of the jamb we are in here in America.

The question that we face in this country is whether or not we are going to address in the manner of a confident country, of an ingenious country, of a country willing to take on its own problems, the challenge of changing our energy future.

The President's approach, as was described by Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon, is to drill yesterday, to drill today, to drill tomorrow, and to drill forever. And the news is in. Oil is not in infinite supply. And if we need any better authority about the limitations of oil, think about Mr. T. Boone Pickens who made a very successful career as a Texas oilman, and he points out the obvious: if you have 87 million barrels of oil consumed today, you have production at 86 million, the proven reserves are limited, the capacity to actually get more out of the ground is somewhat limited, it can be expanded but not at infinite levels, it is time to begin yesterday to plan an alternative energy strategy.

Mr. Speaker, a self-confident country does not put its head in the sand and ignore the problems that it faces; it challenges them. It accepts the burden of responsibility. It has the confidence that we have the people, the talent, and the political will to make that transition to an alternative energy economy.

The American people have that figured out. They know if we are going to create jobs and strengthen our economy, we have to know that green jobs are good jobs and that taking on the challenge of filling up the gas tank in a way that uses alternative energy and creates jobs is the pathway to the future.

So this debate is really a fork in the road. It is between two very clear choices. The oilmen in the White House, Mr. Bush and Mr. CHENEY, believe that the fuel of the future is oil. They think that we can drill our way out of the situation we are in. Americans, I believe, have come to the conclusion that is wrong and will fail and that the pathway to the future is alternative energy.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to return the Chamber to what this bill is, which is Native American housing and the motion to instruct conferees, which we are all in agreement upon, and I would urge an "aye" vote on the motion to instruct.

We have gotten into a great debate over energy. And as I said earlier, the gentleman from Illinois and I and a number of people that sit on the Committee on Financial Services have worked on a bill which we call the GREEN Act. It is Green Renewable Energy Efficiency Neighborhoods. The purpose of that bill, similar to the motion to instruct with respect to Native American housing, is to provide energy efficiency incentives and renewable energy incentives with respect to housing across America. It creates a green

mortgage market so there is a market to buy mortgages of homes that are energy efficient or have renewable energy features. It also helps to upgrade 50,000 of the 3 million units that the Housing and Urban Development either own or underwrite so that people in low to moderate-income housing have energy-efficient homes and lower utility rates.

One of the things that we and the gentleman from Illinois were talking about at the outset of this bill, was about trying to reduce utility costs in Native American housing, and that goes across the board for all low to moderate-income homeowners.

It has a number of other things involving residential energy development grants, as well as utilizing the services of the banks in particular areas, low-income housing areas to add energy efficient and renewable energy features to homes in various areas in cities and towns across the country.

I urge an "aye" vote on the motion to instruct. I look forward to this bill going forward, and I look forward to having this conversation on the GREEN Act with my friend from Illinois in a couple of weeks when that bill comes for markup.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to join everybody that has joined in this debate today. It has been robust and transparent. But I think there have been some false choices placed out here, and I want to clear that up.

I think I am speaking for a majority on this side of the aisle that says, Let's do it all. Let's have an all-of-the-above approach.

Our side has not come to the conclusion that simply enhanced production is going to get us out of this because it is not going to. But enhanced production has got to be part of the solution. So you would find a great deal of support, Mr. Speaker, for conservation efforts on this side of the aisle, at least from this Member, for increased efficiency efforts, and for renewable efforts. But all of those things by themselves don't do American consumers any good really in the short run.

Even the call by the Speaker of the House to release part of the strategic oil reserves, that only amounts to, one suggestion is selling 75 million barrels out of the strategic oil reserve, about 10 percent of the reserve, so about a 3-day supply of oil. That doesn't do much for anybody. So let's not fall into that trap; although it is an admonition on the Speaker's part, ironically, that supply does affect price.

But here is the real point. The other side of the aisle has controlled 30 minutes this morning, and did you notice something? Did you notice that there was no answer to what the Chairman of the Federal Reserve said yesterday? The Chairman of the Federal Reserve—and this is now the fourth or fifth time that I have put this out on the House

floor today—said simply by increasing production by 1 percent, Mr. Speaker, that has an impact of dropping the price by 10 percent.

We have heard some of the best and the brightest, absolutely the A team, some of the folks who came through in the 2006 election, we have heard from the best and the brightest, and yet no answer. They didn't even pick it up. This is not some fact that I trotted out 2 minutes ago, this is a fact that I put out two or three or four times, and yet the silence on the other side of the aisle has been absolutely deafening. Why, because it doesn't fit into the orthodoxy that has absolutely bound this leadership and has taken this debate from what should be a national security debate, what should be a transition time in our public life, what should bring us all together, Mr. Speaker, and has devolved into simple pettiness and capitulation. We can do better. We know what we need to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. WATT, AL GREEN of Texas, CLEAVER, BACHUS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PEARCE.

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6515, DRILL RESPONSIBLY IN LEASED LANDS ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1350 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 1350

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, July 17, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure concerning the domestic production of oil and natural gas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise

and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Res. 1350 provides that it shall be in order on the legislative day of Thursday, July 17, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules relating to a measure concerning the domestic production of oil and natural gas.

The energy crisis that we face is real. It requires immediate attention and short and long-term action. As a Nation, we have in our reserves less than 2 percent of the proven oil and gas reserves in the world. But with 4 percent of the population, we consume nearly 25 percent of the world's oil. That's not sustainable over the long term.

We must take this opportunity now to provide relief immediately to people paying over \$4 at the pump, \$5 for home heating oil, and we need a commitment to a new energy future focused on creating clear and clean domestic alternatives.

Under suspension of the House rules, this body will take up later the Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands bill. The bill promotes the responsible domestic production of oil and natural gas on the 20 million acres that make up the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. That would provide an estimated 10.4 billion barrels of oil, a higher estimate than the consensus estimate of oil that is available in ANWR.

The DRILL Act, as it is called, will increase oil production and do it sooner than other alternative proposals. It will facilitate also the construction of existing pipelines within 5 miles of where they already are located. So its environmental footprint will be minimal, and engineering challenges also minimal. This will help move oil and natural gas to the market.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule which is a cynical attempt to provide political cover for Members of this body who have chosen to elevate partisanship and politics above American consumers and our economy.

Today, both everyday consumers and our national economy are suffering. Mr. Speaker, we are suffering because of this Democrat majority's mind-boggling unwillingness to increase the supply of domestically produced oil to reduce prices at the pump. That's why we are suffering. We are suffering because the policy here in this body in Washington, D.C., and you can read about it

in articles in virtually every single paper across the country, and that is the leadership of this House of Representatives does not want to get the right thing done so consumers can have more energy and oil at the pump.

For weeks now, Republicans have been unified in a commonsense and comprehensive approach to bringing down the price of gasoline for consumers, only to have every single one of those plans and votes on the floor of this House of Representatives ignored by the Democrat majority in favor of an agenda that prioritizes legislation like naming historical trails and gaming the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to prevent the development of increased energy production in New England alone.

□ 1145

They are going out of their way to make sure that commonsense legislation that will help the free market and the energy companies, who should be our friends, to provide what consumers need and to produce a better economy.

These priorities completely ignore the wishes of the American people and will do absolutely nothing to bring relief to millions of Americans who are really suffering as a result of high energy prices. I think that if the American people knew that the plan, or part of the plan, was to sue OPEC, they would laugh just like Members of this body have done.

Rather than taking this opportunity to work in a constructive, bipartisan way, to address these domestic energy supply issues that have led to sky-high energy prices for consumers, today we are being asked outside of regular order, and with no opportunity for Members to offer their own good ideas to bring down the price of gasoline, to spend a whopping 40 minutes debating a fig-leaf legislation that wasn't even released to Republicans until late last night.

Republicans have already put forth a number of smart, innovative ideas to bring down gas prices like H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act of 2007, which would reduce the price of oil by opening new American refineries, investing in clean energy sources such as wind, nuclear, and captured carbon dioxide, and making available more American energy through environmentally sensitive exploration of the Arctic energy slope and America's deep sea reserves.

But, of course, we know we can't get close to that. We also have H.R. 2279, the Expand American Refining Capacity on Closed Military Installations Act, which would reduce the price of oil by streamlining the refinery application process and by requiring the President to open at least three closed military installations for the purpose of setting new and reliable American refineries in place.

H.R. 5656, which would reduce the price of oil by allowing the entire Federal Government, not just the Department of Defense, NASA and our intelligence community, to procure advanced alternative fuels derived from diverse sources such as oil shale, tar sands and coal-to-liquid technology.

H.R. 2208, the Coal-to-Liquid Fuel Act, which would reduce the price of oil by encouraging the use of clean coal-to-liquid technology by authorizing the Secretary of Energy to engage and enter into loan agreements with coal-to-liquid projects that produce innovative transportation and fuel; and, H.R. 2493, the Fuel Mandate Reduction Act, which would reduce the price of oil by removing fuel-blend requirements and onerous government mandates that contribute to unaffordable gasoline. In other words, red tape.

Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership have the ability to bring each and every one of these already developed commonsense solutions up for a vote at any time, but they have chosen to ignore the American public in favor of a radical environmentalist agenda, and each one of these bills is also the subject of a discharge petition that would force their consideration. Every single Member of this body, even though they may agree or disagree with Speaker PELOSI on whatever her agenda might be, can take a commonsense approach and come down and sign a discharge petition that would bring this legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives.

I encourage every single Member of this body who agrees that this country needs to increase its supply of safe and reliable American energy to force this Democrat leadership to finally act by joining me in signing each and every one of these.

It's simple, by the way, for the new Members, as you hear this, all you have to do is walk down to the very front, sign these discharge petitions, and we could, this afternoon, be debating and voting on commonsense ideas to bring down the price of gasoline.

Instead, this Democrat majority, led by Speaker NANCY PELOSI, has chosen to bring up redundant legislation that has been overtaken by events before it can even be considered. The Bush administration has already announced that a new round of leases will be held for the National Petroleum Reserve, making today's restatement of current policy as useless as the restatement of the current "use it or lose it," or, said another way, making energy companies drill dry holes. So, what we need is commonsense activities that would bring commonsense prices down for the American public.

Perhaps the most galling of all is the inclusion of section 5 of today's legislation, which forces cumbersome requirements and restrictions on the construction of any new pipeline from Alaska to the rest of the United States simply on behalf of big labor bosses. While the inclusion of this requirement is no surprise coming from the Democrat ma-

majority that wants to take away a worker's right to a private ballot so that big labor bosses can more easily manipulate the outcomes, it is disappointing that this Democrat majority would blatantly include this requirement at a time when we can see that it should be addressed to make life easier for bringing down the cost of gasoline for all Americans.

Today's bill is being brought forth by the Democrat leadership in a weak attempt and effort that does nothing more than restate current law and restate existing requirements that oil production on lands be developed while adding new restrictions to pipeline construction for the benefit of big labor bosses. I challenge anyone on either side of this aisle to produce a study other than the partisan and logically challenged report developed by the Democrat staff of the Natural Resources Committee that reapplying the so-called "use it or lose it" provision to the National Petroleum Reserve will create even one additional barrel of oil. This is a supply-side problem. This is a problem that the new Democrat majority has made happen, and this is a problem that the American people are asking each of us to solve.

So, the Republican Party is here on the floor of the House of Representatives on behalf of the American people asking all the Members of this body to please understand what we are doing. I think it's a cynical rule that we are debating now, as well as the underlying legislation. We need real legislation. We need to put the American people first. We are not just some country, we are America, and we can win.

Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a brief remark.

The number of bills that were referred to by my friend from Texas, none of those, not a single one of those bills, will get supply out of the ground and into the gas tank in the foreseeable future. The legislation that we are going to be considering today is about getting supply as quickly as possible by taking advantage of something that's available and ready to be leased next to a pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. I thank my distinguished colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am not shocked but disappointed to hear the callous and cynical suggestions from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that Democrats are responsible for the inflation in gas prices that so many Americans are suffering from today, that somehow, in the past 2 years, it is the Democratic energy policy that has caused the inflation in the price of oil and gas. Let us remember that we have two oilmen in the White House and \$4 a gallon gas today. Let us remember that we have an energy policy that was made in secret by the Vice President,

by the oil companies, for the oil companies and of the oil companies and, today, we are reaping the benefits of that secret energy policy on which we have been stonewalled time and time again.

We have 68 million acres of land available on and offshore, on which the oil companies could drill. We have the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska on which the oil companies can drill. Eighty-one percent of all known oil reserves are available to drill on right now. The estimates are that there is a 14-year supply just waiting for Big Oil to put metal to the ground, put metal to the ground and drill.

That's why I rise in support of this bill. All the oil companies have to do is to start drilling on available land, and they could help increase supply and help consumers. Calls from the White House and their allies on the other side of the aisle who somehow claim that we should open ANWR and offshore areas to drilling, which in 20 to 30 years might start producing, are cynical attempts to deflect us from the real challenges that Americans face today and that we face as a Nation in going forward to a new energy policy.

It's estimated that the average American would spend about \$57,800 before the first drop of oil could be produced from ANWR. So what's the point to deflect us from the pain that Americans are feeling now to try to point fingers and to set us aside from changing our energy policy?

What part of "drill now" don't the oil companies understand? What part of "drill now" don't my colleagues understand? No one is stopping the oil companies from drilling. It's time to drill now, help the American people with gas prices, heating oil costs.

This bill says "drill now."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think it's interesting, he says "drill now," but we can't drill where the oil is. ANWR is 19 million acres. We need less acreage than is the size of one-ninth of Dallas-Ft. Worth International Airport. We don't need the 19 million acres. We need one-ninth the size of DFW International Airport, or only 2,000 acres.

Oil companies would go drill in all these places, except they are dry holes. They want to drill where the oil is, and that's where the Republicans want to give them that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 20 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Vermont has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield for such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California from the Rules Committee, our ranking member, Mr. DREIER.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Big D for yielding me time and for accurately pointing out the size that we are looking at exploring in an environmentally sound way in Alaska is the size of the Dallas-Ft. Worth International Airport. I have often said the Dulles International Airport. It's a pretty small area, and I think we need to do that.

I just don't get it. I have enjoyed listening to a load of our newly elected friends from the other side of the aisle over the past hour and a half as we have debated the motion to instruct conferees come to the floor and talk about the need for us to increase exploration. Obviously these newly elected Members have been hearing from their constituents just like virtually everyone has.

I appreciate the fact that they have had their ear to the ground, and they have heard the hue and cry from the American people that we need to do everything we can to address this problem.

The thing is, this bill, as was correctly stated by my friend from Dallas, is nothing but a reaffirmation of current law, and it is called the DRILL Act. The thing that is very perplexing about this is that we are trying to have an all-of-the-above solution, which does include drilling in an environmentally sound way, and yet this bill, which was introduced late last night, just provided to members in the minority again very, very late last night, was cobbled together. We had a Rules Committee meeting yesterday, and no one knew what it was.

We offered, at that juncture, a bipartisan, and I stress a bipartisan, package of legislation which has been introduced, considered. A number of those measures are right here in the well with discharge petitions, and these measures are provided, having gone through an airing by Members of this body, and, yet, we are not given a chance to do that, to have a vote on it.

Now, again, this is called the DRILL Act, but fact of the matter is, the structure around which we are considering this measure should be we are afraid to vote on the potential for drilling act, is really what it is.

□ 1200

Why?

Because we know full well that this procedure, known as suspension of the rules, is really building on what is taking place in our House Appropriations Committee right now and virtually every other committee in this Congress; and that is, we are afraid to have any kind of debate, discussion or debate or vote on the issue of drilling.

Now, I am one who believes, as our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have said, that we need to pursue alternative energy sources, renewable energy, we need to do everything we can to encourage conservation, and we have a lot of very interesting proposals out there to do that.

But I think common sense says that, for the next few decades, even though we need to do everything we can to wean ourselves off of our reliance on fossil fuels, we have no choice. And so that is why, when I listen to my colleagues say that we should pursue the petroleum reserve and get 10 billion barrels, why don't we also look at ANWR to go for 10 billion barrels?

Again, I believe that the American people want us to come together to address this. As we listen to the horror stories of what has happened, one of the most telling came to me from a grandparent who said that, in one of our town hall meetings, they can't afford to pay for the gasoline to drive to visit their grandchildren from the San Gabriel Valley of California down to Long Beach. And the notion that this dramatic increase in gasoline prices is literally dividing families is something that I think we, as Democrats and Republicans, should come together to address.

Now, as we listen to our need to expand drilling and to encourage big oil to do that, I think we need to look at the fact that, for at least a decade and a half plus, we have been trying to encourage things like exploration in ANWR. And what has happened? Well, in the other body we had members of the Democratic Party filibuster this measure.

I also have to say that in 1995, 13 years ago, we all know that we were able to get through both Houses of Congress, through both Houses of Congress, a measure that would allow us to, in an environmentally sound way, explore that tiny area in Alaska. And what has happened as a by-product of that? Well, unfortunately, then-President Clinton chose to veto that measure.

USA Today, which is hardly a Republican publication, had an editorial just a few weeks ago in which they said that if that measure had been signed, rather than vetoed by President Clinton, we wouldn't be standing here having this discussion that we are now.

And so that is why we have come forward, and Mr. SESSIONS is going to move to defeat the previous question so that we will have an opportunity to make in order legislation like the very thoughtful proposal from our Democratic colleague, Mr. BOUCHER, the gentleman from Virginia, who has, as a hardworking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, come up with a way in which we could proceed on this. A lot of thought has gone into this, a lot of work. And this was introduced a while back.

There are five other bills, along with Mr. BOUCHER's, that have been introduced. And all we are saying is, why don't we have a debate on those and have an up-or-down vote, so that we can, again, pursue what we describe as our all-of-the-above solution to what is obviously a very serious problem that is having a ripple effect across our entire economy, and, in fact, as we all know, across the global economy.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule so that we can come forward with a measure that will allow us to do what it is the American people want us to do; work together, Democrats and Republicans alike, for a solution to this very, very pressing problem.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for the time and for his leadership on this extraordinarily important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the DRILL Act, a real solution for the hardships facing our families and a real answer to the mistruths being spread to the American people.

The truth is that there are millions upon millions of onshore and offshore acres available for drilling, but the oil companies are only using a fraction of them.

The truth is that the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, also known as the NPR, is home to 20 million acres that could produce 10.6 billion barrels of oil. This area, Mr. Speaker, has been set aside for oil and gas exploration since the 1920s, but not a single oil company is producing there.

Mr. Speaker, the cry by those on the other side of the aisle and Big Oil, that the problem is that the oil companies don't have access to drill, is false. And it is an effort to deflect the American people from holding the two oilmen in the White House accountable, as well as their friends, for an energy policy that has given Big Oil record profits, and the American people \$4 a gallon gas.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know why we need to open up ANWR when we have this huge, untapped resource right next to the existing oil infrastructure in Alaska known as the NPR.

The DRILL Act will accelerate the development of the NPR by requiring the Bureau of Land Management to offer annual lease sales of the land.

Our bill also calls for the President to facilitate the completion of oil pipelines into the NPR, and to speed construction of a natural gas pipeline to the Continental United States to move the product to the market. When this natural gas pipeline gets built, NPR will be even more important, as it holds over 60 trillion cubic feet of gas, nearly 16 times what ANWR holds.

And Mr. Speaker, the DRILL Act also incorporates important use it or lose it legislation which requires oil producers to drill on the leases they already have before asking us for new ones.

Again, the truth is that Big Oil holds leases on 68 million acres in the U.S. that they could drill on but they are not doing so.

And lastly, this bill also reinstates the ban on the export of Alaskan oil so that American oil is used right here at

home in the United States. Can you imagine, at this time of crisis, the same oil companies who are telling the American people that they want to be part of the solution, are sending the oil that they are drilling to other parts of the world, when we need that oil right here.

Mr. Speaker, the DRILL Act is a solution to the energy costs that our constituents are facing today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SUTTON. Let me also remind my colleagues that we have also passed landmark energy legislation, price gouging prevention legislation, legislation to take action against OPEC, and legislation to crack down on manipulation and speculation activities that have been driving up the oil prices.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. It offers immediate relief. It is part of the solution, and I urge its passage.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the favorite son of the Volunteer State, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), in his opposition to this rule. Mr. Speaker, let me read just one thing to you. Charles Krauthammer is one of our most respected syndicated columnists and television commentators. A little over 3 weeks ago he wrote this: "Gas is \$4 a gallon. Oil is \$135 a barrel and rising. We import two-thirds of our oil, sending hundreds of billions of dollars to the likes of Russia, Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, and yet we voluntarily prohibit ourselves from even exploring huge resources, huge domestic reserves of petroleum and natural gas. At a time when U.S. crude oil production has fallen 40 percent in the past 25 years, 75 billion barrels of oil have been declared off limits according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration."

Still quoting Mr. Krauthammer: "That would be enough to replace every barrel of non-North American imports for 22 years. That is nearly a quarter century of energy independence."

Mr. Krauthammer ended by saying: "The situation is absurd." Robert Samuelson, a couple of months ago in *The Washington Post*, and he is another syndicated columnist, but not a conservative or a Republican by any stretch of the imagination. He wrote this. He said, "The truth is that we are almost powerless to influence today's prices. We are because we didn't take sensible actions 10 or 20 years ago. If we persist, we will be even worse off in a decade or two."

The first thing to do, Mr. Samuelson said: "Start drilling."

And George Will pointed out in a recent column that when we were able to

pass drilling in ANWR, 12½ years ago, President Clinton vetoed it. If he hadn't vetoed it, that would have been 27 million barrels of oil, 20 million barrels of gasoline and 7 million barrels of diesel fuel coming down to this country, coming down here every day, and would have had a great, great effect on this problem. And we are certainly in a problem.

A couple of months ago we heard in the Highways and Transit Subcommittee that 935 trucking companies had gone out of business in the first quarter of this year. And that survey only counted trucking companies with five trucks or more.

A couple of weeks ago, in the Aviation Subcommittee we heard that eight airlines had gone out of business in the last year and a half. And this is a needless crisis.

The Minerals Management Service estimates that the quantity of undiscovered, technically recoverable resources ranges from 66 to 115 billion barrels of oil.

One of our leaders has described this DRILL Act as a hoax of a bill, and it is a hoax because it still leaves 85 percent, or 611 million acres of our Outer Continental Shelf off limits for oil production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, let me close just simply by saying this. I have noticed over the years that almost all of these environmental radicals come from very wealthy or very upper income families, and perhaps they can afford 5 or \$6 a gallon gasoline. But many hardworking and average Americans cannot afford this. We are sending this country into a needless economic crisis.

We need to start drilling in an environmentally safe way where there is oil, as the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, and not pass a hoax of a bill such as this.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, Today we are going to take up the DRILL Act; Drill Responsibly In Leased Lands. We recognize, on the Democratic side of the aisle, that part of our energy portfolio is oil and gas. We have 68 million acres that the oil and gas companies have under lease today that they could drill that they are not drilling. That is 14 years worth of supply to the United States.

But what we have, instead, is we have an addiction to foreign oil. And we have a picture here of the President and the King of Saudi Arabia.

We have to break that addiction. So we need to drill here in the United States. And under this particular bill, we require the oil companies to either use it or lose it. Drill on those 68 million acres. 68 million acres is the size of

New England. Drilling locations, all across the United States and in the Outer Continental Shelf. Use it or lose it.

We cannot be tied to foreign oil forever. We have learned that lesson. It is time we have to have domestic drilling, and that is what the DRILL Act is. And even more so, it is time to switch to energy efficiency and renewable energy sources. If we are addicted to one commodity, we are going to be in trouble because we depend upon 8 oil countries and 5 oil companies and we are in real trouble.

Now, there is 68 million acres here is depicted. You can see, the size of New England, twice the size of Pennsylvania, bigger than Colorado. Huge amount of property.

Now, one of the things that we have done is there is another 23 million acres available in Alaska to drill, where there is a pipeline nearby.

□ 1215

The oil companies can drill there. Further, we can release some of the amount of oil we have in our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And we have a chart here that shows that when we took oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in 1991, there was a 33 percent drop in the price of oil immediately; 2000, 18 percent, 2005, 9 percent. That's what we're asking the President to do.

We need immediate relief, and then we have to switch and get off the addiction to oil by pursuing renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it seems like the Democrat Party has an argument with themselves on this one. They're arguing with themselves.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished second baseman from the Republican championship baseball team, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I certainly thank the third base coach for yielding the time.

I do think that there is a healthy thing that's going on here, and that is the Democrats are beginning to hear from their constituents that we've got to do something about foreign oil, and we've got to use our American resources. I think that's good.

I think this bill will probably pass. I don't actually know why we're debating it. It's pretty much a restatement of current law. I heard one Democrat say it's a "drill now" bill. You know, that's what they are doing right now. They're exploring these leases. These leases are very expensive. They don't buy them to sit on them and for the U.S. Congress to think. This is really ridiculous that they're sitting on land where there are great reserves of oil, but for some reason, they're not drilling there.

Come on, guys. This is a capitalist system. These companies are money hungry. They run after profit. If there were oil in these places, certainly they

would be working on it. If you want to give them a nudge, I'm all for it.

I plan to support the bill. I think it ought to be voice voted out on suspension. It's no big deal. It's a rhetoric bill. It's not a realistic bill.

What we do know is that 65 percent of our land resources are tied up and off-limits. We do know that, for example, the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve is the size of South Carolina in a State twice as big as Texas. And in this massive amount of land the size of South Carolina, there is a tundra area of about 2,000 acres which we believe would increase our domestic American oil supply 10 percent. It was vetoed by Democrat liberal President Bill Clinton 10 years ago. If it hadn't been vetoed by the Democrat liberal, special-interest President, we would have that oil today. It's too bad.

And then we hear so often from the Democrats, well, you know, if you open up ANWR and all of these places, it will be 10 years before we get the oil. Well, where are these electric cars? Where are these battery-operated cars? I mean, all of this alternative energy, which I certainly support and have been funding from the appropriations side, working very diligently on, that's going to be 10 and 15 years down the road as well.

We've got to do three things on our energy crisis: we have to have conservation, we have to have innovation, and we have to have exploration. It's that simple. But you have got to explore where their actually is oil. I concur with the gentleman from Texas. This is good because the Democrats are admitting that we have to open up more lands.

So we're going to pass this bill. Nothing is going to happen to the price at the pump. It's not going to be affected by this because it's basically current law, but I'm glad that you guys are slowly, reluctantly entering into the debate of drilling because we believe that in an environmentally safe fashion, you can drill in Alaska, and you can drill offshore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to say 108 oil platforms were damaged in the Gulf of Mexico during Katrina, and there was no pollution. All of the problems in the gulf, pollution wasn't one of them because now we have environmentally safe ways to extract oil from the bottom of the ocean or from land.

I want to say this. You know, we tied up the offshore in the day of the 8-track tape player. That was when you had an 8-track tape player in your GTO and you were the cool, edgy, high-tech guy. Today in the world of iPods and BlackBerrys and cell phones and everything else, technology has moved past the good old 8-track tape player. And the same thing has happened in medicine, the same thing has entered in en-

tertainment, the same thing has happened in oil drilling. We have new technology, modern technology that will extract oil in an environmentally safe fashion.

I want to close with this. What is so sacred about protecting the American global environment but not the foreign global environment? The Democrats are fine if you are drilling offshore in your country or drilling on the land in your country, but not in America.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona, a leader in solar energy, alternative energy, Congressman GIFFORDS.

Ms. GIFFORDS. I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

The high costs of fuel are being felt throughout my southern Arizona district, and people are really hurting out there right now.

To bring down the cost of oil—this is pretty common sense—what we're going to have to do is force those big oil and gas companies to increase their production. That means drilling on the 68 million acres of Federal land that is already under control from these big oil companies.

Today, we're going to vote on H.R. 6515, the Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands, or Drill Act. This bill is going to require both oil and gas companies to start using their Federal leases both onshore and offshore, and if they don't use it, they should lose it.

It will also accelerate the leasing process in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, and that's an additional 20 million acres. We have to be realistic, and I don't think the American people are being fooled. It's going to take 5 to 7 years before we benefit from increased drilling.

That's why we're also calling on the President to immediately release a small amount of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The hardworking taxpayers of my district have paid for that reserve supply to be used in a time of crisis. And when I talk to my constituents across the over 9,000 square miles of my district, we know because they agree that \$4 to \$5 a gallon is a crisis.

So I urge the President to take action on the SPR, and I also ask my colleagues to join with me in passing H.R. 6515. We have to address this energy challenge, stabilize our economy immediately, but then look to the future in terms of renewable energy. And in Arizona, solar energy is certainly the key to that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to let the gentleman from Vermont know that our time allocation is out of balance now, and I would appreciate if the gentleman would use up that time and make it more equitable between us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I am always here to accommodate my friend from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield at this time 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you, Mr. WELCH. Thank you for the hard work that you're doing.

Mr. Speaker, it's a very good thing that the American people can see today that we're working together, not just working together but we're beginning to join hands to begin to solve this energy crisis that we're all facing.

I think we can all agree that we have to drill for new oil right here in America and guarantee that the oil that comes from our hands stays within our boundaries and is sold to American citizens first. We can all agree that we have to invest in every single form of renewable energy—biomass, wind, solar—and indeed we have to look into the newer and modern techniques and nuclear energy in finding a way towards becoming an energy-independent nation.

Thirdly, we have to prevent any price manipulation in the market price not just here in the United States but also throughout the world. We have to guarantee that there really is a free marketplace in oil where places like OPEC don't control the supply and determine the price. We need a competitive and open marketplace, and we've done that here in this Congress moving the ball forward.

But it's not just about drilling. It's not just about investing. It's not just about preventing things. The people I represent, that I have the honor of representing in northeast Wisconsin, they need help now. I mean, their fingernails are not long enough to hang on to what is coming. They need help now.

So in the long term, drilling brings oil 10 years from now, investing 5, 10, 15 years from now, but preventing price manipulation in the marketplace, that can have an immediate effect. So I would urge the CFTC to do its job and provide the oversight to guarantee that we don't have to pay more than the price ought to be.

Finally, the President did accommodate us. We sent letters to him asking him to stop purchasing oil and putting it into our SPR, our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And he accommodated. And that was put in effect July 1. Now he should listen to us again. He should begin to release 5 to 6 days' worth of our Strategic Petroleum Oil Reserve. Why? Because it will immediately drop the price of oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KAGEN. Our Strategic Petroleum Reserve has about 703 million barrels of oil. If we release 5 to 6 days' worth, it would immediately drop the price at the pump by putting immediate supplies onto the marketplace. These are things that the President can do right here and right now. Our constituents need help today as we begin to invest and plan for the future.

But first and foremost, let's understand that this crisis we're in was absolutely and totally predictable since

1973. And our government on both sides of the aisle has failed in the past. Let's not fail again. Let's work together.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have one additional speaker, and I believe that the gentleman from Vermont has about twice as much time as we have. So I would like to inquire about his opportunity to utilize more of his speakers or to ask where he is in this process.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, can you tell us the time allocation at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes. The gentleman from Vermont has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. We reserve our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are a lot of reasons we're in this pickle we are today. But let's just remember one. George Bush elected 2000; DICK CHENEY's secret meetings with the oil and gas industry. They formulated an energy policy. That energy policy was adopted by the Republican House, the Republican Senate, and signed by the Republican President. That was in 2005. Many of us said it was shortsighted, it would make us more dependent upon imported oil, and it has.

When George Bush was elected, 52 percent of our oil was imported. Today it's 58 percent. Many of us said it would drive up the price. It has. When George Bush was elected, it was \$1.46 a gallon. Today it's \$4.39 a gallon in my district.

So they're saying now suddenly, Whoa. It's the Democrats' fault. No. We're living under the failures of the Republican oil industry energy policy. There's actually 164,968,695 reasons why we're living under that. That's the amount of money the Republican Party has received from the oil industry in the last 18 years, \$164 million in political contributions. Now, that's a pretty big motivation.

There's another thing going on here. Since George Bush took office, the profits of the oil industry have been \$511 billion in this country. That's \$511 billion out of Americans' pockets and into the oil industry's pockets. They made more money under 7 years of George Bush than they made in the entire quarter century preceding his presidency. Yeah. There's something a little bit rotten here.

They talk about drilling offshore and all of that stuff. Well, let's talk about short-term relief.

There's three ways to get short-term relief. One is release our oil. Release our oil. We have paid to put oil in the Strategic Reserve for emergencies. This is an emergency. It's been done three times: 1991, the price went down 33 percent; 2000, it went down 18 percent; 2005, it went down 9 percent.

□ 1230

That would give relief today at the pump, and there's another thing that we could do, but they're against this, too.

The gentleman from Texas talked about, oh, they want to file a complaint against OPEC. Well, you know, we probably do, but George Bush isn't going to do that, that's for sure. Here's George Bush holding hands with King Faisal of Saudi Arabia when he was over there begging them to increase production.

OPEC's production, with a doubling in the price of oil, is down 2½ percent. They have colluded to drive up the price of oil and limit the supply, and we have a legal option, which the President refuses to use. He refuses to file a complaint in the World Trade Organization for a clear violation of the rules of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, article 11, by the OPEC countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That would have an immediate impact for the American people. And then there's the speculators.

Today, the largest holder of oil resources in the United States of America is not ExxonMobil, not Shell, not Conoco, name all of our oil companies. No, it's Morgan Stanley on Wall Street, through their speculative activity, followed by Goldman Sachs and followed by others who are speculating and driving up the price of this market.

We have credible testimony from Wall Street experts, if we reined in the speculation which was created by the Enron loophole—remember Enron? Texas corporation, Ken Boy Lay, the President's best friend. He's dead. Enron's bankrupt. He would have gone to jail for fraud. But the loophole lives on, and we're all paying at the pump. An estimated 50 percent, according to Wall Street experts, is going into speculative activities, but they don't want to take on speculative activities. They just want to talk about one thing, and that is, they want to drill in ANWR.

Well, guess what, ANWR was made a national wildlife refuge in 1950. The Naval Petroleum Reserve was made a petroleum reserve by Warren Harding. Now, why was this a natural preserve and this an oil preserve? Because they know there's more than 10 billion barrels of oil under here. Republicans change it from a naval reserve to a national reserve, and Bill Clinton actually leased it. And yesterday, George Bush announced he's going to lease more of it.

There's 10 billion barrels of oil under this. That's our Saudi Arabia. They've drilled 25 wells, but they haven't tried to connect to the Alaska pipeline. They've capped the wells and they're sitting on them. And why are they sitting on them? Because they think if

they keep manipulating the market they can make as much money as possible today and even more down the road. They are sitting on supplies of oil, and they are failing to develop what they could.

Mr. SESSIONS. We reserve our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding.

And, you know, we have a wonderful situation in here. We have a very interesting and productive dialogue, I believe, about something we all want to do, and that's to solve our energy crisis to take the pressure off the American consumers whose lives are being terribly affected, adversely affected, by these high gas prices and the economy as well.

I call back to the words of a very smart person who once said the significant problems that we have today cannot be solved by the same level of thinking that created them. And unfortunately, this idea that we are going to drill our way out of the problem, both the short term and the long term, is the same level of thinking that got us into this problem. The man who said that was Albert Einstein. He was a pretty smart guy.

What we are proposing, and you have heard many instances of it and suggestions of it today, is that we have the ability, we have the resources right now to have an impact, a downward impact on prices. All we have to do is free our own oil, free America's oil. It's in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

As my colleague from Oregon just pointed out, we have been able to reduce the price three separate times over the last 17 years by releasing that oil. We can do it again and we should do it again. But more importantly than that is the entire attitude we take toward what's down the road, no pun intended.

My colleague from Tennessee on the other side of the aisle just mentioned a few minutes ago, he asked where are the electric cars, where are these hybrid cars? Well, actually, they're very close on the horizon. We met with Ford executives just a few weeks ago in my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky. They are on the verge of some significant breakthroughs. They have a plug-in hybrid that uses hydrogen power, as well as electricity. They're working on a battery car. They have several versions of alternative power sources they're working on.

General Motors has promised to have a battery-powered car on the road in 2010. We know in California there's a new manufacturer that's developed a battery-powered car.

These are the technologies that will be our future. We need to be investing in them, because as President Bush said the other day, what we are trying to do with this long-term approach is change the psychology of the market, change the psychology of the speculators, so that if they see down the

road that there's not going to be that much need for oil, the price will come down. I agree with him totally.

But wouldn't the effect be that much more dramatic if the speculators said not only is there going to be a reduced demand for oil in 2020 or 2030, there's going to be virtually no demand for oil in 2020 or 2030? That would really scare the speculators out of this market and drop the price. That's where we need to be investing our attention, our resources.

We can take tax breaks way from the oil companies—we have tried to do it a number of times already—and invest it in these technologies because they're not that far away. They are actually closer than the policies that will bring us relief at the gas pump maybe in 2030.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, English economist John Maynard Keynes said, "When the facts change, sir, I change my mind. What do you do?"

Well, it's obvious today that the facts have changed, and our friends in the new majority don't change their thoughts or ideas to adjust to the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN).

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, you know, the only way to produce more energy for America is to produce more energy. It's not taxing the energy. It's not releasing more reserve from the Strategic Reserve. If we released what is being proposed today from the Strategic Reserve, it would be a 3-day supply. But yet when President Bush earlier announced that he was going to lift the offshore ban on drilling, the price of a barrel of oil dropped \$9, and the markets responded.

The way you change the energy and the cost to America is to introduce more energy to the marketplace. And one of the ways we can do that is to make it easier for oil and gas companies to be able to drill.

I have introduced a piece of legislation, H.R. 6379, the Federal Exploration and Production Reform Act, that would allow oil companies and gas companies to be able to get their permits processed in a timely manner from the Bureau of Land Management and would help us be able to put that production online in immediate form. Right now, it takes an average of 213 days to get a permit processed through the Bureau of Land Management. That's not acceptable. They even have a huge backlog of permits.

And we've heard all the debate here today that over 65 percent or so of our energy comes from foreign countries. We have over \$700 billion of our money going to other countries, many who are hostile to America. We're making those countries rich by buying their energy.

I am convinced that we can produce our own energy here in America, whatever form it might be, whether it's oil, gas, clean coal technology. There's wind, solar, nuclear, biofuels. All those

things are possible. I know they're possible because America's a great Nation. We have smart people. We have innovation. We have creativity. We can do whatever we want to do if we put our heads to it, if we put our minds to it, and allow it to happen.

But this Congress has stopped it from happening. We've had lawsuits, we've had rules and regulations, we've had bureaucratic red tape that has tied up the industry from making the innovations, producing the energy that would fuel our Nation, and we can no longer afford to do that. The American people are suffering. Businesses are suffering, and now it's time for this Nation to generate our own energy.

Let's get rid of the Federal bureaucratic red tape, the time delays. Let's put Americans to work. Let's quit transferring our wealth to other foreign countries and risking our national security and our economic security.

We can invest that money here in America. We can generate revenue that could go to transportation, education, health care, go to our infrastructure in our Nation. Let's put Americans to work. Let's invest here and let's produce energy.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I reserve my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will take from those words that the gentleman from Vermont has no further speakers and would be interested in me closing at this time.

Mr. Speaker, since taking control of Congress in 2007, this Democrat Congress has totally neglected its responsibilities to do constructive things to address the domestic supply issues that have created today's skyrocketing gas prices, diesel prices, and energy costs that the American families are facing. And today, once again, they are proving to Americans that they have a failure of leadership and vision.

Mr. Speaker, we'll see what happens when the August break comes around and our friends in the new Democrat majority head home to find out how much home fuel prices are going to spike with home heating fuel, and we will find out what happens in September when we come back from the break.

So to avoid that, Mr. Speaker, today, I urge my colleagues to vote with me to defeat the previous question so this House can finally consider in July, as opposed to September, real solutions to the rising energy costs. If the previous question is defeated, I will move to amend the rule to allow for this House's consideration of H.R. 5984, H.R. 2208, H.R. 3089, H.R. 2493, H.R. 5656, and H.R. 2279.

Mr. Speaker, these may not be household understood names of bills, but in September, the new Democrat majority, after spending August at break, is going to find out they should have done something, rather than doing nothing.

Yesterday afternoon in the Rules Committee, hours before Republicans were even given a copy of today's legis-

lation, the same amendment was defeated by the Democrat majority by a party-line vote.

While I do not have a great deal of hope that this Democrat majority will provide a better outcome than the one provided by my Democrat Rules Committee colleagues, the vote on this previous question will allow every single Member of this body, especially those Members of the much- and often-reported bipartisan working group on drilling, to stand up for real solutions to this energy crisis—it's easier to do it in July than it will be in September—not just ineffective restatements of current policy that do absolutely nothing to increase the production of American energy for consumers.

I encourage everyone that believes that a comprehensive solution to solving this energy crisis and achieving energy independence includes increasing the supply of American energy to join me and to defeat this rule and the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place this motion and extraneous material in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas.

First of all, there is common agreement here. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to know this. People are suffering. They cannot afford spending more than \$4 a gallon for gas, and folks in my part of the country, the cold weather region, are living with enormous anxiety about how they're going to pay \$5 a gallon for home heating fuel. So the problem that we face is real and it is urgent.

I disagree with one of the authors of the energy policy that got us here, and that is the former senator from Texas, Phil Gramm, who is advising their Presidential candidate. And he recently announced that we really don't have a problem. He said, "You've heard of mental depression; this is a mental recession." And he's saying that America is a nation of whiners.

You know what, people have a right to complain about an energy policy where they can't afford to fill up their gas tank. They're living in enormous anxiety when the fuel truck shows up to heat their home, and they have to make decisions between food and fuel, between medicine that they need and the fuel that's required to keep their home warm.

□ 1245

This is about rejecting the energy policy that has failed us and has brought us here.

You know, my friend from Texas made a statement that I agree with. He said the oil companies should be our

friends. That is right. Oil companies have been very good at what they do—exploring for oil, finding oil, refining oil, producing oil, and getting it to the market. But the policies that we've had in place since President Bush became the leader of this country have enriched the oil companies. But the oil companies, in turn, with over \$500 billion in profits, have not reinvested that money into either producing where they can or moving to an alternative energy policy.

You know, one of the folks raised the question as to whether or not this is a "fig leaf" bill, whether there's rhetoric in this bill because we're talking about 20 million new acres that has a proven capacity of at least 10 billion barrels of oil. Is it a question of Congress not making lands available for drilling onshore and offshore when we know already there are 68 million acres onshore and offshore available, and this bill makes it clear we want to make 20 million acres more available? Is it a question of lands where there is oil available being denied access? Or is it a failure on the part of the oil companies to invest?

You know, ExxonMobil, in one quarter, made about \$40 billion in profit; for 1 year, \$40 billion in profit. Did they put that profit into new drilling technology, into exploiting some of the leases that they have, into getting oil out of the ground and into the market? No. They spent \$32 billion buying back their own stock.

Basically what you're seeing is that the oil companies that have been doing extraordinarily well under this energy policy that's got us to this crisis have not been reinvesting their money, but they've put their capital on strike. They've been buying back shares and maintaining the value of their stock at the expense of exploiting the oil fields that they have immediate access to.

Well, I want to go through some of the arguments that my friend from Texas made. He accused the Democratic Congress of a mind-boggling refusal to increase production. That's just flat out wrong. You've got the 68 million acres where the oil companies right now have the legal right to go in and drill, and they haven't done it. That's not an act of Congress, that's a corporate decision made by the major oil companies.

Second, he said that the energy companies don't go there because they are "dry holes." That's just flat out wrong. I mentioned earlier I actually do think the energy companies are good at what they do. They don't waste their money or their stockholder money. And when they decide to spend their money on purchasing a lease, it's because they've come to their own independent conclusion that it's worth that investment, that there is oil in the ground or under the sea.

So those oil companies have access to it. Why don't they drill? And also, why aren't there drills available, the drilling rigs for offshore drilling and drill-

ing rigs on land? There's two reasons: one, the oil companies are doing great sitting on these leases; the longer that they wait, the more they make. If they bought a lease when oil was at \$30 a barrel and then it goes to \$75 a barrel and up to \$130 or \$140 a barrel, that's money in the bank. The longer they wait, the more they make.

A second reason is, they aren't willing to risk the profits in increasing production. As long as there is a shortage of supply, the price stays up. And their profits are exploding as we speak. So there is an enormous amount of responsibility that we have and expect from the oil companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1350 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, July 17, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures: (1) The bill (H.R. 5984) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law. (2) The bill (H.R. 2208) to provide for a standby loan program for certain coal-to-liquid projects. (3) The bill (H.R. 3089) to secure unrestricted reliable energy for American consumption and transmission. (4) The bill (H.R. 2493) to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a reduction in the number of boutique fuels. (5) The bill (H.R. 5656) to repeal a requirement with respect to the procurement and acquisition of alternative fuels. (6) The bill (H.R. 2279) to expedite the construction of new refining capacity on closed military installations in the United States.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

YEAS—228

|             |             |          |
|-------------|-------------|----------|
| Abercrombie | Berry       | Capuano  |
| Ackerman    | Bishop (GA) | Cardoza  |
| Allen       | Bishop (NY) | Carnahan |
| Altmire     | Blumenauer  | Carney   |
| Arcuri      | Boren       | Carson   |
| Baca        | Boucher     | Castor   |
| Baird       | Boyd (FL)   | Chandler |
| Baldwin     | Boyd (KS)   | Clarke   |
| Barrow      | Brady (PA)  | Clay     |
| Bean        | Brady (IA)  | Cleaver  |
| Becerra     | Brown, (OR) | Clyburn  |
| Berkley     | Butterfield | Cohen    |
| Berman      | Capps       | Conyers  |

Costa Kagen  
 Costello Kanjorski  
 Courtney Kaptur  
 Cramer Kennedy  
 Crowley Kildee  
 Cuellar Kilpatrick  
 Cummings Kind  
 Davis (AL) Klein (FL)  
 Davis (CA) Kucinich  
 Davis (IL) Lampton  
 Davis, Lincoln Langevin  
 DeFazio Larsen (WA)  
 DeGette Larson (CT)  
 Delahunt Lee  
 DeLauro Levin  
 Dicks Lewis (GA)  
 Dingell Lipinski  
 Doggett Loebsock  
 Donnelly Lofgren, Zoe  
 Doyle Lowey  
 Edwards (MD) Lynch  
 Edwards (TX) Mahoney (FL)  
 Ellison Maloney (NY)  
 Ellsworth Markey  
 Emanuel Marshall  
 Engel Matheson  
 Eshoo Matsui  
 Etheridge McCarthy (NY)  
 Farr McCollum (MN)  
 Fattah McDermott  
 Filner McGovern  
 Foster McIntyre  
 Giffords McNeerney  
 Gillibrand McNulty  
 Gonzalez Meek (FL)  
 Gordon Meeks (NY)  
 Green, Al Melancon  
 Green, Gene Michaud  
 Grijalva Miller (NC)  
 Gutierrez Miller, George  
 Hall (NY) Mitchell  
 Hare Mollohan  
 Harman Moore (KS)  
 Hastings (FL) Moore (WI)  
 Herseht Sandlin Moran (VA)  
 Higgins Murphy (CT)  
 Hill Murphy, Patrick  
 Hinchey Murtha  
 Hinojosa Nadler  
 Hiroso Napolitano  
 Hodes Neal (MA)  
 Holden Oberstar  
 Holt Obey  
 Honda Olver  
 Hooley Ortiz  
 Hoyer Pallone  
 Israel Pascrell  
 Jackson (IL) Pastor  
 Jackson-Lee Payne  
 (TX) Perlmutter  
 Jefferson Peterson (MN)  
 Johnson (GA) Pomeroy  
 Johnson, E. B. Price (NC)  
 Jones (OH) Rahall

**NAYS—188**

Aderholt Capito  
 Akin Carter  
 Alexander Castle  
 Bachmann Cazayoux  
 Bachus Chabot  
 Barrett (SC) Childers  
 Bartlett (MD) Coble  
 Barton (TX) Cole (OK)  
 Biggert Conaway  
 Bilbray Crenshaw  
 Bilirakis Culberson  
 Bishop (UT) Davis (KY)  
 Blackburn Davis, David  
 Blunt Davis, Tom  
 Boehner Deal (GA)  
 Bonner Dent  
 Bono Mack Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Boozman Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Boustany Drake  
 Brady (TX) Dreier  
 Broun (GA) Duncan  
 Brown (SC) Ehlers  
 Brown-Waite, Emerson  
 (IN) English (PA)  
 Buchanan Everett  
 Burgess Fallin  
 Burton (IN) Feeney  
 Buyer Ferguson  
 Calvert Flake  
 Camp (MI) Forbes  
 Campbell (CA) Fortenberry  
 Cannon Fossella  
 Cantor Foxx

Rangel LaHood  
 Reichert Lamborn  
 Reyes Latham  
 Richardson LaTourette  
 Rodriguez Latta  
 Ros-Lehtinen Lewis (CA)  
 Ross Lewis (KY)  
 Rothman Linder  
 Roybal-Allard LoBiondo  
 Ryan (OH) Lungren, Daniel  
 Salazar E.  
 Sanchez, Linda Mack  
 T. Manzanillo  
 Sanchez, Loretta Marchant  
 Sarbanes McCarthy (CA)  
 Schakowsky McCaul (TX)  
 Schiff McCotter  
 Schwartz McCrery  
 Scott (GA) McHenry  
 Scott (VA) McHugh  
 Serrano McKeon  
 Sestak McMorris  
 Shea-Porter Rodgers  
 Sherman Mica  
 Shuler Miller (FL)  
 Sires Miller (MI)  
 Skelton Moran (KS)  
 Slaughter Murphy, Tim  
 Smith (WA) Musgrave  
 Snyder Myrick  
 Solis Neugebauer

**NOT VOTING—18**

Andrews Gilchrest  
 Boswell Herger  
 Cooper Hunter  
 Cubin Inslee  
 Doolittle Lucas  
 Frank (MA) Miller, Gary

**□ 1311**

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. HOOLEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:  
 Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 509, unfortunately, I am getting a medical procedure done and cannot vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

**RECORDED VOTE**

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 194, not voting 18, as follows:

**[Roll No. 510]**  
**AYES—222**

Abercrombie Boucher  
 Ackerman Boyd (FL)  
 Allen Boyda (KS)  
 Altmire Brady (PA)  
 Arcuri Braley (IA)  
 Baca Brown, Corrine  
 Baird Butterfield  
 Baldwin Capps  
 Barrow Capuano  
 Bean Cardoza  
 Becerra Carnahan  
 Berkley Carney  
 Berman Carson  
 Berry Castor  
 Bishop (GA) Chandler  
 Bishop (NY) Clarke  
 Blumenauer Clay  
 Boren Cleaver

Shadegg Dicks  
 Shays Dingell  
 Shimkus Doggett  
 Shuster Donnelly  
 Simpson Doyle  
 Smith (NE) Edwards (MD)  
 Smith (NJ) Edwards (TX)  
 Smith (TX) Ellison  
 Souder Ellsworth  
 Stearns Emanuel  
 Sullivan Engel  
 Tancredo Eshoo  
 Thornberry Etheridge  
 Tiahrt Farr  
 Tiberi Fattah  
 Turner Filner  
 Upton Foster  
 Walberg Frank (MA)  
 Walden (OR) Giffords  
 Walsh (NY) Gillibrand  
 Wamp Gonzalez  
 Weldon (FL) Gordon  
 Weller Green, Al  
 Westmoreland Green, Gene  
 Whitfield (KY) Grijalva  
 Wilson (NM) Gutierrez  
 Wilson (SC) Hall (NY)  
 Wittman (VA) Hare  
 Wolf Harman  
 Young (FL) Hastings (FL)  
 Herseht Sandlin  
 Miller, George  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Hinchey Moore (KS)  
 Hinojosa Moore (WI)  
 Hiroso Moran (VA)  
 Hodes Hoyer  
 Holden Hoyer  
 Holt Hoyer  
 Honda Hoyer  
 Hooley Hoyer  
 Hoyer Hoyer  
 Israel Hoyer  
 Jackson (IL) Hoyer  
 Jackson-Lee Hoyer  
 (TX) Hoyer  
 Jefferson Hoyer  
 Johnson (GA) Hoyer  
 Johnson, E. B. Hoyer  
 Jones (OH) Hoyer

Kind Richardso  
 Klein (FL) Rodrigue  
 Kucinich Ross  
 Langevin Rothman  
 Larsen (WA) Roybal-Allard  
 Lee Ryan (OH)  
 Levin Salazar  
 Lewis (GA) Sanchez, Linda  
 Lipinski T.  
 Lofgren, Zoe Sanchez, Loretta  
 Lowey Sarbanes  
 Lynch Schakowsky  
 Mahoney (FL) Schiff  
 McCollum (MN) Schwartz  
 McDermott Scott (GA)  
 McGovern Sherman  
 McIntyre Sires  
 McNulty Skelton  
 Meek (FL) Slaughter  
 Meeks (NY) Snyder  
 Melancon Solis  
 Michaud Stark  
 Miller (NC) Stupak  
 Miller, George Sutton  
 Mitchell Tanner  
 Mollohan Tauscher  
 Moore (KS) Taylor  
 Moore (WI) Thompson (CA)  
 Moran (VA) Thompson (MS)  
 Murphy (CT) Towns  
 Murphy, Patrick Tsongas  
 Murtha Udall (CO)  
 Nadler Udall (NM)  
 Napolitano Van Hollen  
 Neal (MA) Velazquez  
 Oberstar Vislosky  
 Obey Walz (MN)  
 Olver Wasserman  
 Ortiz Schultz  
 Pallone Waters  
 Pascrell Watson  
 Pastor Watt  
 Payne Waxman  
 Perlmutter Weiner  
 Peterson (MN) Welch (VT)  
 Pomeroy Wexler  
 Price (NC) Wilson (OH)  
 Rahall Woolsey  
 Rangel Wu  
 Reyes Yarmuth

**NOES—194**

Aderholt Heller  
 Akin Hensarling  
 Alexander Hobson  
 Bachmann Culberson  
 Bachus Hulshof  
 Barrett (SC) Davis, David  
 Bartlett (MD) Davis, Tom  
 Barton (TX) Deal (GA)  
 Biggert Dent  
 Bilbray Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Bilirakis Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Bishop (UT) Drake  
 Blackburn Dreier  
 Blunt Duncan  
 Boehner Ehlers  
 Bonner Emerson  
 Bono Mack English (PA)  
 Boozman Everett  
 Boustany Fallin  
 Brady (TX) Feeney  
 Broun (GA) Ferguson  
 Brown (SC) Flake  
 Brown-Waite, Forbes  
 (IN) Ginny Fortenberry  
 Buchanan Fossella  
 Burgess Foxx  
 Burton (IN) Franks (AZ)  
 Buyer Frelinghuysen  
 Calvert Gallegly  
 Camp (MI) Garrett (NJ)  
 Campbell (CA) Gerlach  
 Cannon Gingrey  
 Cantor Gohmert  
 Capito Goode  
 Carter Goodlatte  
 Castle McCaul (TX)  
 Cazayoux Graves  
 Chabot Hall (TX)  
 Childers Hastings (WA)  
 Coble Hayes

|               |               |                |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| McKeon        | Regula        | Smith (NJ)     |
| McMorris      | Rehberg       | Smith (TX)     |
| Rodgers       | Reichert      | Souder         |
| Mica          | Renzi         | Stearns        |
| Miller (FL)   | Reynolds      | Sullivan       |
| Miller (MI)   | Rogers (AL)   | Tancredo       |
| Moran (KS)    | Rogers (KY)   | Terry          |
| Murphy, Tim   | Rogers (MI)   | Thornberry     |
| Musgrave      | Rohrabacher   | Tiahrt         |
| Myrick        | Ros-Lehtinen  | Tiberi         |
| Neugebauer    | Roskam        | Turner         |
| Nunes         | Royce         | Upton          |
| Pearce        | Ryan (WI)     | Walberg        |
| Pence         | Sali          | Walden (OR)    |
| Peterson (PA) | Saxton        | Walsh (NY)     |
| Petri         | Scalise       | Wamp           |
| Pickering     | Schmidt       | Weldon (FL)    |
| Pitts         | Sensenbrenner | Weller         |
| Platts        | Sessions      | Westmoreland   |
| Poe           | Shadegg       | Whitfield (KY) |
| Porter        | Shays         | Wilson (NM)    |
| Price (GA)    | Shimkus       | Wilson (SC)    |
| Pryce (OH)    | Shuler        | Wittman (VA)   |
| Putnam        | Shuster       | Wolf           |
| Radanovich    | Simpson       | Young (FL)     |
| Ramstad       | Smith (NE)    |                |

NOT VOTING—18

|           |              |               |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|
| Andrews   | Hergert      | Paul          |
| Boswell   | Hunter       | Ruppersberger |
| Cooper    | Larson (CT)  | Rush          |
| Cubin     | Loeb sack    | Smith (WA)    |
| Doolittle | Lucas        | Tierney       |
| Gilchrest | Miller, Gary | Young (AK)    |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1320

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 510, if I were present I would have voted "yea." Unfortunately, I am getting a medical procedure done and cannot vote today.

DRILL RESPONSIBLY IN LEASED LANDS ACT OF 2008

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6515) to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious environmentally responsible program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6515

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA: LEASE SALES.

Section 107(a) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an expeditious environmentally responsible program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska in accordance with this Act. Such program shall include no fewer than one lease sale in the Reserve each year during the period 2009 through 2013."

SEC. 3. NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA: PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION.

The Secretary of Transportation shall facilitate, in an environmentally responsible manner and in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, the construction of pipelines necessary to transport oil and gas from or through the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to existing transportation or processing infrastructure on the North Slope of Alaska.

SEC. 4. ALASKA NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECT FACILITATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Over 35 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves have been discovered on Federal and State lands currently open to oil and gas leasing on the North Slope of Alaska.

(2) These gas supplies could make a significant contribution to meeting the energy needs of the United States, but the lack of a natural gas transportation system has prevented these gas reserves from reaching markets in the lower 48 States.

(b) FACILITATION BY PRESIDENT.—The President shall, pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (division C of Public Law 108-324; 15 U.S.C. 720 et seq.) and other applicable law, coordinate with producers of oil and natural gas on the North Slope of Alaska, Federal agencies, the State of Alaska, Canadian authorities, and other interested persons in order to facilitate construction of a natural gas pipeline from Alaska to United States markets as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 5. PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS AND OTHER PIPELINE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS.—The President, as a term and condition of any permit required under Federal law for the pipelines referred to in section 3 and section 4, and in recognizing the Government's interest in labor stability and in the ability of construction labor and management to meet the particular needs and conditions of such pipelines to be developed under such permits and the special concerns of the holders of such permits, shall require that the operators of such pipelines and their agents and contractors negotiate to obtain a project labor agreement for the employment of laborers and mechanics on production, maintenance, and construction for such pipelines.

(b) PIPELINE MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary of Transportation shall require every pipeline operator authorized to transport oil and gas produced under Federal oil and gas leases in Alaska through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, any pipeline constructed pursuant to section 3 or 4 of this Act, or any other federally approved pipeline transporting oil and gas from the North Slope of Alaska, to certify to the Secretary of Transportation annually that such pipeline is being fully maintained and operated in an efficient manner. The Secretary of Transportation shall assess appropriate civil penalties for violations of this requirement in the same manner as civil penalties are assessed for violations under section 60122(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 6. BAN ON EXPORT OF ALASKAN OIL.

(a) REPEAL OF PROVISION AUTHORIZING EXPORTS.—Section 28(s) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(s)) is repealed.

(b) REIMPOSITION OF PROHIBITION ON CRUDE OIL EXPORTS.—Upon the effective date of this Act, subsection (d) of section 7 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2406(d)), shall be effective, and any other provision of that Act (including sections 11 and 12) shall be effective to the extent necessary to carry out such section 7(d), notwithstanding section 20 of that Act or any other provision of law that would other-

wise allow exports of oil to which such section 7(d) applies.

SEC. 7. ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After the date of the issuance of regulations under subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall not issue to a person any new lease that authorizes the exploration for or production of oil or natural gas, under section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (33 U.S.C. 226), the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands Act (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), or any other law authorizing the issuance of oil and gas leases on Federal lands or submerged lands, unless—

(1) the person certifies for each existing lease under such Acts for the production of oil or gas with respect to which the person is a lessee, that the person is diligently developing the Federal lands that are subject to the lease in order to produce oil or natural gas or is producing oil or natural gas from such land; or

(2) the person has relinquished all ownership interest in all Federal oil and gas leases under which oil and gas is not being diligently developed.

(b) DILIGENT DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall issue regulations within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act that establish what constitutes "diligently developing" for purposes of this Act.

(c) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS.—Any person who fails to comply with the requirements of this section or any regulation or order issued to implement this section shall be liable for a civil penalty under section 109 of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1719).

(d) LESSEE DEFINED.—In this section the term "lessee"—

(1) includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee; and

(2) does not include any person who does not hold more than a minority ownership interest in a lease under an Act referred to in subsection (a) authorizing the exploration for or production of oil or natural gas.

SEC. 8. FAIR RETURN ON PRODUCTION OF FEDERAL OIL AND GAS RESOURCES.

(a) ROYALTY PAYMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall take all steps necessary to ensure that lessees under leases for exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas on Federal lands, including leases under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (30 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), and all other mineral leasing laws, are making prompt, transparent, and accurate royalty payments under such leases.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION.—In order to facilitate implementation of subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and in consultation with the affected States, prepare and transmit to Congress recommendations for legislative action to improve the accurate collection of Federal oil and gas royalties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for debate on the pending measure be expanded to 60 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) each will control 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our freshmen Democratic members and in concert with the Democratic leadership, I am pleased to bring to the floor today the Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands Act, the DRILL bill.

Let there be no mistake about it. As Democrats, we are pro drilling. I repeat that for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We are pro drilling. We are for drilling now. And we are for drilling in areas that bring near-term relief to the American public.

As others put forth bumper-sticker energy policies, today, House Democrats are bringing forth prudent legislation aimed at unleashing the vast potential of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, this section to the far right on the map behind me. That is to be distinguished very clearly and separately from the ANWR, over on my far left.

Where better to drill than in the National Petroleum Reserve? That is what it's for. The National Petroleum Reserve. That is why it was set aside. The National Petroleum Reserve.

Now, my colleagues, the National Petroleum Reserve, situated on the North Slope of Alaska—this reserve is no pipe dream like ANWR way over here, which is a bumper sticker approach to our energy woes—the National Petroleum Reserve is open for leasing. It has been. It will be. Twenty-three million acres. The National Petroleum Reserve is open for leasing, open for business, now, today, 23 million acres containing an estimated 6.6 billion barrels of recoverable oil. There is more than over here in ANWR, which is not even open for leasing at this point in time. It is a pipe dream over here in ANWR.

Far more than ANWR, the National Petroleum Reserve, as I said, has much more recoverable oil than ANWR. And if ANWR were fully open, we still would be 20 years before we could have any oil in production. The Energy Information estimates show that the only effect on the price at the pump would be 1.8 cents 20 years from now.

As opposed to that, we have the National Petroleum Reserve set aside for drilling. In Alaska, 35 trillion cubic feet of natural gas has been stranded. Think about that: 35 trillion cubic feet of natural gas stranded over in the National Petroleum Reserve because there is no pipeline available to bring

it to market over here being the major pipeline. For oil only, I might add.

Elsewhere, there are 68 million acres of land onshore and offshore in the Outer Continental Shelf in the lower 48 under oil and gas leases that are not producing. They may be subject to speculation. They may be purely being warehoused. We don't know.

I say here today, drill. Drill. Drill. Drill here in America. Drill now. Let's drill.

The DRILL Act, Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands Act, would unleash the vast potential of the National Petroleum Reserve by requiring annual Federal oil and gas lease sales and by facilitating the construction of pipelines to connect the NPR-A with the existing central North Slope arteries that will bring it on down to the American consumers in the lower 48. That includes Prudhoe Bay, connecting it over here to Prudhoe Bay, the transportation infrastructure and trans-Alaska Pipeline that comes down here, we do need still a gas pipeline. There is, of course, already existing an oil pipeline.

But it makes as a matter of Presidential priority, the DRILL Act makes the construction of the Alaska natural gas pipeline a priority so that stranded gas, that stranded gas in the National Petroleum Reserve, can be transported to the lower 48.

It requires project labor agreements be entered into for construction of these pipelines so they would be good-paying American jobs. It requires that the trans-Alaska Pipeline, the NPR pipeline that connects, that is right here, a 5-mile segment connecting NPR over to the existing oil and gas leasing being done in the Prudhoe Bay area, that they be maintained and operated in an efficient manner to ensure an uninterrupted flow of oil and natural gas. And the DRILL Act reinstates the ban of the exportation of Alaskan oil to other countries so that this Alaskan oil, American oil, can be used by Americans for their relief.

□ 1330

It is a commonsense approach to our near-term energy woes. We know very clearly we must transition ourselves from oil dependency. We must wean ourselves from oil addiction. Alternative fuels, coal-to-liquids, carbon sequestration, other noncorn-based alternatives, renewables, all of the above should be on the table. It is the only way to secure America's energy independence from foreign crude.

But in the near term, we need to drill. We are saying in this bill today drill, drill, drill. Drill it now. Drill it here. Drill it where the oil is and where it is already available, not wait 20 years from now, as the President proposes to lift some moratorium on the OCS and up here in the ANWR that, as I have already said, won't affect any near-term relief at the pump for American consumers.

Let me observe that there are those who display a fundamental misunder-

standing of parts of this legislation. We do of course incorporate the use it or lose it that has already been passed by a majority in this body which requires the diligent development of Federal oil and gas leases during their primary term, which is normally 10 years. What that means is during that period, we are requesting that the oil companies do something with these leases to explore for energy. If a discovery is made, and we hope that it will be, apply for the permit.

Now, I understand drilling. I think most of my colleagues know I am from the State of West Virginia, by golly, the great State of West Virginia. We know something about energy woes in that State. We are not a NIMBY State by any stretch of the imagination. We do not shirk from our responsibility to contribute to the Nation's need for energy. We have mining. We have drilling.

I understand that complications can take place while trying to develop a lease, environmental challenges, bureaucratic delays, but this constitutes due diligence. This constitutes the development of a lease. This constitutes moving toward meeting our energy woes. Diligent development does not mean the lease is producing, I understand that. It means that a company is doing something with the lease to determine whether it can be brought into production or not. That is a good thing. That is diligent development.

I understand it is a lengthy process, but I am saying to Mr. Big Oil, please do something on these leases. Do something. If you have to go out and buy a Black & Decker drill to drill it to move forward, do that.

Vote for this legislation. A vote for this legislation will mean that we are trying to bring energy immediately to the American people, that we are voting for American good-paying jobs, and that we are voting to prevent American energy from being exported to foreign markets.

As I conclude, I say, drill, drill, drill. Drill here. Drill now. Drill so we can meet our energy supply-side demands here with American resources.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this misguided, misdirected legislation. After seeing this bill defeated just 2 weeks ago, I quite honestly am surprised that we are back for one more attempt at it. It is really heartwarming to find my colleague from West Virginia, the chairman of my committee, saying "drill America now."

The only thing is I am wondering why the chairman did not allow us to have amendments that would allow us to drill now. If he would allow us the amendments that would stop the litigation that is stopping us from drilling now, maybe we could work through some of those 68 million acres, if he would allow us to have amendments

which would stop the regulatory process that is delaying unnecessarily and is of no benefit to the American consumer, maybe we could drill now. But I find the chairman's comments just hard to believe.

In the context of the discussion today, I would invite the chairman to sign on to a letter with me. The letter is from myself and several other Members asking just in one area, one area where we find bureaucratic delays, 7 years in Utah, the BLM has not issued the resource management plans that are required in order to develop just that.

If the chairman of the committee is intent on drill, drill, drill, as he says today, let him just put his one signature beside mine, and we will send it to NANCY PELOSI and send it to the President of the United States from NANCY PELOSI and us in the House and the Members of the Senate.

One place where we have some of that 68 million acres, 1 million of the 68 million acres, and let's just work one block at a time to figure out exactly what the roadblocks are because I believe, I believe in my heart that the majority does not want to drill today.

I believe that they understand that it is not the oil companies who lack the diligence, but it is instead roadblocks by people who have hijacked the energy policy of this country.

In my section of the debate we will talk about the reason the 68 million acres lie unused, and it will go from regulatory process to litigation. It will go into the problems of seismic that are being blocked up along the northern end of this country. We will talk about the delays one step at a time.

But let's talk just a little bit about the bill before us today. It is several sections.

The first section I want to talk about directs the sale of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, the NPR-A. Now that is curious that the Democrats on the floor of the House today do not want to open up ANWR, 2,000 acres. They have been concerned about the environmental degradation of the 2,000 acres of ANWR, and yet today they are saying that they are going to open up 23 million acres to environmental degradation. There is not one bit of infrastructure. There are no roads. There are no drilling pads. There are no pipelines. They are hundreds of miles away from where they need to be for the market. Yet with ANWR, with a 74-mile pipeline, it is sincerely believed that we could get production down to the continental United States within a year.

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline, 800 miles long, took 3 years to have it built and full of oil because this Congress, at that point in time, realized that they could make a difference and they did make a difference by saying that this pipeline is not going to be delayed by litigation.

If the gentleman from West Virginia says drill and drill now, then let him

make the equal commitment that we will not allow our production to be delayed by litigation which is going to come from every sort of environmental group, either in the NPR-A or ANWR or the Outer Continental Shelf.

It is really difficult to believe that the majority is sincere when they say drill today, and on the other side of the spectrum we see all sorts of delaying mechanisms from people who contribute money to them.

I was interested in the last debate to find that oil companies contribute money to Republicans and therefore there is some scheme. When I look at the bill in front of us today, I see groups, I see an alliance with groups that contribute a lot of money to Democrats. I see over \$670 million in the last several years from trial lawyers. There is new language in this bill which will be litigated probably for decades.

I see a section in this bill, section 5, that requires project labor agreements, and I see that the unions have given to the Democrats over \$1 billion.

And then I find the continuing language which says that there are going to be protections in place that satisfy environmental groups; and again, environmental groups have invested over \$1 billion in Democrat candidates.

So when I hear from the other side their observations about the special interests, I think we should look at the bill. Section 2 requires again the direction that any leases be environmentally responsible. That is new language.

Sections 3 and 4 deal with pipeline requirements that companies tell me that they have to currently comply with already, so it appears to be a duplication.

The project labor agreements are brand new. These are things where private companies are directed that they will, before they can work on any private project, have labor agreements in place.

Then we have a ban that is reinstated on exporting Alaskan oil. Keep in mind that it was Democrat President Bill Clinton that opened up the Alaskan oil to be exported. So again, we find now the flip-flop in that position on their part. The ban was originally in place, and President Clinton decided he would relieve that ban. And now we find it being put back in place.

The issuance of new leases, use it or lose it, frankly is already in place in law. There is language that currently states that if you do not use a lease, you lose it.

So either this bill is simply to try to convince the American people that we are doing something when we are actually not, or it is even worse than that. I believe that we have no purpose for this bill. I believe that this bill is not going to increase the amount of domestic energy one bit. I think that what it is going to do is to start anew, it is going to start new processes and are going to delay even by months the process in place for the NPR-A.

So while it is telling us we are going to drill now and drill in the NPR-A, actually it is doing the exact opposite. It is instituting new rules that will have to go through a completely new process.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the debate.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, July 17, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. STENY HOYER,  
*Majority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. ROY BLUNT,  
*Minority Whip, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, MINORITY LEADER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER HOYER, AND MINORITY WHIP BLUNT: In the last month, through various legislative proposals and public comments, Majority leaders in Congress have accused oil and gas companies of refusing to drill. We think many times idle acres are caused by factors beyond these companies' control. In many cases, Congress and the bureaucracy create roadblocks that shut down companies' access to the lands.

Your rhetoric over the last few months leads us to believe we have finally reached a consensus in Congress. In order to start drilling on idle acres where regulatory burdens exist, we request Congressional leaders act now to remove these obstacles on a case by case basis. We also request that you join us in sending a joint letter to the President urging him to issue an Executive Order systematically removing barriers on a case by case basis from lands under development that, due to regulatory burdens, remain blocked from development.

We suggest starting with the permanent delays and lawsuits preventing drilling in Utah. Please join us in sending a letter to the President asking that he open drilling in Utah by issuing the final Records of Decision (RODs) on this state's Resource Management Plans (RMPs)—Vernal, Price, Moab, Richfield, and Monticello—which authorize oil and gas activities in Utah. These plans were to have been underway for over 7 years. In our letter we will ask the President to order the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to issue the RMPs by August 31, 2008.

Additionally, we ask you insist that the RODs authorize the Preferred Alternatives in each RMP without the adoption of new Wilderness Characteristics Areas (WCAs). Removing bureaucratic roadblocks to these 955,000 idle acres will ensure that development starts immediately. This would enable the oil and gas industry to effectively tap into over 5.2 Tcf of natural gas and 334 million barrels of oil. This energy would heat 72.9 million homes and power 24.5 million cars.

Clearing the regulatory roadblocks in Utah is one simple step to lower the price of energy for the American people. It is only by acting in a bipartisan manner that we can move our nation out of this national energy crisis. We have prepared a letter and await your approval. Additionally, we stand ready to assist you in bringing legislation before the House of Representatives that will eliminate the roadblocks to energy development in America.

In coming together to encourage the President to take steps and reduce the regulatory burden on companies developing resources, we will show the American people that the

Federal government is serious about lowering the price of gasoline. If we support the President as he removes regulatory roadblocks, we will see increased development on the acres sitting idle and lower energy prices.

Sincerely,

STEVAN PEARCE,  
*Member of Congress.*  
ROB BISHOP,  
*Member of Congress.*  
CHRIS CANNON,  
*Member of Congress.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, July 17, 2008.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,  
*President, the White House,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Congress has reached a consensus on opening idle lands to energy exploration and production. As we look en masse at these idle acres, we begin to see a pattern emerge. We believe companies producing on acres that remain idle are facing factors beyond their control. In many cases, Congress and the bureaucracy create roadblocks that shut down companies' access to the lands.

We ask that you look at each case individually and on a case by case basis for the purpose of systematically removing the regulatory roadblocks these companies' face on idle acres. We believe you should begin with one simple case in Utah. For seven years, Utah has waited for the final Records of Decision (RODs) on their state's Resource Management Plans (RMPs) at Vernal, Price, Moab, Richfield, and Monticello that authorize oil and gas activities in Utah.

We believe you should issue an Executive Order to require the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to issue the RMPs by August 31, 2008. Additionally, we ask that you order BLM to ensure the RODs authorize the Preferred Alternatives in each RMP without the adoption of new Wilderness Characteristics Areas (WCAs). Removing bureaucratic roadblocks to these 955,000 idle acres will ensure that development starts immediately. This would enable the oil and gas industry to effectively tap into over 5.2 Tcf of natural gas and 334 million barrels of oil. This energy would heat 72.9 million homes and power 24.5 million cars.

Clearing the regulatory roadblocks in Utah is one simple step to lower the price of energy for the American people. It is only by acting in a bipartisan manner that we can move our nation out of this national energy crisis. Additionally, we stand ready to assist you in bringing legislation before the House of Representatives that will eliminate the roadblocks to energy development in America.

Sincerely,

STEVAN PEARCE,  
*Member of Congress.*  
ROB BISHOP,  
*Member of Congress.*  
CHRIS CANNON,  
*Member of Congress.*

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. I am shocked that the gentleman would even start down the road of campaign contributions in this debate, but I am not going to proceed any further down that road.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In 1923, President Harding took the Saudi Arabia of the United States and put it into the Naval Petroleum Reserve. There is a huge pool of known

oil, over 10 billion barrels underneath what has now been called, and the Republicans changed it from the Naval Petroleum Reserve to the National Petroleum Reserve. And yes, indeed, President Clinton did let the first leases in that more than a decade ago.

The companies have drilled 25 test wells to find out there is indeed oil under there, but they have not connected over here to the Prudhoe Bay pipeline and there is no construction going on and no active drilling going on.

Now this area that they want to argue about, in 1950 it was made into a wildlife reserve. Now this was made into a Naval Petroleum Reserve because it has huge amounts of known oil. This was made into a wildlife reserve because it has huge amounts of known wildlife. President Harding didn't make ANWR into the Naval Petroleum Reserve because no one knows if there is any oil under there. They try to pretend that they know that there is oil there, but the Bush administration's own Mineral Management Service says there is a 50 percent chance of recoverable oil under ANWR.

So why not drill here in NPR-A? Why don't the Republicans and the oil companies want to fully exploit these 10 billion barrels of oil? I think there is a pretty simple answer to that, because they are doing really well under the Bush-Cheney energy policy. Remember, written in secret, voted on and put into law by the Republican Congress, signed by George Bush. During George Bush's tenure, the profits of the oil companies have been \$511 billion, a new record every year George Bush has been in office, more money in 7 years than in the preceding quarter-century.

This system is working quite well for them. They don't want to increase supply. In fact, they are working hand-in-glove with OPEC and others who are colluding to restrict supply.

Drill responsibly in leased land. Exploit America's resources.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6515. The bill was introduced yesterday. It is on the floor today. That is pretty fast work. No hearings, no committee process. It is primarily a restatement of existing Federal law with a couple of exceptions. It does have a prohibition of any oil that is found in Alaska going anywhere but the lower 48. Chairman RAHALL and I had a little debate about that on the House floor earlier this week. I certainly don't have any opposition. It is somewhat meaningless because oil is fungible and it can go wherever it needs to go; but if that is the price we have to pay to get more oil drilled and produced in Alaska, I am actually for that section of the bill.

Having said that, this bill is counter-productive if we really want to find

new oil and gas because it doesn't open up any new areas.

□ 1345

If you only allow drilling where we have already been allowed to drill, for example, in the great State of Texas that I represent, we have drilled over 2 million oil wells since 1901. The probability of finding a major new oil field in Texas today is much closer to zero than it is to 100 percent, because we have already drilled so many wells.

Eighty-five percent of the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States of America is off-limits. This bill does nothing about that. It says, let's expedite leasing in the Alaska Naval Petroleum Reserve. Fine, but we can already drill for oil in the Alaska Naval Petroleum Reserve.

What about ANWR? ANWR is to the west of Prudhoe Bay. ANWR is to the east. We think there are 10 billion barrels of oil in a 2,000-acre section of ANWR, 10 billion barrels. Drill 10 wells, and you get 1 billion barrels a well.

If we drill on an expedited basis in ANWR, certainly there is oil to be found there, but we can already drill there, and it won't get 1 billion barrels per well.

I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL) who has been very active on this issue and very involved in our debate we had the other night.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that this Member is serious and sincere, and I strongly support the DRILL bill.

Gas in my district in the Hudson Valley is over \$4.30, and families are paying and really being hurt by this. They need serious solutions that deliver real results, and that's why I support the Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands Act to take action right now to extract more American oil in the right places.

Oil company advocates have been preying on the anxiety of Americans to push the failed ANWR drilling plan that would only lower prices by a nickel in 20 years, 20 years in the future. Our drivers need more help than that, and they need it faster. The DRILL Act answers the call, telling oil companies to drill for oil that can give more relief than ANWR ever could.

The "use it or lose it" measure requires oil companies to drill on land they have already leased or make way for someone who will. If they did that, they could double production and cut imports by one-third. It also makes it easier to lease the 20 million acres of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, already approved for drilling, and calls on the President to build pipelines to bring that 10.6 billion barrels of oil to market. The bill will pave the way to get at the most oil in the shortest time with the greatest responsibility.

I hope all of my colleagues will support it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that is not dealt with in the drill now bill, DRILL, someone said maybe that means Democrats Reinventing the Inconvenient Liberal Lies instead of drilling now, but we just have a process that takes a long time. This process is part of what creates the 68 million acres.

The 68 million acres of idle land are not idle at all. They are involved in this process. This process is not changed one bit by the bill in front of us. Again, if the bill had come through committee, if we would have had hearings, we could have made these points in committee.

It's rather inconvenient because we don't have the ability to amend the bill today. We do not have the ability to offer a substitute bill, no motion to recommit. So we are tasked with simply explaining why the bill should receive a "no" vote.

But the process today has not changed at all, and you cannot read every single element in this block, but you can just see, as we move the chart toward me, what the steps are that are required to drill any single well. Litigation can occur at many different points. Again, this bill does absolutely nothing to stop any of this regulatory process that exists today.

There is not really such a thing as a third-world country. There are only overregulated countries, and when we look at this chart, we see why America is moving towards the status of a third-world country, because we are overregulating to the extreme, and it is winding up with millions of idle acres. Our friends want to say take it away from those companies that are not using it.

Either it is because of bureaucratic process, external litigation, but there are very good reasons why acres are idle. I think that our friends on the other side of the aisle are simply avoiding the real question of why we are not drilling in this country, why we are preferring Hugo Chavez oil, why we are giving preferential treatment to oil from OPEC, rather than this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from New Mexico.

If he was listening to my opening statement and my earlier comments on this issue, I fully understand it's a lengthy process. The regulatory framework was put into place in this and many other laws of this land for a very specific reason, to protect the public health and safety and the environment.

It's a lengthy process to go through this leasing. I must tell the gentleman, and he knows it, once you obtain that lease you have overcome most of the hard obstacle of achieving production. The lands we are talking about are mostly lands already under lease. Therefore, a lot of that burden has already been overcome.

Mr. PEARCE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. Yes.

Mr. PEARCE. I really appreciate and respect what the gentleman says, but when you give the figure 68 million acres are idle, I wonder how many of those acres are, in fact, in this bureaucratic process.

Mr. RAHALL. Reclaiming my time. And under lease. And if they are in that process, that is called due diligence. We don't penalize them. We don't take it away at all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of West Virginia, I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Chairman, speaking of history, I just want to make mention of the fact that we have many Americans that care for it.

I am delighted that some 23,000 women from Alpha Kappa Alpha are here, Americans who are believing in their government and asking for change and asking for the leadership that is here on the floor of the House. To them, I believe we have an obligation to all Americans. It's important to know that I come from oil country. I represent large numbers of energy companies in the City of Houston. I practiced oil and gas law and have the experience of stripper-well legislation or litigation, if you will, worked on take-or-pay and curtailment.

I know very well about the Alaskan pipeline because it was being worked on in the 1970s, so we do have a right in this legislation, H.R. 6515, to ask that the Alaskan pipeline for natural gas for Americans be utilized, be put in place. It might be time now to declare a national emergency and take control of that pipeline and get it working.

But what this bill stands for is for working men and women, families. What it says is we are simply asking for due diligence, and that is to come to the National Petroleum Reserve and go ahead and acknowledge the fact that there are 22.6 million acres that can be leased. Only 3 million acres have been leased, and only 25 exploratory wells have been drilled.

We are simply saying that this is part of the larger piece, the drilling off the gulf of Texas and Louisiana, of which we in those areas applaud and salute. They have been done environmentally safely.

I ask the energy companies, of whom I am inviting to sit down in Houston in a roundtable and begin to engage in the process of doing what the building trades have said. Let us address the question of affordable energy and national security. This is a national security issue.

The question has to be if we have Federal lands, we need to be able to drill. This legislation says so. We need to be able to have due diligence, and we

need to come together to provide the kind of energy policy that is for national security.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to Mr. BRADY, I would point out that this is the area we are talking about leasing, it is not some area up in Alaska that doesn't have any infrastructure, no pipelines. The majority is still avoiding the real question that is in front of this country, why we have \$4 gasoline is because we can't get access to supplies that have an effect on the market today.

I would recognize Mr. BRADY for 3 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a very unfortunate time when families are struggling to try to make ends meet with these energy prices, small businesses too. Basically, Congress is debating a bait-and-switch piece of legislation.

Democrats are hoping that the American public isn't smart enough to realize there are two oil fields in Alaska—ANWR, the one that has been put off-limits, is fertile with what we believe are vast oil and gas reserves. And the National Petroleum Reserve, which, by the way, has been explored out now for 70 years.

The difference between ANWR, and the National Petroleum Reserve, is the difference between Jimmy Carter and his brother, Billy Carter. ANWR holds vast reserves in a small amount of land that can be accessed much more affordably and quickly. The National Petroleum Reserve was first drilled for two decades by the U.S. Navy, the Federal Government.

Then for the next two decades it was drilled again by the U.S. Geological Service, again, the Federal Government. For the recent decades, it has been drilled by companies, three principally, two of them in the Texas area. Unfortunately, no major finds were there. That's why most of this area, it's big, but most of it hasn't been leased because most of it is a dry hole.

What they found instead is that there are some small finds along the edge, which are very expensive to explore, it costs about \$1 billion to put an oil well there, and \$10 million a mile to try to connect it back to the existing fields. Unfortunately, even doing that, even stringing those small finds together to try to produce oil has been held up by environmental lawsuits and red tape.

So the claim that oil companies aren't exploring and doing their best, they are investing billions of dollars there. To claim that there are vast reserves that merely need to be leased, the whole world has passed on these leases year and year and year again. You can offer them every 5 minutes, and they are going to pass on them again.

We need to quit playing games with the American public. We need to open up ANWR, the other Alaskan oil field, that holds a real ability for us to take more responsibility for America's own energy needs, for us to have some say

in that price of energy, to make sure that when families are filling up, they aren't filling up with oil from the Middle East or from Venezuela or that they are paying prices dictated by Iran and Nigeria and Russia, but more American-made energy.

Ignore this bait and switch. Let's get to real energy policy, real American-made energy in ANWR.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded by my colleague from Mississippi, Mr. GENE TAYLOR, and in thinking back over history, when this moratoria was first passed by a Democratic Congress in the early eighties, there was one Ronald Reagan that occupied the White House and signed it into law. My colleagues are attacking Ronald Reagan, His Holiness? I am rather shocked.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman, and I congratulate him on this excellent piece of legislation. I think we know why we are here. We are here because the American consumer is being pummeled at the gasoline pump on a daily basis. They want to know, how did we get from \$30 a barrel of oil and \$1.50 for a gallon, on the day that George Bush and DICK CHENEY were sworn in, to a point now where it's now \$140 a barrel and more than \$4 a gallon gasoline now.

Well, it's a very simple formula during the Bush-Cheney era. It's two oilmen in the White House for two terms, equals \$4 a gallon gasoline. Oil math in the United States is very simple. They put together a secret energy plan, DICK CHENEY and George Bush, on day one in the White House. Today, we are out here debating whether or not it's a success.

Now, from the oil industry perspective, it is, and they were the only ones allowed into these secret meetings with the President and the Vice President.

But, for the American people, they are being tipped upside down at the pump. When we, as Democrats, say you can go right now and drill up in the petroleum reserves, you can go offshore. You can go into all of these locations that are already permitted.

No, there is absolutely no interest on the part of the oil industry. When we say to the oil industry and to the Bush administration, instead of drilling off of the beaches of the United States first, how about going to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve? How about taking 70 million barrels there and starting to deploy it, to put the fear of God into the oil industry, into speculators, into traders?

□ 1400

The President says, I would never use that because it is a free market, the price of oil on the marketplace.

So what we are saying is, don't go to the beaches first. Go to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, but they will not do it.

So the DRILL bill of Mr. RAHALL is very simple. He says, instead of drilling somewhere 20 years from now, to give an insignificant relief, Mr. RAHALL is saying, drill now in the 68 million acres that you already have, which has oil.

We need, instead of drilling for 20 years from now we need to tap, tap, tap the oil where we have it on the land in the United States today. We need to tap, tap, tap the Strategic Petroleum Reserve today, immediately, to protect the American consumer. We need to tap into renewable energy resources in order to protect the American people now with wind and solar.

The Bush administration says no, no, no; I am with the American Petroleum Institute, not the American consumer at the pump. And that is why we say to the oil industry and to the Republican Party, stop your coalition which has driven the price of oil to a point where consumers are being tipped upside down at the pump.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the Perdido lease in the Gulf of Mexico was sold in 1996. Twelve years later, over \$2 billion has been spent before we even produce one drop of oil. That is 34,000 acres that, according to our friends, are idle. And yet, \$2 billion has been spent. Another billion dollars has to be spent before that can be produced.

And what is going to happen with this bill is that people are going to say, I am afraid I might lose my lease. 12 years to produce one, not even 1 drop of oil on 34,000 acres, and people are going to stop buying leases. This bill is going to kill production, not assist production.

I would like to recognize Mr. WESTMORELAND of Georgia for 2 minutes.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Here is a real chart of what the gas prices have done. You have got the Republican Congress, 12 years, and then you have got the Democrat Congress in just 18 months.

But I was really surprised to hear the chairman of the Resource Committee talk about exporting Alaskan oil. There has not been any Alaskan oil exported in 8 years, 8 years. And we talk about, you know, if we are going to drill, I want to know—and this is shameful, but this is snake oil. This is snake oil.

Mr. Speaker, what the American people are being sold today is snake oil. They set up a snake oil shop about 2 weeks ago over here, and it was shut down by the Republican minority because we would not go along with a suspension bill that did not allow drilling.

Here we are right back again, trying to set up another snake oil shop with new ingredients, new facts that are being stirred around in the same thing to try to come up with a different result.

It is not going to come up with a different result because we are not going to cave in to these snake oil salesmen. We are going to stand up for the American people and demand that we drill, that we open up our areas, that we use

our own natural resources, that we don't go hat in hand to foreign countries, that we don't give Hugo Chavez \$178 million a year, that we use our own resources. And we are not going to be tricked by these new escapades that are being put on by the majority party today.

I feel like I am watching a "Whose Line Is It?" Because they are off on so many different things that I don't even know, Mr. Speaker, if they have read their own bill.

They call it the DRILL bill. This is not about drilling. This is about tricking the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can pay attention to their words, because I want to show you, this is a quote from January of 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, they can read this quote and see that there is no sincerity.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from New Mexico, when he brings up all these bureaucratic delays and environmental lawsuits and that big long chart of his, I was here when we passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005, when I believe that side of the aisle was in control, as well as their party in control of the White House. I thought one of the purposes of EPAC, as passed by the Republican Congress, was to speed up this whole mess.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank Chairman RAHALL for his excellent leadership in crafting this legislation, the DRILL Act, which I strongly support.

The oil and gas companies, awash in profits, would have us believe they have nowhere to drill. That is just plain wrong.

According to the Bush administration, 80 percent of our oil and gas resources are available for drilling. The industry is sitting on 68 million acres of public lands where it could be drilling, but isn't. And with this bill today we are speeding up the effort to drill in the Alaska National Petroleum Reserve.

We don't need to open up more areas for drilling when industry is dragging its feet on producing where it already could. This recent push by President Bush to open up the rest of our coast to offshore drilling is a political stunt. It is not about lowering gas prices today or even in the near future. It is just a cynical attempt to change the subject from this administration's abject failure on energy.

The great oilmen rode into the White House 7½ years ago boasting about their new energy policy. Their great plan, now 95 percent implemented, has now resulted in \$4 a gallon in gas, \$500 billion in oil company profits, and an economy in crisis.

Those of us who opposed the Bush-Cheney energy plan did so because we knew this was the likely result.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have a better idea, one that meets today's crisis and transitions us to a new energy future. We believe the President should release a small amount of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We have done it before, and it works. It would likely bring prices down more in 10 days than the Bush-McCain offshore drilling plan would in 10 years.

In addition, oil companies should drill in the vast stretches of this country where they are now permitted, and the Bush administration should open up drilling in the Alaskan National Petroleum Reserve, build the pipelines and sell that oil and gas to Americans.

Finally, we must seriously ramp up our transition to alternative and renewable energy sources. If, in 10 years, oil and gas are still the focus of our energy debates, we surely will have failed. That would mean following the path that George W. Bush and Dick Cheney have charted, and we know where that leads us.

We need to change direction. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the committee pointing out that the Energy Policy Act of 2005 was supposed to speed up the delays. And, in fact, we did.

You would remember, sir, that it was in our committee that we established the five categorical exclusions. Those are the categorical exclusions that were dropped out in your energy bill earlier this year that slowed the process down.

You also remember that we established the pilot offices. The pilot offices were established in several places across the country, and your legislation stopped those too.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PEARCE. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I was simply addressing the questions that were addressed to me by the gentleman from the floor. I would thank you for that reminder, and would point out that, in fact, what we are doing here today, we are saying that people have been laying on these leases, that they are letting them lie idle.

But it was actually the Democrats of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 that passed, Democrats in the majority. And you notice that we have many of the gentlemen on the floor of the House today. Mr. HOYER, Mr. MILLER, Ms. PELOSI and Mr. RAHALL all voted yes in saying that we need, not just 5 years, but 10 years to produce these wells. And now we are having the finger pointed by the same people today, saying that it is irresponsible oil companies who are delaying too long. So the flip-flopping that we are seeing across the country right now is absolutely amazing.

We would love to hear the Democrats say that they want to drill and drill now. The only problem is that I have

heard Democrats say that drill is a four-letter word. Well, either they can't spell or they can't count; I don't know which.

But let's yield 2 minutes to Mr. CARTER of Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I have been listening to this debate, and it has been extremely interesting. But I think that we have got a situation here where, because of the fantastic nature of the Congress, nobody understands what we are talking about. In reality, we are talking about leasing, and they are saying use the lease you paid for.

Now, I think the American people, almost every one of them out there, they know what a lease is because probably they have leased an apartment, or they have leased a home or they have leased a car. They have leased something in their life. And I doubt very seriously if they paid a lease price, a pretty good size lease price that came out of their family's pocket, and then didn't use what they leased. They parked the car in the garage and didn't use it. They rented the apartment for a year and never set foot in it, but lived someplace else. Or if they were in business, they rented a warehouse to store things, and then didn't put anything in the warehouse and wasted their money.

Now, what we are talking about here is leases that the people who are in the oil business have spent billions, with a B, of dollars to lease. Does it make sense to anyone's common sense that they would spend that kind of money and then not look to see if there is some way they could get their money back on the deal? Of course they have.

And in fact, as KEVIN BRADY pointed out, they have been looking and looking and looking and looking in this area to find enough resources to justify billions of dollars worth of expenditures to drill.

I will tell you, you are welcome to drill in my back yard. I have got about two, a little over 2 acres. I will lease it tomorrow, okay? But there is no oil in my back yard, and I don't expect anyone to lease it or drill there because they know in Round Rock, Texas there is not any oil.

Now, the same thing goes here. You can talk about use it or lose it, but once you know there is no production in an area, there makes no sense to spend millions of dollars to find nothing. That is what this is all about. Common sense tells you there is no oil there.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New Hampshire, CAROL SHEA-PORTER.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, almost 8 years ago two oilmen arrived at the White House. They devised an oil policy that left everybody else out. And now we are seeing their very successful oil policy where we are paying for their secret policy. And yet we didn't hear a word from the Republican side of the aisle. And now, when we are paying almost \$5 a gallon, suddenly

they are talking about drilling in ANWR.

Now, they know, as well as we do, as well as the Department of Energy knows and says, that it would take 10 years to get any gas from that. The American family would spend \$57,000 before they saw one penny from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We need to drill now and we need to drill domestically, and they have the leases.

And don't ever be surprised by the fact that the oil companies are claiming there is nothing underneath there anyway, because what they are really doing is buying back their stock.

So my suggestion to the oil companies is to get to work now. Start drilling domestically with what you have. You have 80 percent of the leased land. Use it or lose it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlelady from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) for 2 minutes.

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6515 is the "use it or lose it" bill that was defeated last month, but today it is coming back with just window dressing added to this version.

The previous version of this bill, H.R. 6251, was rejected by the majority of Republicans and nearly all the oil patch Democrats, including the chairman of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

Like the last version, H.R. 6515 breaches contracts by requiring terms under which oil companies may use and bid on leases. In fact, this piece of legislation may actually drive away oil and gas companies from the U.S. and lower the production of energy. It is based on a claim that has been dismissed by the Department of Interior, that the industry is stockpiling 68 million acres of Federal leases.

This bill cannot hide 30 years of shutting off access. In Jimmy Carter's last year as President, over 100 million acres were leased onshore, and it reached 160 million acres under Ronald Reagan. In a good year it is now just 50 million acres. The government and the Democrat leadership is the one that is stockpiling oil and gas leases, and the Speaker is keeping it off the market. Over two billion, that's over 200,000 million acres are not leased.

And according to today's New York Times, when the President decided to lift the ban on OCS oil and gas production, the Speaker responded, I'm not going to let him get away with it.

Well, H.R. 6515 and the Speaker are not living up to their promises.

This bill also purports to open up the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, but the NRPA is already open. Just yesterday the Secretary of the Interior announced a major lease sale for this fall. So 6515 could delay the drilling because the bill now injects new environmental language that is already existing in the NPRA law. And this is an invitation for environmental groups to sue to stop oil production. And they have been filing lawsuits for the last 10 years to stop the production. This is a bad piece of legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

□ 1415

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I was sort of shocked to hear my friend from New Mexico complaining about rules and regulations that fetter the oil-extraction industry as restrictions that make us Third World. Well, you know, think for a moment about the abuses we see worldwide in terms of corruption and environmental abuse, and we have those for a reason.

But even if you're going to ignore that, if you think environmental protection and administrative controls are infringements on freedom and unnecessary, gee, as my friend from West Virginia points out, you passed an energy bill in 2005 that was supposed to streamline it. The Republicans and two oilmen have been in charge for the last 7½ years. If it doesn't work right, whose fault is that administratively?

I would suggest the gentleman look in the mirror and then vote for our legislation.

Mr. PEARCE. The gentleman asks a question whose fault is it. Let's read down through a list of observations: Wilderness Society v. Wisely, 16 leases, 11,000 acres stopped; Montana Wilderness Alliance v. Fry, stops three leases, limits additional 9; Northern Cheyenne Tribe v. Norton, injunction covering 93 percent of the resource area; Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership challenges total of 127 APDs, applications for permits to drill; Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance v. Kempthorne stopped 60 wells; Potash Association stopped 72 wells; Biodiversity Conservation Alliance suspends leases; Wyoming Outdoor Council v. BLM, 11 parcels BLM stopped; National Audubon Society challenging the Resource Operational Division, and then we have Pennaco Energy v. U.S.; Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance; Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance.

The reason that oil and gas exploration is stopped, the reason that we have 68 million acres is because of litigation and excess regulation, many of which do nothing, nothing to improve the environment. Most are bureaucratic delays.

I would suggest that the gentleman should—maybe if he thinks that he can produce oil more cheaply and more effectively than the people who are producing it, maybe he should be there and actually be drilling some wells and find out for himself the difficulty of producing.

Mr. Speaker, I would recognize the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for 1 minute.

Mr. TERRY. Ask yourselves why folks on the left who are more green than the Riddler and the Democrat leadership that has vowed to prevent any new drilling support this bill. Do I smell hypocrisy? No. Because this bill doesn't open up any new drilling. In fact on balance, it makes it more dif-

ficult to drill in an area already open for drilling. It poses new requirements to prove that you have to fully have used other leases before you can get any one there. A new requirement that any company must have a union contract in place before receiving a lease are just some of the couple of examples.

This is not a drilling bill that's going to get us more resources. It's a rhetorical political bill. Don't be suckered. Vote "no."

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, could you give us the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico has 4 minutes left. The gentleman from West Virginia has 6½ minutes left.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from Michigan, again we would just look at one area. This is the Powder River Basin, and 86 percent of the leased land is idle because of the fear of lawsuits. It is lawsuits that are stopping much of the production, and yet the gentleman's bill does nothing. It does nothing to stop the lawsuits.

If we are serious about drilling and drilling now, then let's put something substantial in this bill, let's take it back to committee, let's amend it like we should have, let's put things that restrict the litigation that is stopping Americans from receiving the oil that they deserve and the lower price of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, I would recognize the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) for 1 minute.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank you.

This bill is worse than nothing; it is the illusion of something. As was alluded to by my colleague from Nebraska, when you see people who claim to be more green than the Maid of Arran supporting a drilling bill, questions do arise.

In the final analysis, I must be honest. In fairness, this bill will do one thing. It will unleash the new power of the Democratic Party's hybrid of solar and wind power. It's called hot air. Now, hot air will not fuel your car, it will not fly your plane, and it will not lower your gas prices.

I would point out before you vote on this, remember the more hot air that you unleash over this, the more disastrous the consequences to both gas prices and global warming.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has called upon the country for more domestic drilling. This bill says yes, Mr. President, let's drill. Let's drill in those areas that are already leased and already ready to go because what the President has not told the American people is that there are over 68 million acres of Federal lands already leased to the big oil and

gas companies. They are not moving forward on those leases. They are sitting tight. They like the status quo. They're making record profits. Gas is over \$4 a gallon. They like it that way.

What the President said is don't push forward on those already existing leases. Let's go up in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. But what he hasn't said is the Department of Energy, his own Department of Energy, has found that we won't see one drop of gas on the market for another 10 years as a result of that drilling, and even then the price will be insignificant.

If we really want to get going now, two things we've got to do: One, we need to begin to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That's 10 days until it hits market. Not 10 years. Two, we've got to crack down on the speculators, and this Congress is going to move forward on that measure. We hope we have the President's support because he has said no to releasing oil from the SPR.

In the longer term, we have to do two other things: responsible drilling, and that's what this bill calls for, and we need to make that investment in renewable energy and energy efficiency. If we're going to truly reduce and crack our addiction to oil, especially foreign oil, we need to move forward on those fronts.

This is a responsible bill that says to the President, yeah, let's start drilling on all of those areas where the oil companies have the ability to do that. They're sitting on it. They like it that way. Let's send them a message.

Mr. PEARCE. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman that oil companies are very rarely sitting on it. They are delayed by regulation. They're delayed by litigation, and if we were serious about drilling and drilling now, drill today, we would do something more than recommend a Black and Decker drill. I was surprised to hear our chairman of the committee say that because it takes billions of dollars to build these rigs out in the middle of the gulf, and to suggest that it is quite as simple as grabbing a Black and Decker and going and drilling with your hand, simply just, I think, intentionally understates the difficulty in providing low-cost gasoline for consumers in today's market. I was surprised.

Mr. RAHALL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEARCE. Yes, I would yield.

Mr. RAHALL. Of course I was being facetious in case you didn't understand my southern drawl.

But in regard to the issue of litigation lawsuits, lawsuits, lawsuits to which you refer, if I might respond. In regard to the NPRA, the National Petroleum Reserve, ConocoPhillips currently holds 183 leases up there making them one of the largest leaseholders. As of July 16, 2008, I believe that's yesterday, ConocoPhillips has told my staff, "There are no lawsuits, litigation, on any ConocoPhillips leases in the NPRA nor have there been."

According to several other sources, there are no lawsuits pending to stop lease sales, exploration, or development of the NPRA, the National Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. PEARCE. Reclaiming my time.

I would just point out to the gentleman that the 34,000 acres with the Perdido lease has got no production coming from it yet. It's declared as idle according to your specifications. And I would just remind the gentleman that there are always reasons why production is not occurring. No one is withholding oil at \$140 a barrel.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored and proud to yield at this time 1 minute to our superb majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this bill to the floor.

Drill Responsibly In Leased Lands. The assertion was that Democrats are not for drilling. This gives lie to that assertion. This says, as we have been saying, there are 88 million acres available for drilling right now. Those acres are subject to lawsuit, my friend says. Any acreage would be subject to lawsuits. This acreage is subject to the availability of drills. Black and Decker or otherwise. What an absurd, I say to my friend, assertion. There are no drills available currently to drill in new lands here or other places.

The minority leader, I presume, is going to be speaking in some few minutes. He said this: "They're," meaning the Democrats, "offering excuses designed to get people thinking about something other than drilling. They worship at the altar of radical environmentalists."

This is, of course, the crowd that said global warming didn't exist until just a few months ago. This is the crowd that has been in charge of the White House for the last 7½ years.

The gentleman from New Mexico says, Gee whiz, let's bring the price of gasoline down.

They had an energy policy which they came up with under DICK CHENEY. Some people say it failed. I'm not sure the oil companies thought it failed. It was \$1.46 when they brought up the policy. It's now \$4 at the pump. The oil companies are making the biggest profits they've made in their history.

The assertion Mr. BOEHNER made is, as I said again, that we worship at the altar of radical environmentalists. Let me quote one of those radical environmentalists: "I have been an oilman my whole life, but this is one emergency we can't drill our way out of." That radical environmentalist's name is T. Boone Pickens, and as he said earlier in that statement, "I have been an oilman all my life." He understands very well what can and cannot be done.

This bill says let's drill. Let's get American product to American consumers and try to bring down prices. We've also asked the SPR be released.

Not all of it. Maintain most of it. Why? To bring prices down, to free the oil that Americans have bought for their use and to bring prices down. With Americans being pummeled by \$4-a-gallon gas, it's high time that America did just that. With the passage of the DRILL bill, America will move decisively to increase its domestic oil production.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, isn't it an ironic happenstance that the day before we put this bill on the floor, 24 hours before we put this bill on the floor and say let's drill in the National Petroleum Reserve, isn't it ironic that the White House announces they're going to do just that? My, my, my. What an awful idea we had—right up until the time 24 hours ago when the administration decided they would do it.

I'm glad they've done it. And if our actions spurred their action, so be it. And we're going to take credit. Because they've been in office 7½ years. They took it 24 hours ago. What was the reaction of the oil industry? They were happy.

Now, nobody is saying if you have land over here you have got to use it before you get land over here. What we're saying is you can't inventory land. You can't inventory acreage. You can't be a huge, rich oil company and want no competition and therefore inventory land. We're saying that. Yes, we are. We think that makes good sense for the American public.

Today we call their bluff, I think. Yesterday they saw us. And they said, we'll drill here.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, 68 million acres of American oil-producing land are sitting leased, available, and idle. There is even more land available for drilling in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, or NPR-A, which we're dealing with today.

Combined, we are talking about an area the size of—and all my colleagues listening to this debate and anybody else who is listening to it, they ought to know currently what is available—the area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and most of my own State, Maryland. That entire area is currently available for drilling, for getting American product to Americans.

Let's help the oil companies get that oil out of the ground and get it flowing to the Americans who need it. The DRILL bill speeds up the leasing process in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. It ensures that Alaskan oil will fill American gas tanks.

That is, I presume, why, when they knew this bill was coming to the floor, yesterday the administration said they were going to have this land leased. Yesterday. The American public is pretty smart. There's nobody I think that's hearing my voice, wherever they are, doubts that if they just did it yes-

terday, after being in office for 7½ years, then maybe, maybe, maybe there was a relationship between Chairman RAHALL bringing this bill to the floor and the action yesterday to try to preclude the credit for doing what we think is good policy. Hopefully, we're all going to vote for good policy today and vote for this bill.

It calls upon the President to speed up the completion of the Alaskan oil and gas pipelines. That's what it does because we need those lines to get that oil and product, natural gas and oil, to market and to Americans.

"Drill on the leases you have, or let somebody else do it. But don't just sit on them while Americans are paying \$4 a gallon. Use it or lose it."

The gentleman says, well, they're not just sitting there; they're afraid of lawsuits. We may all be afraid of lawsuits. We may never drive our car because we're afraid of an accident or a lawsuit. That's not what they're in the business for, and very frankly, in terms of fear, when you're making the largest profit for a product, you go look for more, unless of course you want to keep the price high and supply down.

Why is our plan better than the Republicans'? One, it means more oil. The National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, which is already approved for drilling, has an estimated 10.6 billion barrels of oil. ANWR has 10.4 billion. And the information we have is the oil companies aren't too interested in drilling there.

Two, our plan means more oil, faster. Unlike ANWR and protected coastal areas, NPR-A plus the 68 million leased acres elsewhere are currently approved for production.

And get this, right now, today, available pipelines reach to within 5 miles of the National Petroleum Reserve, and if the pipelines are completed soon, we will speed production up even more.

Third, I see no reason to give even more handouts of public land to companies enjoying record profits and billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies unless they are using that which they currently have. Inventorying land, inventorying acreage, inventorying possible oil supplies is not what the American people want.

What the American people want is they want production. They want performance. They want prices to go down. That's why we say let's start on the land they already have. Let them eat their vegetables before they think about dessert.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Would the majority leader yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I would like to ask the gentleman: How can we accurately know what those reserves are if we can't even have seismic, modern seismic activity done? So, that's the reason to open the Outer Continental Shelf, to at least get the process started. If the seismic shows nothing, these companies lose the lease. That's current law. So I don't understand the majority's opposition to opening the Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, what the majority says is we've done seismic, we've had available 10-year leases to do the research on 68 million in the Lower 48. Thirty-three million of those are on the Outer Continental Shelf, and 20 million acres are in the Alaskan Petroleum Reserve.

What we are saying is, we have available now. You don't have to do the seismic. Presumably, that's what you've been doing on the 68 million acres. If you haven't been doing it, then let's release it and give it to somebody else who will because, as you point out, the seismics have not been done in other areas. They have been done here, presumably by people who already had available the leases.

Mr. BOUSTANY. But if the majority leader would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I'll yield one more time, and then I want to finish my comments.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the majority leader.

The point is, if we have tight supply and demand, then we should be opening up all these areas for seismic analysis to get accurate information about these reserves, and if the seismic shows nothing, there's no activity; you lose the lease. The companies lose the money. That is the current law, and I think the American people want an explanation as to why we're not doing that. We should be looking at all of our potential resources.

We, in Louisiana, have known for a long time how this works. In fact, Louisiana delegations for 35 years have fought to open up additional Outer Continental Shelf and let the States share in the revenue.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, what the American people want, they want to know why we're simply arguing that we ought to have more available when we haven't used what we now have available. That's what the American people want to know, and that's what this bill says, and that's what we're arguing.

Your argument, with all due respect, is not necessarily wrong, but it certainly is not a replacement for what we have provided here. Let's move ahead on that which is already authorized, and then we can certainly authorize more to see whether or not more is available.

Mr. Speaker, we have lived through 7½ years of Republican energy policy: plans put forth by Vice President CHENEY, a bill passed in 2005—let me stress, a bill passed in 2005. Oil was approximately \$2. Their plan was passed, passed through this House, passed through the Senate, sent to the President, he signed it. Three years later, the price of gasoline has doubled. It is a failed policy. We need a new policy. We need to make sure we use the land we have.

And that's why it's so ironic that just yesterday, I tell my friend from Louisiana, isn't it ironic that just yesterday the President made an an-

nouncement the day before this bill was going to be announced that he wanted, in October, to allow the leases to move forward on this land which we're talking about? He apparently agrees with the objectives of this bill.

With this responsible domestic production bill we can start today. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Let's use the resources that are available right now on leased lands. Drill responsibly in these leased lands. Let's keep America's oil in America. Vote for the DRILL bill. Let's make America more energy independent.

And before I close, let me reiterate what T. Boone Pickens said because the nub of this debate is not just about more oil. The nub of this debate and the nub of the failure in the past of perhaps all of us has been that we have not honestly said to the American public, the only way we will solve this problem, the only way we will become energy independent is to ensure a vigorous program of pursuing renewables so that we will have energy for the future, not just for today; for our children, not just for ourselves.

Vote for this DRILL bill. It is a responsible way forward.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert two documents that show a history of litigation in the NPR-A. If the gentleman from West Virginia is unaware of those, maybe that would help.

LITIGATION HISTORY: OIL AND GAS LEASING IN THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE—ALASKA

In 1980 Congress amended the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act (Public Law 96-514), directing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out "an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas" in the 23 million acre National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. Pursuant to this directive, BLM developed an expedited leasing program.

In 1983, BLM completed an environmental impact statement (EIS) and issued a record of decision (ROD) opening all but 1,416,000 acres of NPR-A to leasing. The ROD called for five annual lease sales of approximately two million acres each. Soon after the release of the ROD a lawsuit was filed by two Inupiat Eskimos in U.S. District Court for Alaska. The plaintiffs, together with amicus State of Alaska and North Slope Borough, sought a preliminary injunction blocking the lease sale. They contended that BLM failed to make certain subsistence-related determinations required by Section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), 16 U.S.C. §3120. After a trial on the merits, the district court held in favor of BLM, finding that such determinations were not required. However the court issued an injunction precluding execution of the leases pending appeal of the matter to the Ninth Circuit. The district court's decision was affirmed on appeal in *Kunakana v. Clark*, 742 F.2d 1145 (9th Cir. 1984), thus allowing issuance of the leases. By 1998, all leases issued under the 1983 ROD had expired without a significant discovery.

In 1998, BLM completed an EIS and issued a ROD addressing the 4.6 million acre Northeast Planning Area of NPR-A. The ROD opened 87 percent of the area to leasing, excluding an area that included most of the submerged lands of Teshekpuk Lake and lands to the north and east of the lake. Several environmental groups filed suit in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

(*Wilderness Soc'y v. Babbit*, Civ. No. 98-2395), alleging violations of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and seeking an injunction to preclude lease sales under the ROD. In an unreported decision, the court ruled in favor of BLM as to the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, thus allowing the lease sales to move forward. BLM held lease sales in 1999 and 2002, which resulted in the issuance of several leases near Teshekpuk Lake. However, the court has yet to issue a final decision on the merits, and the case remains pending without any action having been taken by the court for several years now.

After completing an EIS, in 2004 BLM issued a ROD addressing the Northwest Planning Area. The ROD opened all 8.8 million acres of the planning area to leasing, but deferred 1,570,000 acres near the village of Wainwright from leasing for ten years. Several environmental groups filed suit against the Department of the Interior in U.S. District Court in Alaska. The plaintiffs argued that BLM acted arbitrarily in violation of NEPA by authorizing leasing in the entire planning area without considering reasonable alternatives and without doing a site-specific analysis of each of the areas affected by the proposed action. The plaintiffs further argued that the biological opinion was arbitrary in violation of the Endangered Species Act, alleging that it was insufficiently thorough, not co-extensive with the ROD, and paid insufficient attention to the uneven distribution of eiders within the affected area. The district court ruled in favor of BLM on all counts, *N. Alaska Envtl. Ctr. v. Norton*, 361 F. Supp. 2d 1069 (D. AK 2005). The decision was upheld on appeal in its entirety in *N. Alaska Envtl. Ctr. v. Kempthorne*, 457 F.3d 969 (9th Cir. 2006).

Seeking to open additional areas of the Northeast Planning Area to oil and gas leasing pursuant to a 2002 recommendation contained in the President's National Energy Policy, BLM completed an amendment to the 1998 EIS in 2005 and issued an amended ROD in 2006. The amended ROD sought to open for leasing all lands in the planning area except the submerged lands underlying Teshekpuk Lake. In doing so, 389,000 acres that had been unavailable under the 1998 ROD would be available. Several environmental groups filed suit against the Department of the Interior in U.S. District Court in Alaska, alleging violations of NEPA and the Endangered Species Act. Holding in favor of the plaintiffs in part, in *National Audubon Society v. Kempthorne*, No. 1:05-cv-00008-JKS (Sep. 25, 2006), the court vacated the ROD. The court found that the amended EIS failed to adequately analyze cumulative impacts associated with the adjoining Northwest Planning Area, and that for similar reasons the biological opinion was inadequate as well. The Department chose not to appeal the adverse decision, but instead proceeded to correct the deficiencies noted by the court by supplementing the amended EIS and revising the biological opinion accordingly. BLM issued the final Supplemental EIS on May 23, 2008. Under the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act, potential plaintiffs have 60 days from issuance of a final EIS to bring suit (i.e., until July 22, 2008)

[From the Anchorage Daily News, Dec. 20, 2007]

GROUPS SUE TO PROTECT RARE LOON IN ALASKA'S ARCTIC OIL RESERVE

(By Dan Joling)

Three conservation groups sued the federal government Wednesday hoping to block Arctic petroleum development through protections for a rare loon that breeds in Alaska's National Petroleum Reserve.

The groups claim yellow-billed loons are threatened by industrialization in the 23 million-acre reserve that covers much of Alaska's western North Slope.

"The yellow-billed loon is one of the rarest and most vulnerable birds in the United States," said Andrea Treece, an attorney with the Center for Biological Diversity. "If the loon is to survive in a warming Arctic, we need to protect its critical habitat, not open it up for oil development."

Inundation of the loons' freshwater breeding areas by rising sea levels tied to global warming is also considered a threat, but petroleum development is the petitioners' main concern.

The lawsuit names Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. According to the conservation groups, the agency is more than two years behind the legal deadline for taking action to protect the yellow-billed loons under provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

A spokesman for the agency said a decision on protections is coming.

"We expect to have money available in the fiscal year '08 budget and then complete the status review and the 12-month finding," said Bruce Woods.

The Center for Biological Diversity, the National Resources Defense Council, Pacific Environment and other U.S. and Russian scientific and conservation organizations filed a petition in April 2004 to list yellow-billed loons as threatened or endangered. After a petition is filed, agencies have a 12-month deadline to issue a proposed rule listing a species or to decide listing is not warranted.

The Fish and Wildlife Service only last May accepted the petition for review. The determination required the agency to solicit public comment, carry out a status review of the loons and, if merited, issue a proposed rule to protect loons. That has not happened and the lawsuit will seek an order from a federal judge telling the agency to do so.

The yellow-billed loon breeds in tundra wetlands in Alaska, Canada and Russia, and winters along the west coasts of Canada and the United States.

The Fish and Wildlife Service estimates there are 16,500 yellow-billed loons in the world, including 3,700 to 4,900 that breed in Alaska. More than 75 percent of the Alaska breeders nest in the petroleum reserve and many nest in areas recently opened to oil and gas development near Teshekpuk Lake and along the Colville River, according to conservation groups.

Smaller numbers breed on the Seward Peninsula, the land mass east of the Bering Strait, and on St. Lawrence Island in the Bering Sea.

President Warren Harding created the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska in 1923 as an emergency oil supply for the Navy. Current leasing plans come from a presidential directive guiding the Department of the Interior to foster oil and gas development there.

The lawsuit was filed in San Francisco by the Center for Biological Diversity, the National Resources Defense Council and Pacific Environment.

So we now arrive at the point of conclusion of this debate. Protests are up 706 percent. That stops oil production. This bill does nothing against the protests.

Litigation is up in this one case. Eighty-six percent of the available acres are undrilled because of litigation. This bill does nothing about litigation.

In this particular case, 33 percent of this in Utah is out of production be-

cause of a combination of litigation and bureaucratic delays. This bill does nothing about that.

Finally, 1992, the Democrat majority extended the drilling from 5 to 10 years because they understood at that point what the Democrat Congress of today does not understand: that it does take time to prove up on leases, find if there is oil there, and produce them. The entire allegation that 68 million acres are completely idle is one that's intended, I think, to misconstrue the whole situation.

And finally, the entire underlying intent of the bill, the use-it-or-lose-it, is already a part of BLM regulations. So this bill does nothing except it duplicates what is already in place for many instances, and it threatens companies with the loss of valuable resources and will actually drive the price of gasoline up.

I would urge a "no" vote on the bill today and give the gentleman thanks for the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I would say to the gentleman from New Mexico, again, we realize this is a lengthy process, leasing and permitting and getting into actual production. But again, a lot of the regulatory framework that's in place is in place for a darn good reason, to protect the public, to protect their health, to protect their safety, and to protect our environment, regulatory framework of which I happen to be proud to have supported over the years and I think should be there for that public protection.

I'd be glad to yield the gentleman from Illinois 1 minute.

Mr. EMANUEL. Thank you very much for the time.

Three years ago this summer, President Bush signed into law in 2005, in August—July 28, we passed it here in the House—an energy bill which the President said at that time, "I'm confident that one day the Americans will look back on this bill as a vital step towards a more secure and prosperous Nation that is less dependent on foreign sources of energy."

At that time, gas was \$2.29 a gallon. By any measurement, that legislation has failed. Today, it's \$4.11 a gallon, and our dependence on foreign oil is greater now than it was then.

What has happened here is we have provided the oil and gas companies \$15 billion in subsidies of taxpayer money to drill. They're not drilling on the 68 million acres. We have provided them 68 million acres on the Lower 48 to drill. They are not drilling.

So we have a simple thing: use-it-or-lose-it. Get drilling. We agree that supply is part of it. We also agree that efficiency is part of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman 30 more seconds.

Mr. EMANUEL. There are three parts to this: supply, efficiency, and alternatives.

When we increased the fuel efficiency of cars, we moved on one of those pieces. Here, we're moving on supply. We're asking you to join us to make sure that we have adequate supplies out there. There are 68 million acres to be drilled, and as the majority leader said earlier, it's ironic on the day that we have the bill on the floor, finally we're going to have 2 million acres opened up in Alaska.

This requires that there's an annual offering of more property up to be drilling. It does not have to only occur when the Congress puts a bill on the floor to threaten an administration that you finally move more supply to market.

This is a comprehensive approach to solving the energy crisis that the country faces.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend debate by 10 minutes, equally divided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. RAHALL. We're prepared to wrap up, Mr. Speaker. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, to conclude our debate on this side, and in order to promote the passage of this DRILL Act, which will bring American energy to American consumers in a responsible way, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentlelady from California, NANCY PELOSI.

□ 1445

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his extraordinary leadership in bringing the most extensive drilling legislation to the floor of the House. Thank you, Mr. RAHALL.

Because part of what we must do in order to bring down the price of energy to the American people is to increase domestic supply and to protect the consumer. And increasing domestic supply means that we must remove all doubt in the minds of those who wish to drill and those who want the drilling to take place that there are 68 million acres in the lower 48 States where drilling is allowed: "Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands," the DRILL bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the documentation of that amount of land. Thirty-three million of those acres are offshore. So the question is, why do you not want us to drill offshore? We do, in 33 million acres. Why do you not want us to drill on land? We do, in tens of millions more acres in the lower 48.

And then this bill takes us to Alaska, where the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska is a bigger source of oil than the ANWR, the refuge in Alaska. So why those who wish to make an argument here are saying we won't let you drill: No, we want you to drill. Why are you saying this is the law, they have to do it anyway? Well, they aren't because these lands are not drilled upon.

We're not getting the product from them.

So in order to protect the consumer and to increase domestic supply, we're talking about two things: We're talking about protecting the consumer with legislation to curb unnecessary, excessive and abusive speculation in the marketplace. That debate is going on in the Senate as we speak here right now and will come to the House soon.

Increasing domestic supply means facilitating drilling where it is allowed already—in tens of millions of acres across our country. It means investments in renewable resources, because that is part of our energy supply now and for the future. And it also means an immediate call upon the President to free our oil. Right now, the President is sitting on over 700 million barrels of oil. This is oil that has been bought and paid for by the American taxpayer and is warehoused in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. It is there for emergencies, and we have a national emergency in terms of the energy crisis in our country.

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve is 97.5 percent full, the fullest it has ever been in history. All we're asking the President to do is to take 10 percent of that oil and release it over time into the marketplace; increase the supply, reduce the price.

Ten days ago, we called upon the President to free our oil. If he had done so at that time, we would already have an immediate impact at the pump, 10 days. Release the oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, 10 days later we would have had an impact at the pump.

What our colleagues are suggesting about going beyond the areas that already have permits all ready to go will take 10 years to get to the pump. Even the President, who is advocating drilling in the protected areas of OCS, even he said in his press conference the other day, this is not an immediate fix. This will not lower the price at the pump in the near future. Even the President has said that.

So this is a false argument. It's an argument trying to be used to divert attention from the fact that President Bush has had a failed energy policy for the last 7.5 years. If he had acted earlier, we would be reaping the benefits of our investments and renewables. But there has been a resistance in the Congress and within the White House to these changes.

So here we are today at a moment of truth. The truth is that there is a great deal more oil to be exploited in our country. The truth is that it is not being exploited, and this bill would encourage that exploitation. It would encourage those who have the leases to use it or lose it, and if they don't want to exploit the situation, to let someone else drill and produce oil and gas in those acres.

It also says that in Alaska we should be drilling in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. Instead of having a

fight over a protected area, let's go to an area that is already permitted for leasing and has more oil in the first place. The bill also says, when we do that, we must bring that product to market.

So let's complete the pipeline—it's 5 miles there to complete the pipeline—and then build the natural gas pipeline to take natural gas from Alaska to the United States. The only reason that has not happened is because the President has not decided it should.

All of this is only a decision. We call upon the President to use the good offices of the President of the United States to encourage those who are in the final stages of decision making on this to move. And then the supply of energy to our country will be vast, and it will create probably a hundred thousand new jobs. Building the Alaska Pipeline, the Natural Gas Alaska Pipeline, would be the biggest infrastructure project in history. And all the President has to do is give the signal that this should be done. He hasn't in 7.5 years. This bill calls upon him to do so.

So when we drill, and when we bring the oil and gas down to our country, we are saying that none of this oil that is being produced can be exported to foreign countries. It is there not for the profit of these corporations, but to meet the energy demands of the American people.

Essential to all of this, though, is to ignore the false claims being made of the impact of drilling on these protected lands. Maybe the science and the technology one day will make that feasible, and we should always keep our minds open to that. But to say we have to go there—which will take much longer to bring product to market—is just a diversion from the matter at hand, which is, a failed policy in the White House. As Mr. MARKEY said, two oilmen in the White House, \$4-plus a gallon at the pump. The President is sitting on 700 million barrels of oil that would bring down that price at the pump.

Free our oil, Mr. President. "Use it or lose it" to our oil companies. End speculation that is driving up the price. Protect the American consumer. Vote for the DRILL Act.

I thank Mr. RAHALL again for his leadership.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill.

The bill is similar to one I voted for last month that dealt with Federal lands that have been leased for energy exploration and development under the Mineral Leasing Act but where such activities have not yet occurred.

As I noted last month, the debate over this legislation has included statements—by some supporters and some opponents alike—that exaggerates the likely effect of enactment. For example, I believe it would be better to avoid the "use it or lose it" rhetoric that oversimplifies the issue and fails to reflect the reality that oil and gas exploration is a complicated commercial and scientific enterprise involving efforts that do not easily fit within strict regulatory timelines.

But while that part of the bill may not be as far-reaching as some have claimed, I think it is a reasonable response to current conditions and should be passed. In essence, it would bar the current holders of federal mineral leases—whether for onshore or offshore areas—from obtaining additional leases unless they are able to show that they are "diligently developing" the leases they already hold. The Secretary of the Interior would be responsible for spelling out in regulations exactly what would be needed to show such "due diligence."

Current Interior Department regulations include provisions addressing due diligence requirements, so this is not a new concept. But I think giving it greater emphasis is appropriate in view of the continuing importance of oil even as we work to increase the availability and use of alternative energy sources. More useful in terms of energy policy, this bill will reinforce the provisions of current law that aim to prevent hoarding of leases. And providing an incentive for relinquishment of some leases may increase the opportunity for others to explore for and produce oil or gas from those lands.

This approach is similar to that taken when Congress amended the coal-leasing laws by passing the Coal Leasing Act Amendments of 1976 over President Ford's veto. That 1976 legislation provided for a due-diligence requirement as part of a comprehensive overhaul of the laws governing leasing and development of federally-owned coal resources—a provision that some analysts have said had the most immediate practical effect of any of the legislation's various provisions. As a result, for several decades the holders of federal coal leases have been required by law to diligently develop their leases, which has aided in the orderly and efficient development of the nation's coal. I think a similar reinforcement of existing law for leasing of other federal energy resources makes sense.

I have a similar reaction to the other provisions of the bill—they certainly are not all that needs to be done to improve our energy policies, but they can make at least a modest contribution in the right direction.

These provisions include a requirement for the Department of the Interior to offer at least one lease sale annually in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. This is an area of well-established potential that was initially made available for leasing in the Clinton Administration, and with regard to which the current Administration just today announced that 2.6 million acres would be offered at lease sales in the near future. Dictating a leasing timetable in legislation is unusual, but the potentially beneficial effects on prices from tapping the reserves in this part of Alaska are undeniable.

In addition, the bill would reinstate a ban on the export of Alaskan oil that was previously a matter of federal law. Oil is a globally-traded commodity, so the effect of this will be limited, but it may, to some extent, reduce reliance on exports.

The bill calls on the President to facilitate the completion of oil pipelines into the National Petroleum Reserve and to facilitate the construction of a Alaska natural gas pipeline to the continental United States to move the product to market. These are only exhortations, but I see no objection to their inclusion in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this bill is a comprehensive solution toward solving our dangerous dependence on foreign oil. Nor does it come close to addressing all that we must do on energy policy.

We need to do more.

We can look for ways to increase exploration in offshore areas—for example, in 2006 I proposed opening up part of the eastern Gulf of Mexico to within 100 miles of the Florida coast, rather than leave the 125-mile buffer that was finally enacted, and I think that additional acreage should be made available. We should adjust the tax on imported ethanol, and I have introduced to reduce an artificial trade barrier that discourages imports of that fuel. We need to aggressively pursue development of alternative energy sources, including solar and wind power, and we should move aggressively to support research in carbon sequestration for clean coal development, and review policies that inhibit a more proactive effort with nuclear power. And we also need to work even harder to increase energy efficiency, so that we get a greater payoff from all energy sources.

In short, we need a comprehensive and balanced energy policy. This bill by itself is at best a small part of that prescription—but, modest as it is, it does deserve approval and I will vote for it.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, which fails to open up any new lands anywhere to American energy exploration and production. Worse still, this bill imposes restrictive labor requirements including Project Labor Agreements, which eliminate open competition and increase the cost of projects.

A PLA is a labor agreement that requires all contractors working on a site to agree to certain working conditions. If a non-union company is interested in work on a construction site covered by a PLA, these companies will very likely be forced to hire union labor, despite their already having a competent workforce in place.

Why? Well, supporters of these restrictive requirements claim that they are necessary to protect workers' wages.

So here we are, with another "no new American-made energy" bill, but now the majority is claiming to be protecting workers' wages. Forgive me, but it's hard to take this bill seriously.

One of the biggest drains on workers' wages is the high price at the pump. Today, the price of a gallon of regular unleaded stands at \$4.11. A gallon of diesel costs \$4.85.

Low-income workers are disproportionately harmed by high energy costs. If this bill was serious about protecting workers' wages, it would open new areas for exploration, it would promote the development of new sources of American-made energy.

Instead, we're seeing the same tired, old rhetoric from the other side. We're seeing the same stubborn refusal to embrace a comprehensive energy agenda that includes the development of new American-made energy sources, the expansion of alternative fuels, and the promotion of conservation.

This bill does nothing to offer workers the relief they need, and I strongly oppose its passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today is yet another sad day for the American peo-

ple—real people who are suffering from \$4-plus pain at the pump and the Democrat Majority's refusal to do anything about it.

This bill is nothing more than a feeble attempt to fool the American people into believing that the Democratic leadership in Congress actually supports more drilling. They don't. The Democrats in Congress have a well documented, 30 year history of opposing more drilling. In fact, just last year, the very same Democrat leaders in this body who now say they support more drilling were arguing that oil companies were drilling too much and too quickly.

And let me remind Members that in the first 100 hours of the Democrat's Majority's "new direction" for American energy, they attempted to limit and slow down energy production in the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska (NPR—A) by undoing the provisions Republicans enacted into law in 2005 that would have expedited more drilling in NPR—A.

This bill is a sham. It will not produce one drop of American-made oil or natural gas. In fact, there is more drilling in my dentist's office than in this bill.

For the record, here are the facts about drilling in NPR—A:

All lands in NPR—A that are available to be leased under current Bureau of Land Management planning documents have been offered for lease in the past, are currently leased, or are available to be leased now.

If the Democrats want to open all of NPR—A for production, they'll have to exempt the 24 million-acre area from the National Environmental Policy Act and dozen other environmental laws. And if they wanted to produce more oil, they'd do something to address the multiple environmental lawsuits that have slowed/stopped production in NPR—A.

Both industry and the Department of the Interior say the Bureau of Land Management has enough authority to do lease sales and the agency can do them every year if they want—the Democrats' bill won't do anything new.

Both industry and Interior say the only impediment to more production is environmental lawsuits, and this bill doesn't touch that. In fact, the "use it or lose it" parts of the bill create new litigation that will hold up leasing in NPR—A.

This legislation is yet another unfortunate example of the Democrat leadership's negligence on producing energy. For the last 30 years they have thrown every obstacle they could in the way of producing more oil and gas for consumers.

It's interesting, however, that the Democrat Leadership is arguing that oil companies must ravage the 24 million-acre NPR—A—an area 20 percent larger than ANWR—for its 10.6 billion barrels of oil.

Are we to "extrapolate" that the Speaker and the Majority Leader now support allowing Americans to tap the same amount of oil from just 2000 acres of the 19 million-acre Coastal Plain of ANWR?

The Coastal Plain of ANWR, a flat, frozen desert just 74 miles east of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, is just 1.5 million acres—1/16th the size of NPR—A. It contains the same amount of oil. And with today's technology we can produce all of that oil while disturbing no more than 2000 acres, or 0.01 of ANWR's 19 million acres.

If the Majority leadership sincerely wants more oil, surely they would support drilling in

ANWR, the environmentally friendly alternative to NPR—A. But no, they don't. And this fact should serve as a reminder of the Majority's real energy policy: No more drilling.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this do-nothing legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6515.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 173, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

YEAS—244

|                 |                 |                 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Ackerman        | Diaz-Balart, M. | Kildee          |
| Allen           | Dicks           | Kilpatrick      |
| Altmire         | Dingell         | Kind            |
| Arcuri          | Doggett         | Klein (FL)      |
| Baca            | Donnelly        | Knollenberg     |
| Baird           | Doyle           | Kucinich        |
| Baldwin         | Edwards (MD)    | Kuhl (NY)       |
| Barrow          | Edwards (TX)    | Langevin        |
| Bean            | Ellison         | Larsen (WA)     |
| Becerra         | Ellsworth       | Larson (CT)     |
| Berkley         | Emanuel         | Lee             |
| Berman          | Engel           | Levin           |
| Berry           | English (PA)    | Lewis (GA)      |
| Biggert         | Eshoo           | Lipinski        |
| Bishop (GA)     | Etheridge       | LoBiondo        |
| Bishop (NY)     | Farr            | Loehsack        |
| Blumenauer      | Fattah          | Lofgren, Zoe    |
| Boucher         | Filner          | Lowe            |
| Boyd (FL)       | Forbes          | Lynch           |
| Boyda (KS)      | Foster          | Mahoney (FL)    |
| Brady (PA)      | Frank (MA)      | Maloney (NY)    |
| Bralley (IA)    | Gerlach         | Markey          |
| Brown, Corrine  | Giffords        | Marshall        |
| Buchanan        | Gillibrand      | Matheson        |
| Butterfield     | Goode           | Matsui          |
| Capps           | Gordon          | McCarthy (NY)   |
| Capuano         | Graves          | McCollum (MN)   |
| Cardoza         | Green, Al       | McDermott       |
| Carnahan        | Grijalva        | McGovern        |
| Carney          | Gutierrez       | McIntyre        |
| Carson          | Hall (NY)       | McNerney        |
| Castle          | Hare            | Meek (FL)       |
| Castor          | Harman          | Meeks (NY)      |
| Cazayoux        | Hastings (FL)   | Melancon        |
| Chabot          | Hayes           | Michaud         |
| Chandler        | Herseth Sandlin | Miller (NC)     |
| Childers        | Higgins         | Miller, George  |
| Clarke          | Hill            | Mitchell        |
| Clay            | Hinchey         | Mollohan        |
| Cleaver         | Hirono          | Moore (KS)      |
| Clyburn         | Hodes           | Moore (WI)      |
| Cohen           | Holden          | Moran (VA)      |
| Conyers         | Holt            | Murphy (CT)     |
| Cooper          | Honda           | Murphy, Patrick |
| Costello        | Hooley          | Murphy, Tim     |
| Courtney        | Hoyer           | Murtha          |
| Cramer          | Inlee           | Nadler          |
| Crowley         | Israel          | Napolitano      |
| Cummings        | Jackson (IL)    | Neal (MA)       |
| Davis (AL)      | Jackson-Lee     | Oberstar        |
| Davis (CA)      | (TX)            | Obey            |
| Davis (IL)      | Jefferson       | Olver           |
| Davis, Lincoln  | Johnson (GA)    | Pallone         |
| DeFazio         | Johnson, E. B.  | Pascarell       |
| DeGette         | Jones (NC)      | Pastor          |
| Delahunt        | Jones (OH)      | Payne           |
| DeLauro         | Kagen           | Pelosi          |
| Dent            | Kanjorski       | Perlmutter      |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Kennedy         | Peterson (MN)   |

Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Richardson  
Rogers (AL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano

Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney

Towns  
Tsongas  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

## NAYS—173

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Costa  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen

## NOT VOTING—18

Andrews  
Boswell  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Cubin  
Doolittle  
Gilchrest

□ 1516

Messrs. RADANOVICH, MCHENRY,  
FOSSELLA and Mrs. SCHMIDT

changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 511, unfortunately, I am getting a medical procedure done and cannot vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House of Representatives on July 17, 2008, because I was invited to accompany the President of the United States on a tour of communities in my Northern California Congressional District that have been devastated by wildfires. For this reason, I missed rollcall votes 509, 510, and 511. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: Rollcall 509, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1350—“nay”; rollcall 510, on agreeing to H. Res. 1350, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules—“no”; rollcall 511, on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 6515, the Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands Act of 2008—“nay.”

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2125 AND H.R. 1650

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from two bills, H.R. 2125 and H.R. 1650.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALZ of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2488

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from a bill, H.R. 2488.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. I would like to ask my friend, the majority leader, to give us an update on what he plans to bring to the floor next week.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding. On Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 12:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 3999, the National Highway Bridge Reconstruction and Inspection Act and H.R. 5501 the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008.

We will also consider legislation to address the housing crisis, H.R. 3221, the American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008. Finally, we may also consider additional energy-related legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. On the topic of additional energy-related legislation, I know we just had a bill on the floor on energy. It was a heated debate. And while a majority voted for the bill, it didn't pass. I wonder if there is any opportunity that bill might come back next week with a rule.

Mr. HOYER. We have not discussed that yet. We regret it, of course, that it didn't pass. But having said that, I'm sure there will be discussions as to what the next steps will be. But I am not prepared to announce what they will be, mainly because I'm not sure what they will be at this point in time. But we are still very interested in the proposition, as you know, that that legislation spoke to, and that is providing an accelerated exploration, discovery and exploitation of our energy here in the United States, drilling in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, building a line to get not only the oil, but also natural gas down to the lower 48, and to ensure that companies aren't inventorying property on which either they or others might be producing energy for America.

So we believe the provisions of that bill are important. And I would think that we're going to be looking at ways in which we may move forward on that. But it has not been decided.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. As you mentioned, there is lots of interest in the bill. I appreciate the fact that we were able to extend debate, even on a suspension bill. But I think this is a topic where certainly both sides evidenced a willingness to discuss it. And we need to do that. And I would hope to see more energy legislation on the floor and would hope to have it under a rule if that is at all possible.

On appropriations, last week I mentioned that the chairman, the appropriations chairman, had appeared to announce that there would be no appropriations work on the floor. Your comment at the time, if I recall, was that that had not been a decision that you and the other leaders had made yet.

Today, the Speaker announced that the House would consider the Defense bill before October. I'm wondering if you have any idea when that might happen and if there is a chance that

the five other bills that are out of committee could also get to the floor before October, and what could happen with the Interior bill which would obviously be the most important bill as it relates to this topic of energy that we just discussed.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the Speaker that it is our intention to move the Defense bill. We think that is critically important to do. We think it's critically important to move the other bills as well.

I was having a discussion with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the last vote. I asked him about his discussions with Mr. LEWIS to try to facilitate the consideration of appropriation bills. My belief is that they hadn't made as much progress as he had hoped to make, but with relation to the other bills, I will just reiterate what I have said, that I continue to talk to Mr. OBEY about my hope that we can find a way to move appropriation bills to the floor if that is possible. But we have not gotten any scheduled at this point. We do intend to move certainly the Defense bill. The Speaker was accurate on that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. And the Defense bill certainly is critical, as all these bills are. And obviously I share the sense that it's a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to defend the country. But the Homeland Security bill, the Military Construction and Veterans bill also are particularly important components of that very element of what we do, and other bills that are out such as the Financial Services bill, all the discussions we're having and will have about housing over the next few days, but another bill where if we knew that the regulators were funded and how they were funded and the other things that happened, that is a helpful thing to know.

I think that is all the questions I have for today, and I would yield back.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 21, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 22, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### HONORING ARMY MAJOR GENERAL ANTHONY CUCOLO

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart, Georgia, underwent a change of command. As a member of the Armed Services Committee whose State is home to Fort Stewart, I rise today to thank Major General Rick Lynch on a job well done as he moves on to Fort Hood, Texas, and to congratulate Major General Tony Cucolo as he takes command of the 3rd ID.

This is a command of monumental importance in the United States Army, Mr. Speaker. The 3rd Infantry Division has one of the most successful combat records of any United States Army division. It was the first conventional U.S. unit to enter Baghdad in 2003 and the first division to actually serve three tours in Iraq.

Major General Lynch commanded the division on this most recent tour in Iraq, during which time we saw undeniable progress. Major General Cucolo has large boots to fill. But I have every confidence that he is the right man for the job.

Having served as brigade commander at Fort Stewart from 1999 to 2001, he is returning to familiar turf. He returns to Fort Stewart from the Pentagon, where he served as the Army's chief of public affairs for the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me, and all of our colleagues, in honoring these two fine soldiers for their service to our Nation.

#### HONORING J. FRED PATTON FOR HIS GENEROUS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of J. Fred Patton, a gracious contributor to the Third District of Arkansas, who passed away earlier this week.

For more than 101 years, Mr. Patton showed passion for Arkansas through his compassion for neighbors, community service and education that he provided for future Arkansans. He authored "The History of Fort Smith," now in its seventh edition, and taught Sunday school for more than six decades.

Throughout his life, Mr. Patton received numerous professional, civic and humanitarian awards, including the honor of being selected as one of 10 outstanding citizens in western Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma in 1989. I had

the privilege to meet and get to know Fred over the years, and he truly was an amazing person who wanted the best for his community.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patton certainly will be missed. However, his legacy will live on for generations to come. I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to celebrate and honor the life of this wonderful man.

□ 1530

#### BRINGING DOWN ENERGY PRICES

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come down to the floor at the end of the week to just say if we really want to be sincere about bringing down the price of energy, we need to have an all-of-the-above strategy.

That is opening up the Outer Continental Shelf which we legislatively limited 25 years. That is bringing on wind and solar. We can use the revenues from opening the OCS to build wind and solar operations. We can use our vast resources of coal, 250 years worth of supply in the Illinois coal basin alone, turning that into liquid fuels creating American jobs. We also can continue to expand the use of biofuels.

The great thing about the Republican proposal is that it is all of the above. We are not willing to say "no" to everything. We want everything to come on board, to bring on more supply and lower the cost of liquid fuel for the cost of electricity, and we want these fuels and these commodities to compete. In the competition, we will have lower-cost fuel and energy so we can have a manufacturing base left in the United States of America.

#### ENERGY POLICIES

(Mr. MCCOTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we saw a picture of the President of the United States with foreign dignitaries. We today see the Speaker of the House with a foreign dignitary. We do not begrudge either of them on this side of the aisle. We have to have responsible foreign relations. The only difference is we do not use pictures to explain America's energy policy or put forward conspiracy theories as to why you are feeling the pain at the pump.

Let us be realistic about this. We need more American oil production, commonsense conservation, and free market innovations. And no amount of political cant or hot air is going to do anything except keep your prices at the pump to the point where your family budget shrinks.

### SPECIAL OLYMPICS CELEBRATES 40TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a special group of people, the millions of participants and volunteers of the Special Olympics. Next Sunday, the Special Olympics turns 40 years old, and we are extremely grateful for the opportunities they provide to the intellectually disabled members of our community.

The goal of the Special Olympics is simple to express, but monumental to achieve: to empower individuals to become physically fit, productive and respected members of the community through sports training and competition. Not deterred by the challenge of their tasks, the organizers of the Special Olympics programs have performed phenomenally and made a serious impact in countless lives.

Ironically, their extraordinary results are likely due to their focus on the games, and not the winners. This is apparent from their oath, "Let me win. But if I cannot win, let me brave in the attempt," a message from which we can all learn.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to recognize and congratulate the Special Olympics on their 40th anniversary and to wish them continued success in their most worthy cause.

### AMERICAN ENERGY

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to address the energy situation as well and point something out that I don't believe has been very well illustrated here.

This chart that I have, the inside circle is all of the Btus of energy that are consumed in the United States annually, 72 quadrillion Btus. The outside circle is all of the different sources of energy. Excuse me, this is the production chart on the inside. The outside circle is the consumption chart. We are producing only 72 percent of the overall energy that we are consuming. We need to grow the entire size of the energy pie. But if you take out of it all of the things that the environmentalists don't want us to do, it leaves only a little bit of solar and wind and geothermal. That is only 0.74 percent of our energy production.

They want to grow it into 100 percent of our energy production. That cannot be done. We have to grow all sources, not the tiny little sliver, three-quarters of 1 percent that the environmentalists would let us do. Let's go for all of it, as the gentleman from Illinois said.

### AFFORDABLE ENERGY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Today, Mr. Speaker, we addressed an enormously important issue, and that is how to give relief to the American people on these soaring energy prices, small businesses, teachers and bus drivers, families who are carpooling, others who are trying to get to work. We owe them our collective minds to be able to ensure that we have a combined philosophy and program as it addresses the question of affordable energy and protecting our national security.

So I do believe there is a right way of drilling. I do believe we should go into the National Petroleum Reserve, and frankly I believe we should release gallons of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve so the American people can have immediate relief. I also think it is extremely important that we conserve, and we look at solar and wind.

And as it relates to the 23 million leases that are there, only 3 million are used, let us delegate from those who may own them, let us set aside some opportunity for minority and women-owned businesses and small businesses to be able to engage in that. Let's have a collective effort.

### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SKELTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### OCCUPATION OF IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Government Accountability Office issued a report on Monday that should worry every single Member of the House. The GAO said that the government isn't moving quickly enough to ensure that radioactive materials don't get into the hands of terrorists.

Last year the GAO ran a sting operation to see how easy it would be for anyone to get a license from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to buy enough radioactive materials to create a dirty bomb. They set up a bogus company with only a post office box number and got the license within a month.

The government then promised to tighten up on its requirements for the purchase of radioactive materials, but the GAO report found this effort is still

years behind schedule. So while the government takes what looks like its sweet time, we live under the threat of a dirty bomb that could kill many Americans and devastate our economy.

But as outrageous as this situation is, it is only a prime example of how our country's real security needs are being ignored.

Another example is the occupation of Iraq because the administration continues to have tunnel vision when it comes to Iraq. While the administration devotes most of our military resources and troops on the occupation of another country, an occupation that actually makes no sense whatsoever, it is blind to the real threats to our security in Afghanistan.

Even Admiral Mike Mullen, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has admitted that we are focusing on the wrong place. Earlier this month he said, "I don't have troops that I can send into Afghanistan until I have a reduced requirement in Iraq. We don't have enough troops in Afghanistan to hold, and that is key clearly to the future of being able to succeed in Afghanistan."

Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda is growing stronger along the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Even Ryan Crocker, our ambassador to Iraq, admitted when he testified before Congress in March that stopping al Qaeda in Afghanistan should be our top priority, not the occupation of Iraq.

Yet we have five times more troops in Iraq than Afghanistan. That doesn't make military sense; it doesn't make common sense.

We can have two reactions to this tragic situation. We can scratch our heads and wonder at the folly of it all, or we can take action. Of course I prefer action. That is why I have offered a SMART Security plan which would defeat terrorism through strong international alliances, aggressive diplomacy, improved intelligence, and initiatives to address the root causes of terrorism.

In addition, I and my colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE from California, asked Members of Congress to sign a letter to Prime Minister al-Maliki of Iraq last week. Thirty-one Members signed the letter, and I thank them.

The letter states, "We, the undersigned Members of the United States House of Representatives, support the sovereign right of the government of Iraq to insist that any security agreement between the United States and Iraq include a timetable for the complete redeployment of U.S. Armed Forces and military contractors out of Iraq."

Prime Minister al-Maliki has called for such a timetable. We should work with him to make it happen. This is a great opportunity to end our disastrous and counterproductive occupation of Iraq.

Yesterday, The Washington Post released a poll that shows that 63 percent

of the American people believe that the war in Iraq was not worth fighting. Let's listen to the American people, Mr. Speaker. Let's bring our troops and military contractors out of Iraq, but let's not repeat the same military folly in other parts of the region.

#### TEXAS IGNORES WORLD COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, Texas, the State of Texas, has ignored the order of the World Court in Geneva. Let me give you the facts of this case.

Fifteen years ago in 1993 there were two young teenage girls by the name of Jennifer Ertman, 14, and Elizabeth Pena, 16, headed home as the sun set in Houston, Texas.

They took a shortcut so they could get home in a timely fashion, as ordered by their parents. That was their fatal mistake. They came in contact with a group of gangsters headed by Jose Medellin. It was a gang initiation. The girls stumbled upon the gang of gangsters, and these gangsters kidnapped, held hostage, and brutally sexually assaulted these two girls for as long as they wished.

□ 1545

After they were through, they tortured them, and Jose Medellin strangled each of them with their shoelaces. Medellin was proud of his conduct. He was later arrested by the Houston Police Department along with others from his group of bandits, specifically Derrick O'Brien, Peter Cantu and two others.

These individuals were tried by Texas juries. A Texas jury found that Derrick O'Brien committed the worst crime in our society, ordered the death penalty, and he's been executed.

The ringleader of the case, Jose Medellin, well, his case has been on appeal for 15 years. Here's what has happened in his case. He was convicted. His case worked its way all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court upheld this conviction. Then years later he says, I should have been allowed to talk to my Mexican consulate at some time during the proceeding, even though he never requested it upon his arrest.

Of course, then, the Federal Government gets involved in the case. The case works its way back through the Supreme Court. Before it gets to the Supreme Court, the administration, the White House, intervened and told Texas courts to give Medellin a new trial because he was not allowed to ask or see his Mexican consulate, even though he didn't request it. Remember, Medellin was illegally in the United States, even though he had been here since he was 6 months of age.

The State of Texas, the Texas courts, in all due respect to the President of the United States, ignored his request.

The case went back to the Supreme Court, right down the street.

A few months ago the Supreme Court of the United States said, World Court has no jurisdiction. The President of the United States has no jurisdiction to tell the courts in Texas what to do and upheld his conviction and ordered him executed.

But, once again, the World Court intervened yesterday, and said the State of Texas cannot execute Medellin.

Well, let me tell you something, the State of Texas on August 5 is going to execute this defendant for what he did. The State of Texas has decided that the World Court has no jurisdiction to tell the State of Texas or any other State what to do. I think it was put appropriately by the fathers of these two girls.

No parent wants to see their child die before their time, especially the way that these two girls died. I have four kids, three of them are girls; and seven grandkids, four of them are girls. Here's what one of the fathers had to say about the death of his daughter. He said, "The World Court doesn't mean diddly. This business belongs in the State of Texas. The people of the State of Texas support the execution. We thank them."

More appropriately, the other father, Adolfo Pena, the father of Elizabeth Pena, said, "I believe we have been through all the red tape we can go through. It's time to rock and roll."

Justice must be served for victims of crime. 15 years justice has been waiting, in this specific case, 15 years, longer than one of the girls even lived. This defendant arrogantly has been sitting on death row.

I was a judge when this case was tried back in Texas in the 1990s, and it was one of the worst crimes we had ever heard in our city, where two teenage girls minding their own business were kidnapped by a bunch of gangsters, sexually assaulted, tortured, murdered and the criminals bragged about this conduct.

Today is judgment day for Jose Medellin. He deserves the death penalty, he earned it, and justice demands it, whether the World Court likes it or not.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PRESIDENTIAL SIGNING STATEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 2008, I introduced

H.R. 5993, the Presidential Signing Statements Act. This bill would promote congressional and public awareness and understanding of Presidential signing statements. I am very pleased that next Friday the House Judiciary Committee will examine the issue of Presidential signing statements as part of a hearing on the balance of powers in our government.

The history of Presidential signing statements dates back to the 19th century. However, on September 17, 2007, a Congressional Research Service report noted that U.S. presidents have increasingly employed these statements to assert constitutional and legal objections to congressional enactments.

In doing so, Presidents sometimes communicate their intent to disregard certain provisions of bills they have signed into law. It is for this reason that I have introduced the Presidential Signing Statements Act. Just as the American people have access to the text of bills that are signed into law, they should have easy and prompt access to the content of Presidential signing statements that could affect how those the laws will be executed. To enable a more complete public understanding of our Nation's laws, the Congress should also be able to call for the executive explanation and justification for a Presidential signing statement.

According to CRS, President Clinton signed 381 signing statements while in office. Seventy of these statements raised legal and constitutional objections. President George Bush has signed 157 signing statements, 122 of these statements contain some type of constitutional challenge or objections. Because future Presidents are likely to continue this practice, Congress should act now to pass legislation to ensure proper understanding and disclosure of these signing statements.

The American Bar Association recently examined the issue of presidential signing statements and appointed the task force on presidential signing statements and the separation of powers doctrine.

The task force issued a report urging Congress to enact legislation requiring the President to promptly submit to Congress an official copy of all signing statements he issues and to submit a congressional, to the Congress, a report setting forth in full the reasons and legal basis for this statement. The ABA also recommended that such submissions be available in a publicly accessible database.

The bill that I introduced would require the President to provide copies of signing statements to congressional leadership within 3 days of being issued. Secondly, it would require signing statements to be published in the Federal Register; and, third, require executive staff to testify on the meaning and justification for Presidential signing statements at the request of the House or Senate Judiciary Committee; and, fourth, provide that no monies may be used to implement any

law accompanied by the signing statements if any provision of the act is violated.

Because it's critical that we preserve the division of power in our government and public understanding of our Nation's laws, I hope many of my colleagues will consider cosigning the Presidential Signing Statements Act.

I look forward to next week's House Judiciary Committee hearing, and the opportunity to further discuss why this legislation is a much-needed piece of legislation.

Before I close, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform in Afghanistan and Iraq, and ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and ask God to continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IT'S TIME TO PASS A FEDERAL MEDIA SHIELD LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. These two rights form the bedrock of our democracy by ensuring the free flow of information to the American people.

Sadly, today, the free and independent press in America is under fire. In recent years, more than 40 journalists have been subpoenaed, questioned or held in contempt for failure to reveal their confidential sources.

For a journalist, maintaining an assurance of confidentiality to a source is sometimes the only way to bring forward news of great consequence to the Nation. Being forced to reveal a source chills reporting of the news, and, thereby, restricts the free flow of information to the public.

Now, not long ago, a reporter's assurance of confidentiality was unquestioned. That assurance led to sources that willingly provided information to journalists who brought forward news of enormous consequence to the Nation. One thinks of Watergate, recent stories of misfeasance at Walter Reed Army medical center, and even the abuse of steroids in major league baseball.

All of these stories never would have come to the light, stories great and small, were it not for confidential sources and the dogged persistence of a free and independent press. As a conservative who believes in a limited government, I believe the only check on government power in real time is a free and independent press.

A free press ensures the flow of information to the public, and in this time of scandals and rumors of scandals and corruption in high places, such information is needed now more than ever to hold those in power to account. In order to maintain our free and independent press, I authored the Free Flow of Information Act with Congressman RICK BOUCHER of Virginia several years ago. This bill is also known as a Federal media shield statute. It provides a qualified privilege of confidentiality to journalists, which enables them to shield sources from disclosure in certain situations.

Now, the bill is not about protecting reporters, it's about protecting the public's right to know. We introduced the bill in May of 2007, and on October 16 of last year, it passed in this House of Representatives by an overwhelming and bipartisan margin of 398-21. I was especially pleased to earn the support of Republican and Democratic leadership, the chairman and ranking members of the Intelligence and Armed Services Committee, and many other leaders throughout the House of Representatives.

The bill received wide bipartisan support because of measures we added to specifically address very real and legitimate concerns about how a privilege for journalists could impact national security. The Federal Government, as we know, is tasked with a tremendous responsibility of protecting the Nation. We must always put national security in the forefront of our consideration.

The Free Flow of Information Act does just that. Well, with news that the United States Senate may be taking up a version of this legislation as soon as next week, I wanted to rise to speak about the bill and what some of its critics may say.

Critics of the bill will point always to concerns about national security. But our version of the bill only provides a qualified privilege, meaning that disclosure of a source's identity may be required in certain situations. The foremost of those situations, of course, is when the Nation's security is placed at risk. The bill permits compelled disclosure to prevent or identify the perpetrator of an act of terrorism against the United States or its allies, to prevent significant or specified harm to national security, or, in cases that involved the unauthorized disclosure of classified information that caused or will cause significant or articulable harm to national security. In such cases, a judge will be able to determine whether the public interest, in compelling disclosure of a source, outweighs the public interest in gathering or disseminating news or information.

Overall, I sincerely believe the bill strikes a reasonable balance between the public's right to know and the fair administration of justice. In striking that balance, the version of the legislation that passed this House puts national security first.

Long ago Thomas Jefferson warned, "Our liberty cannot be guarded but by the freedom of the press, nor that limited without danger of losing it." Jefferson's words hold true today.

The passage of the Free Flow of Information Act in this Congress is necessary not only to explicitly and fully provide for the freedom and press of our Nation, but also to protect our liberty for future generations of Americans. With the extraordinary bipartisan support of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and support in the United States Senate, which includes both major party candidates for President of the United States, it is my hope that the United States Senate will take up the Free Flow of Information Act and report it next week with a strong bipartisan affirmation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### WHERE IS THE HOUSE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, here we are, Thursday afternoon, 3:58 p.m. All across the Nation, the day shift is ending, or about to end. Folks getting ready for the afternoon shift. Other folks that work the night shift are either just waking up or just going to sleep to get prepared for another day, another day of work.

Where is the House? The House has gone home, Thursday afternoon, and the House has gone home, not to return until next Tuesday. What didn't we do this week, like we didn't do last week, and the week before, and the week before, we didn't address the number one issue on the minds of Americans and hurting the American pocketbook, and that's the issue of gas prices, didn't address it, nothing.

□ 1600

Now, the majority will tell you that they brought to the floor a drill bill. What they brought to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, cynically, was what they called a drill bill. In fact, it was really just a "no energy" energy bill.

Why do I say that? Well, the bill had eight sections. Six sections are either current law or are clerical. Current law: No new energy. One of the sections mandated project labor agreements that would increase the construction costs of Alaskan pipelines by as much as 30 percent. Increasing costs: No new energy. The final section would increase the bureaucracy and the red tape for any new energy production. It didn't open any exploration onshore. It

didn't open any exploration offshore. Increasing costs: No new energy.

Now, what is the solution? Well, the solution is what the American people know, and that is that it's a broad array of items. It's conservation. Americans are doing an incredible job of trying to conserve. We're using less energy than we did last year. Conservation is the key, and we can all do more. It's finding alternative fuel, that fuel that will allow the 21st century to be an American energy 21st century. That will take a little while.

So, in the near term, in the short term, what's the solution? Mr. Speaker, you know what it is. It's what your constituents tell you about. It's increasing supply. It is increasing the supply of energy, American energy for Americans. How do you do that? America has incredible resources.

Onshore resources: We ought to be doing more exploration. We're only using 6 percent of the eligible land to be leased to find American energy for Americans onshore.

Offshore: Deep-sea exploration. The vast majority of Americans support environmentally sensitive and sound deep-sea exploration. We ought to be doing that. Only 3 percent of the available territory is being utilized currently.

Utilizing clean coal technology: We now have technology available that allows us to use coal of which America is, remarkably, the world's greatest repository of coal in the world, and we ought to be using that for clean coal technology.

Oil shale, which exists in our western area: There are more than 2 trillion barrels of oil that could be extracted from oil shale in environmentally sensitive and sound ways.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we're doing none of that. Now, it's not because there isn't legislation for it. In fact, we have bills right here at the desk: H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act; H.R. 2279, the Expand American Refining Capacity Act; H.R. 5656, to Repeal the Ban on Acquiring Alternative Fuels; H.R. 2208, the Coal Liquid Fuel Act. All sorts of bills exist. They exist, but we aren't allowed a vote.

As you know, the majority party, the Democrat leadership, beholden to leftist individuals, will not allow a vote on the floor of the House. All we're asking is for a vote. We're not asking for a guaranteed outcome, just a vote. Give us a vote, Mr. Speaker. Why not? What are you afraid of? Why not have a vote? Why not respond to the demand of the American people and increase American energy for Americans? Bring down gas prices. We demand a vote. We hope that next week we'll see it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McCOTTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### FUNDING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HOMETOWN SECURITY BY EARMARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight an earmark in the fiscal 2009 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Now, the reason I'm having to do this is that it looks like we won't even be considering this bill on the floor, and therefore, it may be that all of the earmarks, the hundreds of earmarks that were approved in the committee for that bill, may be dumped into the bill, just air-dropped into the bill, at the last minute without even being considered by the House. That's simply not right.

This earmark is for the Kentucky-based National Institute for Hometown Security. When I came across this earmark, I was surprised at the dollar amount. In fact, it was the second largest earmark requested by an individual in the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Now, I would submit that spending like this pushes the Federal Treasury threat level past orange, or high risk, right into the red zone, or severe category.

According to the Web site of the earmark recipient, the institute sponsor suggested organizing the higher education institutions of Kentucky to more effectively compete for research funds and projects aimed at improving homeland security. It appears that the purpose of the consortium and of the institute is to make Kentucky better at receiving Federal funds, arguably an admirable purpose. It's simply too bad that it's paid for with Federal funds.

The institute goes on to say that the institute is designed to help develop new technologies and devices that commercialize them. Now, with taxpayers shouldering over \$5 trillion in Federal debt, why do we need to fund programs for the benefit of commercializing products?

This institute was created in 2004. According to the Department of Homeland Security, the agency which is charged with overseeing this, the Department has never requested funds for the National Institute for Hometown Security. Why are we doing this through an earmark?

I must ask the question: Would this institute exist in the first place if select members of a powerful committee did not direct the spending for it?

Since receiving its first earmark, the institute has received more than \$60 million in Federal earmarks, including \$12 million in 2005, \$20 million in 2006, \$20 million in 2007, \$11 million in 2008. If this earmark is approved, the institute will have received \$74 million in earmark funding. For what? What has

the center produced or achieved that can possibly be worth this kind of money? Will we continue to earmark for this institute indefinitely?

I am certain, if I had the opportunity to challenge this earmark on the House floor during regular order, the sponsor might be glad to highlight what he believes the institute's achievements are. My response would simply be: If this institute is so important, if it's so needed for the Department of Homeland Security, why do you have to earmark funding for it? Why doesn't the Department seek its own funding and say this is a vital institute? "We ought to provide funding within the budget. We're going to request it." No. The money has to be earmarked by an appropriator.

In 2005, a Washington Post story provided details on the institute. It indicated that the sponsor of the earmark has, as a senior appropriator, "encouraged contractors to move into his district and has announced millions of dollars in antiterrorism research at Kentucky colleges and universities."

That same article highlighted the sponsor's having taken credit for \$206 million in homeland security research-related funding for the State. The Post article indicated: "So much Federal money for high-tech homeland security projects has flowed to southeastern Kentucky, that those who are there have taken to calling it 'Silicon Holler' with the institute and the university consortium at the heart of it."

I would submit that handling this funding in any other way than through earmarks might put a damper on what appears to be a spoil system where certain powerful Members are able to shower their districts with taxpayer dollars. If we had regular order and a regular authorization-appropriation oversight process, we wouldn't be earmarking funds like this.

I would inquire also as to what, if any, oversight the Appropriations Committee has undertaken to ensure that the \$60 million that has already been given to the institute was worthwhile and why an additional \$11 million is warranted.

I would submit also that, when taxpayers send their dollars to Washington, they expect more than an earmarking system that is absent real oversight and that seems to just give the keys to the Treasury to a few powerful appropriators.

Mr. Speaker, I will soon be circulating a letter to Speaker PELOSI and to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, asking them to ensure that if we don't have regular order and if we don't go through the appropriations process that we not air-drop earmarks into an omnibus bill when this body has not had a chance to even see them, let alone to adequately vet them.

I urge my colleagues to do better with the taxpayers' money. We should be better stewards. We have a time-honored process in this body of authorization, appropriation and oversight

that we have been ignoring for years, and the taxpayers are the worse for it. We cannot continue to do that. This institution is a better body than that, and we ought to give more respect to it.

#### AMERICA'S CHALLENGES IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as we all know from listening to our colleagues and, even more importantly, from listening to the American people, the United States is currently facing a host of critical and complex challenges that have an enormous impact on our daily lives.

Fuel prices have skyrocketed, creating a ripple effect throughout our entire economy. We pay ever increasing prices at the pump, at the supermarket and nearly everywhere we buy the everyday goods that our families need. We all feel the strain of these rising prices. At the same time, we see our economy softening because of the housing crisis.

The threat of radical extremism persists throughout much of the globe, including, of course, in Afghanistan and in Iraq, where our brave men and women in uniform are fighting. We, of course, constantly face the problem of illegal immigration, which exposes the weaknesses of our borders and further strains our economy.

Madam Speaker, these challenges are as diverse as they are complicated. They did not develop overnight, but have arisen over time. They contribute to a growing and pervasive frustration by the American people. These challenges are daunting, but they are far from hopeless.

I believe the key to finding the solutions to the challenges of the 21st century is not to view them as isolated problems. We need a broad, visionary approach that sees these issues for what they are: the interconnected challenges of a smaller and smaller world.

Growing demand for energy in both China and India, combined with volatility in the Middle East, central Asia and the Niger Delta contribute to rising gas prices here in the United States. Natural disasters combined with rising fuel prices contribute to a global food crisis that threatens a billion people. Weak and corrupt governments perpetuate poverty in the developing world, which is exacerbated by the growing food crisis, contributing to growing unrest and ripe conditions for radical extremism.

Every single day, Madam Speaker, every day, people who have not been screened for a criminal or for a terrorist background enter our country through porous borders. Of course, we know all too painfully well the cabal of

20 hijackers from 7 years ago this coming September 11. They fed off the deep discontent that poverty and ignorance breed. They trained in Afghanistan, received funding through international financing schemes. They entered the United States by way of a broken immigration system and perpetrated, as we all know, the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil.

These issues are not isolated from each other. Any 21st century agenda for America must recognize the fundamental nature of these issues and take a comprehensive view towards solving them. I believe this demands an approach that looks inward as well as outward.

First and foremost, we need to look at how American policy is affecting American problems, and we need to find an American solution. Second, we need to look at the reality of this interconnected world about which I've spoken and give our approach a global view.

Our energy crisis provides a good illustration of exactly what I mean. There are a number of contributing factors that are driving up prices, as I've mentioned. There is growing demand abroad. There is volatility in many oil-producing regions, but we are also suffering because we have failed here at home to develop our own domestic solutions.

Technology in the oil and gas industry has become so advanced that we can explore and drill without damaging our environment. Yet we have vast resources untapped in ANWR and way off our shores. An increased supply of oil does very little good without the capacity to refine it. Yet we have not built a new refinery in three decades.

□ 1615

We all know that nuclear energy is the cleanest, safest, most cost-effective energy source known to man, and yet we have also not built a new reactor in three decades. Furthermore, despite the fact that we in the United States and in my State of California are the world's leaders in innovation, we have not invested nearly, nearly enough in new green technologies that diminish our dependence on fossil fuels and allow us to use the energy we have more efficiently.

Madam Speaker, these are American failures. We need a comprehensive overhaul of our national energy policy to increase our domestic production, improve efficiency, and make us more self-sufficient. But at the same time, there is no escaping the global oil market and the reality that prices are driven by global factors. By promoting our own responsible energy agenda, we don't extricate ourselves from the global market. We shape it, we shape it, Madam Speaker, through our leadership. By increasing supply while diminishing demand through technology improvements, we can help to stabilize and reduce global prices.

By neutralizing the acute crises caused by out-of-control prices, we can

help to reduce the volatility that drives up prices to begin with. In other words, we need a uniquely American solution without losing sight of our place of leadership in this interconnected world.

Madam Speaker, the same is very true for the problem of illegal immigration. Failure on this issue is a failure of our border security. We cannot address this problem without addressing our borders. The solution begins with substantial resources for the border patrol and increased technology, including fencing along our border. We simply must strengthen and modernize our first line of defense.

Yet we would be hopelessly shortsighted if we didn't recognize that the problem does not begin, the problem does not begin at the border. It begins in the poor villages of our neighbors to the south. Nowhere else on Earth do a developed and a developing country share a 2,000-mile border. Nowhere else on the face of the earth is a border of 2,000 miles existing between a developed and a developing nation. As we seek to hold back the tide of illegal immigration with a strong border, we must also endeavor to diminish the flow of that tide in the first place.

In the long run, Madam Speaker, growth and opportunity in Mexico is the key to ending the scourge of illegal immigration. As their economy grows and jobs are created, the desire to attempt to cross our border will greatly diminish. Because of this, a permanent solution to the problem demands that Mexico pursue sound economic policies so that there is opportunity on both sides of the Rio Grande.

Our policy toward Mexico must be focused on encouraging them to be accountable to the Mexican people for making the necessary economic reforms which will lead to this important growth. And because strong economies require strong institutions, we must also encourage them to pursue efforts to build their own capacity.

Greater bilateral engagement will ensure Mexico's continued effort to liberalize their economy, to modernize and train their law enforcement and judiciary is important, to build the capacity of their Federal, State, and local government institution is also key, to strengthen the rule of law and provide an environment where economic opportunity can flourish is critically important. It will also ensure that we have an able and effective partner in our efforts to stem the illegal flow of people and narcotics across our border.

Madam Speaker, we have already seen, and this doesn't get much attention, but we have already seen some positive results from our engagements. Mexico has taken a number of important steps toward reform, liberalization, and institutional capacity building. President Felipe Calderon put forth a bold reform agenda in his presidential campaign. Since then, he has taken very positive steps in instituting

economic reform, strengthening the rule of law, and very important—and they're suffering greatly from this as you know, Madam Speaker—combating corruption.

But we know very well that a great deal of hard work lies ahead for Mexico. Millions, millions still live in poverty, and good jobs are all too rare. Many key institutions are still very weak, exposing shortcomings at all levels of government. The criminal justice system in Mexico is still woefully strained in its efforts to combat the illegal trafficking of drugs, guns, and people.

These remaining challenges have left us no choice but to get tough on the issue of border security. But they also demand that we recognize that fundamental reform in Mexico is absolutely essential to tackling illegal immigration in the long run.

Again, these are solutions, Madam Speaker, that demand a robust agenda here at home with a view toward the broader international context out of which these challenges arise.

The need for development, opportunity, and growth abroad extends well beyond illegal immigration into the tremendous threat we face from the spread of radical and violent extremism. When confronting any national security threat, we know that our Armed Forces are the guarantors of our security. We need a strong, modern military to protect our homeland and fight our battles overseas. But the terrorists' designs of radical extremists will never be thwarted through military might alone. Their ability to perpetrate attacks originates with their efforts to exploit the frustrations and disaffection in the developing world.

Madam Speaker, with over a billion people living on less than \$1 a day, the potential for exploitation is virtually limitless. Poverty breeds hopelessness, ignorance, and intolerance. These circumstances are made possible by weak or corrupt governments. They do not have the ability to strengthen the institutions that make economic opportunity possible or provide a voice for their people's frustrations.

The result, as we all have tragically found, is fertile ground for terrorism. Development is the only long-term sustainable solution because it is the only approach that addresses the root problems. We must pursue greater economic engagement so that new opportunities can be created, and we must also work to strengthen institutions so that governments are more accountable and economies are more open.

In March of 2005, I had the great privilege of joining with my colleague, DAVID PRICE, under the leadership of Speaker Hastert and now Speaker, then-minority leader, NANCY PELOSI, as we founded the House Democracy Assistance Commission. I had the privilege of leading the Commission when we were in the majority.

Today we continue that very able work under, as I said, my colleague,

Mr. PRICE. Our Commission endeavors to engage in precisely the kind of capacity building that I have been discussing. We work with 12 legislatures around the world in new and re-emerging democracies providing guidance and training in legislative functioning. Our mission, Madam Speaker, within the broad goals of capacity building, is very specific: to strengthen the representative bodies of these fledgling democracies so that they effectively meet the needs of the people they represent.

A strong, effective legislature is critical to enacting the economic policies that create both growth and opportunity. It ensures a check on an overreaching executive branch, and it gives a voice to those with grievances, all of which contribute to a vibrant, a very vibrant, prosperous, and peaceful democracy, all of which are necessary to ensure that radical extremism cannot take root.

Madam Speaker, clearly our struggle against terrorism demands a global development agenda. Once again, we see that the solution to the challenges we face requires that we look inward as well as outward. We cannot guard against terrorist attacks without a strong national defense, but we cannot overcome terrorism without engaging worldwide.

The challenges of the 21st century are not isolated problems, and we cannot hope to address them by isolating ourselves from this interconnected world. Of course, moving forward on these great challenges also demands that we, as Americans, find common ground.

In many ways, we, as a Nation, are currently grappling with very fundamental philosophical questions on the problems that we are confronting. A central question we all have is how to apply our core American principles to the new challenges that we face. How do we secure ourselves against new threats without diminishing the civil liberties that we hold so dear? How do we wage a war against Islamist extremism without appearing to treat those of the Muslim faith with the very intolerance that fuels extremism? How do we end the scourge of illegal immigration while continuing to be that shining city on a hill to the many legal immigrants who have always helped to make this country the great Nation that it is? How do we engage in the worldwide marketplace while ensuring that Americans can successfully compete in a very dynamic economic environment?

There are those who say that America is bitterly divided today over these questions. Madam Speaker, it's certainly true that there is great diversity of opinion in how to address the security and economic challenges that we face. But if we are willing to engage each other in honest and open debate, this diversity of opinion is our great strength, not our weakness.

As we face these substantial new challenges that I discussed, we need

that great clash of ideas just as our founders intended. Unfortunately, resorting to inflammatory talking points has supplanted sincere and honest debate. The shrill voices of "talking heads" are no substitute for true engagement.

Madam Speaker, I believe Americans have grown weary of politics-as-usual, of the endless fighting that takes place right here in Washington, DC, but not because of the existence of opposing views. Americans have grown weary of the obstinacy, the hardened positions and intolerance of differing opinions. The refusal to truly engage in an open and substantive way is something that has frustrated most Americans. Now, Madam Speaker, in a country of over 300 million people there will never, there will never be uniformity of opinion, but there can and should be a deep respect for the clash of ideas and an interest in reaching broad consensus on the great issues of our day.

Madam Speaker, this is the essence of the United States of America. And it is the essence of what we just celebrated earlier this month on July 4th: the freedom of ideas, all ideas to be debated, debunked, or developed in this messy process of democracy. I truly believe that our country will rise to the challenges we face today just as we have always done. We will accomplish this through open, sometimes heated and passionate, but always respectful debate. We will accomplish it by applying the core American values that we have long held while maintaining a global perspective on the challenges of the 21st century.

□ 1630

Whether the issue is soaring gas prices, illegal immigration, terrorism, or any other challenge that we face, we must set our priorities as Americans. But we must tackle our problems with a worldwide focus, boldly asserting our global leadership role. By doing so, we will make our borders safer, our economy stronger, and our future ever brighter for our children.

#### PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I want to begin this evening's discussion by reading a little reminiscence that was written by one of my staff members, Dr. John Darnell. He's imagining that he is talking to his granddaughter at some future date, and this little reminiscence is called, "Making It Through the Energy Crisis—Future Reminiscences with my Grandchildren."

"Grandfather, tell us the story about the men who went to the Moon and barely made it back—and how that was like when the world discovered there wasn't enough oil.

“Oh, you mean *Apollo 13*. Yes, that story is very much like what happened back in the energy crisis of 2008, before you were born. What those astronauts had to do to survive was very much like what the world had to do.

“Tell us the story, Grandfather!

“*Apollo 13* was one of many trips to the Moon and back, some returning without landing. This trip was planned to include a landing to explore the lunar surface. When they left Earth they were on a ‘safe return’ trajectory so that if something went wrong, their craft would have automatically looped around the Moon and returned on the proper path for a safe landing. In order to land on the lunar surface, however, they had to adjust their trajectory for a better orbit for the landing. Once they had made that adjustment, they were no longer on the ‘safe return’ trajectory.

“And, that’s when the problem happened?

“Right! A sudden, loud bang announced the problem—there had been some warning signs that something was not right for some time before, but the controllers didn’t know what to make of them—and in a similar way the early symptoms of the energy crisis were misunderstood and ignored.

“So, what was the loud bang?

“One of the liquid oxygen tanks that powered the command module’s fuel cell and supplied oxygen to breathe had exploded! When they finally realized what had happened, they had to quickly shut off the oxygen to the fuel cell to save what was left. That meant there was no power for the command module. Fortunately, in planning the mission, they had rehearsed what they would do if the command module lost power—they would use the lunar lander as a ‘lifeboat’! That’s like what we called ‘contingency planning’ in preparing for anticipatable disruptions of the world’s energy supplies.

“So, that’s how they got back safely?

“Well, yes, but that wasn’t all there was to it—their problems were far from over.

“First, not only could they no longer land on the Moon, but the power and oxygen they had assumed would be available were now limited to what the lunar lander could supply—only intended for two people for a few days on the surface—which now had to be stretched out to supply three people for the trip all the way back to Earth.

“How could they get by on so little?

“By purposeful conservation! By that I mean that it was not enough to just use a little less energy; they had to use a lot less.

“The astronauts not only had to save enough to make it all the way back before their supplies ran out, they also had to have enough power to spare to operate the controls of the lunar lander during two course corrections.

“The world in 2008 faced a very similar problem: availability of fossil fuels had reached a peak and could not keep growing to match exploding demand,

not to mention needs of business as usual. And, not only did the world have less energy available than it could have used, but, as with the astronauts, purposeful conservation was needed to save enough extra to have resources, including energy, to spare for investing in the shift to a more sustainable energy path.

“It sounds like the astronauts almost ran out of time if they hadn’t changed course to speed up their return—which used up some of their reserves! How close did they come to running out?

“Very close. Every minute and every breath used up precious supplies—the time they bought by conserving made it possible to invest in the course corrections, with very little to spare! Not only that, but they had an unanticipated complication: carbon dioxide was building up in their atmosphere—they could have returned intact, but dead from asphyxiation!

“That’s spooky—the world today has the same problem—how did they solve their problem?

“It wasn’t easy! It took creative, out-of-the-box thinking and collaboration among the crew and backup crew on Earth, using a duplicate capsule on the ground. Eventually they were able to improvise a makeshift device, using materials on hand, including a sock, to adapt the command module’s filter to the lunar lander.

“Of course, as you point out, there has been a parallel need to curb global carbon dioxide emissions that has limited choices of technologies as the world has shifted to a more sustainable energy economy. Conservation, itself, dramatic efficiency improvements and carbon-neutral and sustainable energy resources all have helped reduce greenhouse gas emissions far below ‘business as usual’ projections, while homegrown businesses and jobs have flourished far in excess of the losses in traditional industries.

“They were really lucky to have overcome all those problems to make it back safely when it looked like they didn’t have a prayer!

“You’re right; it was pretty amazing that they made it! Maybe more than you realize—when they made their course corrections, they had to use hand calculators and steer by hand to hit a reentry ‘window’ that was like the thickness of a sheet of paper four feet way. If they had missed it, their reentry vehicle would have either burned up or bounced off into space!

“But, it wasn’t just luck. They had prepared and rehearsed contingency plans in case of anticipatable emergencies, so they didn’t panic; instead they communicated, cooperated, collaborated creatively, and rose to the challenge with determination to do what was necessary to make it, even if it meant some hardship. And some prayer probably didn’t hurt!

“It has taken a similar sense of determination, worldwide, for us to make it as far as we have in the transition to a sustainable energy economy. In the

past 20 years we have come a long way toward that goal but there is still a long way to go. And it was by no means inevitable or easy. There were many points where it could have gone seriously awry. In the early years there was a lot of denial, anger and blame, and an impulse to fight over control of access to the remaining oil and gas.

“But, there is still oil and gas being used today—we didn’t run out—why didn’t they realize that we could switch to renewable energy sources like we use today?

“A lot of people thought we could do just that—along with a slew of other things that seemed reasonable . . . But, by the time the crisis hit, fossil fuel prices were killing the economy and everything cost so much that no one had any money to spare to invest in any of the alternatives . . . And, when the shortages hit, there was nothing ready to turn to as a substitute on the scale that was needed—time had become a scarce resource as well as money and energy itself! And, every proposed solution was competing for those same scarce resources!

“Reluctantly, people came to see that only one thing could accomplish what was needed: purposeful conservation! Even in the midst of the crisis, contingency plans could be implemented rapidly at almost no cost, buying time, saving money, extending the depleting resources and further reducing costs by falling demand resulting in lower prices.

“Conservation with the purpose of investing the conserved resources in greatly improved efficiency buys still more time and lowers the level of energy needed for a comfortable standard of living—a level that can be sustainably and affordably be supplied from a variety of sources.

“I see—since even efficiency takes time, money and energy, you have to start with purposeful conservation to buy time and be able to afford it and so on. But, today everyone seems to take that for granted—what made the difference?

“International cooperation instead of confrontation. Consuming Nations committed to reducing their consumption in concert with a calculated decline in production by producing countries—faster than natural depletion rates. This had the effect of making things predictable, creating reserves and extending the resource productivity, assuring that no one is tempted to seek an unfair advantage, and reducing competition for control of dwindling resources, that is wars.

“The second profound change has been the challenge of the ‘International Race to Sustainability.’ Like the race to the Moon that spawned the Apollo missions, the Race to Sustainability has captured the imagination of innovators all over the world. Much of the resources that had been formerly dedicated to building military capability in anticipation of a struggle of control of fossil resources are now

being directed toward the prestigious goal of leading the Race to Sustainability.

“Now, as you know, there are ongoing competitions that demonstrate self-powered, zero energy communities, both new and retrofitted. Self-powered, net food and fuel producing farms that are now commonplace, as increasingly are self-powered manufacturing in the renewable sector. Even transportation is becoming self-powered with the increasing deployment of highly efficient, Personal Rapid Transit networks.

“Wow, Grandfather, the way you tell it, the story of the world’s transition to sustainability is almost as exciting as the *Apollo 13* story! We’re so lucky to be alive to be a part of it!

“Yes, it is an exciting time to be alive! With new, highly efficient technologies, the energy available whenever there is access to sunshine, blowing wind, running water, the energy of the ocean or the Earth’s heat, can bring prosperity! The world has never seen such widespread prosperity! Increased democracy, better education of women, health care are following close behind.

“Thank you, Grandfather,” very much for this story.

I read this because I think it sets in perspective what we want to be talking about today, and I have a chart here that kind of tells us where we are and what’s been happening recently.

This chart could go back through the 8,000 years of recorded history, and it would look just the same as it does in these last 400 years of recorded history. The amount of energy being produced would be very low, not discernible from the baseline as a matter of fact, and now we start with the Industrial Revolution using wood here, and you see the increased energy production. And then we learn to use coal, and boy, it shot up. But then when we learned to use gas and oil, it really took off. And that curve is one that we’re going to see several times in the charts that we’re going to see just in a few moments, and this curve is on a very compressed abscissa. So it’s a very sharp curve.

It shows a couple of very dramatic things. First of all, it shows that the rate of increase in the use of gas and oil up through the Carter years was on such a trajectory that it would now be well off the top of the chart if something had not happened. That something that happened was the oil embargoes in the 1970s and the oil price spike hikes that inspired people to be more efficient. We actually had a recession.

Here you see it as a drop in the demand for oil around the world, and it’s not so plain on this chart because the abscissa is so compressed. We’re going to see it on subsequent charts.

The rate of increase in the use of oil is now on a very much lesser slope than it was at the beginning. It’s interesting to note that the world’s population essentially followed this curve. The world’s population started out down

here through about 8,000 years of recorded history at something like half a billion or so people around the world, and now it’s increased to what, nearly 7 billion people. If we had a population on here, it would pretty much follow the rate of increase in the use of fossil fuels here, the release of energy. That’s because our quality of life has been so much affected by this incredible amount and quality of energy that we’ve found under the ground.

The next chart takes us back a few years to show us how we got here and the warnings that we have had, that we were going to be here. Oil at \$140 a barrel was not unanticipated if you had looked at the warning signs. And incredibly, most of the world and most of the leaders in our country have chosen to ignore or not look at these warning signs.

Back in 1956, it was on the 8th day of March, a very famous speech was given by M. King Hubbert to a group of oilmen in San Antonio, Texas.

□ 1645

And what he predicted was that by 1970 the United States would reach its maximum oil production. Now, that was preposterous when he made that prophesy because we were then king of oil, I think producing more oil, consuming more oil and exporting more oil than any other country in the world. And to suggest that in just 14 years no matter what we did we would reach our maximum capacity for producing oil was just silly to those who listened to it. But right on schedule, in the 1970s, you can see from the chart here, we reached our maximum oil production, just as M. King Hubbert had predicted. He became a legend, an icon in his own lifetime.

This chart shows us another thing, and that is the attempt by one of the groups out there who are still kind of in denial about whether or not we’re reaching that point where the world has no more ability to produce an increased amount of oil. CERA, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, they use this chart to try and convince you that M. King Hubbert really didn’t know what he was talking about.

The “Hubbard curve” was the lower 48 prediction here, and the actual oil production from the lower 48 are the green squares. And maybe a statistician could convince you that those are different curves, but I think to the average layman, gee, M. King Hubbert had it pretty right, this is what he predicted would happen, and this is what happened.

Now, if you take the total U.S. production, because we found a lot of oil in Alaska and we found a lot of oil—we have about 8,000 wells in the Gulf of Mexico—and if you add those two production sites to the lower 48, which he predicted, you see we get just a blip in the slope down the other side of Hubbert’s peak.

Now, I want you to take a look at where we were in 1980. That’s about

here. And you’re looking back and you can see, gee, M. King Hubbert was really right, wasn’t he? The world did reach its maximum oil production in 1970.

And I’m going to use this time period, 28 years, because I think that we had known, of an absolute certainty, for 28 years that we were going to be here today. M. King Hubbert was right about the United States; we peaked right on schedule. I think it was in 1979 that he predicted the world would be peaking about now.

Now, if he was right about the United States—and the United States is certainly a microcosm of the world—why shouldn’t he be right about the world? Essentially no attention was paid to this. Essentially no preparation was made for the inevitability that the world would reach this maximum production.

The next chart looks at where the world has been and where the world is going relative to oil production.

There are a number of bars here which show when oil was discovered and how much of it was discovered. Notice that the first discoveries were in the forties, and then, boy, some really big fields found here in the fifties. And then most of it found in the sixties and peaking about ’80. But ever since the sixties it’s been down, down, down. And that’s in spite of ever-more incentives to find oil, in spite of ever-better techniques to discover oil, like computer modeling and 3-D seismic. And we now have a pretty good notion of the Earth’s geology, and it’s known that oil can exist only in certain unique geologic formations.

The solid black line here indicates the consumption, the worldwide consumption. Now, we saw that curve on the first chart we showed you. There we had really compressed the abscissa here because we have 400 years instead of 100 years on it. And remember that curve was going up very sharply and then there was the recession during the seventies? And then a much slower rate of increase because today we have much more efficient air conditioners and refrigerators and freezers and so forth. We better insulated our homes. We used to do a lot of things to conserve energy. Note where this curve would be now if this rate of increase had continued. It would be off the top of the chart, wouldn’t it? So the embargoes of the seventies and the oil price hikes then were really a blessing in disguise because it encouraged us to do what we ought to have been doing even before that, and that was to become more efficient.

Now, what will the future look like? Now, that depends upon how much more oil you think we’re going to find. But I would just caution that one needs to keep in mind this chart that shows what we have found. With ever-increasing incentives to find oil, it’s been down, down, down.

Now, the creators of this curve kind of predict what they think the future

looks like, and they have oil peaking in production about now, which is about when M. King Hubbard said it would peak in production. Notice that since the eighties we have not been finding as much oil as we've been using, so we've filled in that difference between what we found and what we use by borrowing from the reserves back here. Everything above this line is a reserve. So we've been borrowing from these reserves.

We have a lot of these reserves left. And their projection for future discoveries—and I would have drawn the curve a little lower—but their projection for future discoveries is this curve. It's not going to be smooth like that, it's going to be up and down, but on the average, probably about that. So you've got to fill in the difference between what we discover and what we use by borrowing from the reserves back here.

Now, you can't pump what you haven't found. So if you think the future is going to be much different from what they project, then you have to believe that we're going to find a whole lot more oil than they believe.

The next chart. I mentioned the speech by M. King Hubbard that I thought was probably the most important speech of the last century. And I think that this one is the most insightful speech of the last century. This was a speech given by Hyman Rickover, the father of our nuclear submarine, to a group of physicians in St. Paul, Minnesota on the 4th day of May, 1957, just a bit, a year after M. King Hubbard had given his speech. Now, I don't know if Hyman Rickover knew of M. King Hubbard, I don't know if he had read that speech. But these are a couple of things that he said, which I think are so obvious.

"There is nothing that man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuel reserves. They were created by solar energy," he said, "500 million years ago and took eons to grow to their present volume.

"In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuel reserves are finite, the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect: The longer they last, the more time do we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources and to adjust our economy to the vast changes which we can expect from such a shift." Wow, this was 51 years ago. We were then about 100 years into the age of oil, which he called this "Golden Age."

I really love this paragraph because I think it is such an apt description of where we are and who we are and what we're doing, which he felt, and I feel, is immoral.

"Fossil fuels resemble capital in the bank. A prudent and responsible parent will use his capital sparingly"—I haven't noticed that the world has been doing that with fossil fuel—"in order to pass on to his children as much as possible of his inheritance. A selfish and irresponsible parent will

squander it in riotous living and care not one whit how his offspring will fare."

I think of this statement when I hear the pleas of those who say, "Drill now, drill more, pay less." And the unfinished part of that sentence is, "We don't really care about what happens to our kids and our grand kids, we want it now."

Another counsel in Hyman Rickover's speech—and he says this 51 years ago, I don't hear our leaders saying this today—"I suggest that this is a good time to think soberly about our responsibilities to our descendants—those who will ring out the Fossil Fuel Age."

Hyman Rickover knew we were 100 years into the Fossil Fuel Age; he didn't know then how long it would last. Remember he said that no matter how long it lasted, the only important thing was that the longer it lasted, the more time that we have to plan an orderly transition to renewable fuels.

We might give a break to these youngsters by cutting fuel and metal consumption so as to provide a safe margin for the necessary adjustments which eventually must be made in a world without fossil fuels. How much better off would we have been as a country and as a world if 51 years ago we had listened to Hyman Rickover, who said this is a good time to think soberly about our responsibilities to our descendants. I have 10 kids, 16 grand kids and two great-grand kids, and I am genuinely concerned about what I'm going to leave to my kids.

Have we reached peak oil worldwide? This is in dispute by many people, but I just want to give you the data compiled by the two entities in the world that most effectively follow the production and consumption of oil. This is the IEA, the International Energy Association, and the EIA, the Energy Information Administration; the prior a European entity, and the latter a creature of our Department of Energy.

Here is their data, and they have pretty good concurrence. For about the last 3 years they show oil production worldwide as being flat. And what has happened in that 36 months? That oil production has been constant. Try as we might, the world has not been able to increase oil production for 3 years.

Three years ago, oil was about \$52 a barrel. Today, it's \$130, \$140 a barrel. This is exactly what one would predict would happen with the constant supply and increasing demand. This kind of is, energy-wise, the perfect storm, because just at the time that the world has probably reached its maximum capacity to produce oil is just the time that the third world, led by India and China, are industrializing and demanding more and more oil.

Our rate of increase in the use of fossil fuels is only about 2 percent in our country, it's only been about 2 percent worldwide, but that is now increasing. The growth rate in India and China, they're not at all happy with 2 percent.

The last data I saw, China's economy was growing at 11.7 percent a year, and their demand for oil was even greater than that because in this rapidly growing economy they haven't taken the time to make sure they're using these energy sources efficiently.

And it's not that we haven't been warned. We certainly knew from M. King Hubbard and what happened in 1970 in our country, and by 1980 we knew of an absolute certainty that M. King Hubbard was right about our country peaking in 1970. And by the way, we have drilled more oil wells than all the rest of the world put together. In spite of that fact, we produce only about 8 percent of the world's oil and that's because we have only about 2 percent of the world's reserves.

Your government has paid for four major studies—they've resulted in five reports because one of the studies resulted in two reports—on this issue, and two of those were in '05. This was the first big report called the Hirsch Report, for the senior investigator on it, by SC IC, a very large, prestigious international engineering science organization. The second was a report later on in '05 by the Army Corps of Engineers. Then we had two reports in '07, just last year. The Government Accountability Office did a study, and at the request of the President and the Secretary of Energy, the National Petroleum Council did a study. And all four of these studies, in different words, said that the peaking of oil is a certainty. It's not if, it's when. The peaking of oil is a certainty. And it's either present or imminent, with potentially devastating consequences.

There are some really interesting and important geopolitical considerations, and this next chart looks at those. This is really an interesting chart. This is the "World According to Oil." And this is what our globe would look like if the size of the country was relative to how much oil reserves it had. And we see some very interesting things here. Saudi Arabia dominates the planet. That's because Saudi Arabia has about 22 percent of all the oil reserves in the world. We think that's what they have. You see, most of the oil reserves are held by countries like Kuwait and Iran and Saudi Arabia and Iraq. We know a little bit more about Iraq because we're there, but these other countries hold their data very close. The world community cannot look at their data. We know what they're producing because we buy it. We really don't know what the reserves are. So these are estimates as a result of what they tell us they have in reserve. We hope there is that much there.

Some interesting things about this "World According to Oil." Look at the United States over here. We have 2 percent of the world's oil. We're 50 percent of the land mass of the globe in the "World According to Oil." And a very interesting thing is that the country from which we get our biggest supply of oil, Canada, has about half the oil

that we have in the lower 48 and Alaska.

The country from which we get our third largest—it used to be the second until a few months ago—Mexico, has considerably less oil than the United States. Now, Canada can export oil because there are not very many Canadians. The Mexicans can export oil. Although there are a lot of them, they're so poor they can't afford to use it, and so they're exporting.

□ 1700

But this shows that the first and third suppliers of oil in our country are very small reserves. They have between them about the same amount of reserves that we have, that is, about 2 percent of the world's reserves.

Another very interesting thing to look at is the size of China and India. More than a third of the world's population, about 2.4 billion people out of a little bit less than the 7 billion people we have. And look at their size. You can hardly find Japan here because Japan is almost totally dependent on outside sources of energy. But these two huge countries demanding more and more energy and they are dwarfed by Russia. Russia has maybe three or four times, three times the energy that we have. They don't have all that much compared to giants like Saudi Arabia, but they, I think, may be the world's largest exporter because they are very aggressively pumping the oil that they have.

The next chart shows us a logical consequence of this. I mentioned how small the reserves in China are; so what is China doing about that? And this chart shows what they're doing about it. This is a map of the world, and it shows where the Europeans have invested, where the Russians have invested, where we have invested, and where China has invested. Where you see a dollar sign, and I don't see very many of them, is where we have invested. This symbol you see where China has invested, and you see it all over the world. They even tried to buy Unocal in our country. But China is now buying oil all over the world, and they aren't just buying oil, they're buying goodwill. Do you need a soccer stadium, a hospital, roads? Why is China doing this? Because in today's world, it doesn't make any difference who owns the oil. It is a global commodity. He who comes with the dollars gets the oil. I hope it continues to be dollars. If it's euros or something else, our economy is even in more trouble. So why are they buying oil all around the world? Of course, you can't get inside the heads of the leaders there, but you can only guess why they are doing it from some other things that they're doing.

One of the other things they're doing is very aggressively building a blue-water navy. They're building their navy much more aggressively than we are and much faster than we. They launched—the exact number I'm not

sure of, but maybe ten or so submarines last year; we launched one. Their navy will soon be bigger than ours, nowhere what our Navy is.

China this year will graduate six times as many engineers as the United States graduates, and about half of our engineers are going to be Chinese and Indian students. The Chinese will graduate more English-speaking engineers in China than we graduate the total number of engineers in our country. It is impossible for a country that is so aggressively pursuing education in these technical areas, with a huge population and a great work ethic, to not be a serious challenge to us, by and by, economically and militarily.

Is this huge navy that they're building necessary because they want to be able in the future to use their oil and not share it with the world, as now you must? In order to use their oil, they are going to have to have a navy big enough to protect the sea lanes so that they can have access to their oil.

The next chart, this chart shows the 10 companies on the basis of oil production and reserve holdings. Now, we have giants in our country, oil companies, ExxonMobil and Chevron and Royal Dutch Shell and so forth, and many people believe the price of oil is high because somehow they're gouging us. The bar on the right here shows the reserves of oil, and these are the top 10 companies or countries that hold oil reserves. And you see that 98 percent of all of the top 10 are oil countries, where oil is owned by the country. Now, that was pretty obvious from that chart we had that showed the world according to oil, but this puts it in bar chart form.

Luke Oil, which is kind of independent of Russia, has only 2 percent of the 100 percent of the oil that's owned by the largest 10.

The bar on the left here shows production. This is not who owns it but who is producing it. Now, even though these people own the oil, our oil companies might be producing it for them. But that's not true because, you see, if you take the top 10 in the production of oil, 78 percent are these companies in North Africa and the Middle East, and only 22 percent is represented by the giants: ExxonMobil, Royal Dutch Shell, BP. Only 22 percent represented by these giants.

The next chart shows some numbers that shocked a number of our people. And the President has a letter from at least 3 years ago now by 30 prominent Americans: Boyden Gray and McFarlane and Jim Woolsey and 27 others, including several retired four star admirals and generals, really concerned, telling the President: Mr. President, the fact that we have only 2 percent of the world's oil and use 25 percent of the world's oil and import about two-thirds of what we use is a totally unacceptable national security risk. What if we didn't have access to that oil? They said this is a problem we have really got to fix.

Now, we are really good at pumping oil. You see our little 2 percent of the oil reserves results in 8 percent of the world's production. So our oil wells are going to be pumped down quicker than the average oil well in the world, and we have actually less than 5 percent of the world's population. We have about 1 person out of 22, and this 1 person out of 22 uses a fourth of all of the oil in the world. This is not lost on other nations. They understand this, and they are watching us to see what we do.

The next chart is a chart from the first study that I mentioned, the Hirsch Report, which resulted in two publications. And this is a chart which shows us very explicitly what T. Boone Pickens is telling us in his ads, that you're not going to drill your way out of this one.

Now, this chart makes what I think and what others think is a grossly unrealistic projection, and that is that we're going to find as much more oil as all the reserves yet to be pumped in the world. Now, as LaHerrere says, this is an absolutely implausible projection. Remember that big chart showing the down, down, down, and they are suggesting that's going to turn around and produce as much more oil as all the known reserves in the world today. And even if that happened, even if that happened, it would push the peaking of oil out to only 2016, it says here. This is one of the reasons T. Boone Pickens says you're not going to drill your way out of this.

Oil consumption up through the Carter years was so great that every decade—and think about this. This is a stunning statistic. Every decade we used as much oil as had been used in all of previous history. Had that curve continued, when you've used the half the oil, which is where I think we are now, you would have 10 years of oil left. And that's not 10 years at this rate because in the future it's going to be harder and harder to get. That's what has happened in the United States, harder and harder to get, less and less of it, and because of the world's supply and demand, ever higher and higher prices.

Look what happens if you find ways to get more of it out. Then you really fall off. If you're concerned about your kids and your grandkids, you would like to leave a little something for them. But even if you did that, it pushes the peak out only to 2037, this chart says.

Now let's look at energy and how much we use and where it comes from because this will tell us what our options are for the future and what our challenges are for the future. I would like to use an analogy relative to this chart which I think is easy to understand. A young couple whose grandparents have died and left them a considerable fortune, and they have established a life-style where 86 percent of the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 14 percent of it comes from what they're

earning. And they look at how old they are and how long they're likely to live, and they say, "This is going to run out before we retire. We have got to do something." There are only two things they can do, one or both of these. Either they can use less, spend less, or make more. And that's precisely where we are in terms of energy, that 86 percent of all of the energy we use is our grandparents' inheritance. It's fossil fuels that were placed in the ground a very long time ago over a very long time span. And we now are removing them from the ground in a very short time period. And, of course, one of the consequences of this is we are now dumping into the atmosphere CO<sub>2</sub> that had been sequestered from the atmosphere over a very long time period in the past. We're now releasing that into the atmosphere in a very short time period. And many people are concerned about this increase in CO<sub>2</sub> and what it's doing for global warming and climate change and so forth.

Only 14 percent of the energy we use comes from sources other than coal, natural gas, and oil. But eventually as we run down, and oil and gas and coal are not forever—that's obvious that they are finite, that they will run out. The only question is when we are going to reach the peak and how long it will take before we run down the other side of the curve of the age of oil. So ultimately we are going to be living entirely on renewable energy and nuclear energy. Now, we may add some additional renewable energies here. We're the most creative, innovative society in the world, and what we can do when we have to is just absolutely incredible.

Note that a bit more than half of all of the energy we use that's not fossil fuels comes from nuclear. It's 8 percent of our total energy used. It's about 20 percent of our electricity. If you were in France, it would be about 80 percent of your electricity. So, clearly, that could grow. I know some people that have been really opposed to nuclear, but these are bright people, and when they look at a probable alternative to not producing more nuclear, which is shivering in the dark because of lack of energy, more nuclear doesn't look like a bad alternative to shivering in the dark; so they now are more focused on the potential of renewables and nuclear.

And here we look at the present renewables, and you see hydroelectric, and that's probably not going to grow in our country. We have dammed about every river we should and maybe a few that we shouldn't have. The biomass, that can grow a little bit. That's primarily energy produced by the timber industry and the paper industry, wisely, using a byproduct that would otherwise go to the landfill.

Solar and wind here are just trifling. They are a tiny part of the 6 percent here. And they are growing. They are growing like 30 percent a year. But when you start out so small, even 30-

percent-a-year growth represents a tiny, tiny percentage of our total energy.

Geothermal here is true geothermal. It's not hooking your air conditioner to ground temperature, which you really ought to do. If you don't do that, what you are trying to do in the summertime to cool your house is to heat up the outside air. If what you're trying to do is heat up the ground, which is 56 degrees, that's a whole lot easier than heating outside air, which is 100 degrees. And the reverse is true in winter, of course.

The next chart shows the U.S. energy consumption by sector. And this is important because where are we going to have our real challenges in energy production? About 40 percent of our energy is electric power, about 28 percent of our energy is transportation, 21 percent industrial, and residential and commercial is about 11 percent.

The next chart looks at where we get the energy from for electricity. Mostly we are talking about liquid fuels, but electricity is also a challenge.

□ 1715

And the take-away from this discussion is that the future for transitioning to renewable alternatives for electricity is a very much brighter future than transitioning to fossil fuels.

And here we look at what we're producing electricity from today. Almost half of it is from coal, natural gas, nuclear and hydroelectric. And that can't go a whole lot. Microhydro might be as big as this by the way without the impacts on the environment that this big macrohydro does by damming up rivers. Petroleum, very little petroleum produced here. Other gases and other forms of energy, pump storage and so forth you see there. Now in a fossil fuel deficient world, coal is going to go away eventually. Natural gas is going to go away eventually. And the petroleum, liquid fuels and coke will go away eventually.

The next chart is a blowup of a tiny part of that chart. And this shows renewables. Only 2½ percent of our electricity is produced by renewables. It is really small. One-thirtieth of our electricity is produced by renewables, and much of that by wood. And if we want to sustain our forests and still build houses—and we're having trouble stabilizing that now—we probably can't grow that a whole lot. Wind, boy, that can really grow. I look around and I see almost no wind machines, and I see leaves on the trees blowing everywhere. And so we could have a whole lot more wind machines and a whole lot more energy from that. Waste. That could and should grow. But I will caution that that is self-limiting. That waste stream you see go to the county landfill—and watch what is dumped in the county landfill. Almost everything dumped there is going to be the result of profligate use of fossil fuels. And in a fossil fuel deficient world, that waste stream is going to be very small. We

ought to be burning it. I think that is a better alternative than putting it in a landfill. What is even better is we ought to be recycling where that is appropriate. But burning is a good idea. But that is not a solution to our problem. And it's not a true renewable. It's a sensible thing to do. But it's not a true renewable, although it's listed here because it's dependent on the use of fossil fuels for using most of it. And they're going to wind down. There will be less and less of that.

Geothermal, that could grow probably a lot because there are several places in our country where we're near enough to the molten core of the Earth, and we can tap into the heat of the Earth. And that is essentially an inexhaustible source of energy. In Iceland, I saw not a chimney in Iceland because all of their energy comes from geothermal.

Solar PV. Wow, I'm a big fan of that. China and Japan have the six largest companies in the world. We used to lead in that area. We have lost that lead. Now six of the largest producers in the world are in China and Japan. That is growing at about 30 percent a year. And wind is growing. Wind is bigger and growing very fast. But we're talking here about percentages of 2½ percent. This is 1 percent up here. Notice down there that our solar today is a tiny, tiny part of 1 percent, like 1/100th of 1 percent.

The amount of energy that we get from fossil fuels is just incredible. The world uses about 85 million barrels a day. We use a little over 21 million barrels a day, about one-fourth of that. And each barrel represents the work equivalent of 12 people working all year. It has been so cheap, such a high quality and so easy to get. When oil was \$12 a barrel, in terms of life improvement by using energy, you could buy the work equivalent of one man all year long for \$1. This is why Hyman Rickover referred to this as a "Golden Age."

About a year and a half ago, I had the privilege of leading a codel of nine of our Members to China. And I was shocked. My colleagues were shocked when we started talking about energy with China. They talked about post oil. Post oil. We have trouble in our country thinking beyond the next election or thinking beyond the next quarterly report. In China, they seem to think in terms of generations and centuries. There will be a post oil world. And they're looking at what needs to be done to get there in an orderly fashion. They have a five-point plan. And everybody we talked to there knew it. Everybody knew. No matter what sector of government we were in, they talked about the five-point plan.

Number one is conservation. Do you remember the little story I read about the grandfather telling his grandchildren the story of Apollo 13 and the analogy of that to our transition from fossil fuels to renewables, or at least 20 years of it? It all began with purposeful

conservation. That is the number one thing we have to do. That is not just riding in a Prius rather than an SUV. Coming to work the other day, I noticed in front of me was an SUV in one lane with one person in it, and a Prius in the other lane next to it with two people in it. I thought to myself, the people in that Prius are getting six times the miles per gallon per person as compared to the person riding in the SUV.

We have enormous opportunities for conservation. Enormous opportunities for conservation. Then, domestic sources of energy alternatives and diversify, get them from home if you can, and the fourth one may surprise you. They're concerned about the environment. Although they are the world's biggest polluter, they have 900 million people, three times our population in rural areas, and through the miracle of communications, they know the benefits of industrialization, and they're demanding them. They are demanding them. And I think China sees their empire unraveling like the Soviet empire unraveled if they can't meet the needs of these people. And so they have a huge, huge challenge in pollution and environmental impact.

The fifth point is one that is very interesting. Even though they are buying up oil all over the world, because they think we may have confrontation, they are building a big blue water Navy, and they are going to own their own oil. They are pleading for international cooperation. Do you remember in the little story we read about the grandfather and his grandchildren? It was international cooperation, spending our money on the race to sustainability rather than on weapons that could destroy each other so that we could have more of the oil that finally got us through this huge challenge that we face.

What America needs to do, I think we need to have a program that has the total commitment of World War II. I lived through war. I was born in 1926. If you're doing the arithmetic, yeah, that makes me 82 years old. But I remember that war. We had victory gardens. We had daylight savings time. Everybody grew a victory garden who could. They cleared vacant lots in New York City. And you could see the pictures of the rubble in the middle and the vegetable gardens growing between the rows of rubble. No new cars were made in 1943, 1944 and 1945. The cars back then were either 1942 or 1946 cars. Everybody saved their household grease and took it to a central repository. Everybody was involved. It was the last time our country was at war. Our military has been at war since then, our military families have been at war since then. But our country was at war then. Everybody was involved. That is what is going to have to happen if we're going to make it in an orderly fashion through the exciting challenges that we face. We need to have the technology intensity and focus of the Apol-

lo program. Huge technology. I remember the cartoon of the little red-headed freckle-faced boy who said "6 months I couldn't even spell 'engineer' and now I am one." And everybody wanted to be involved in engineering. And we were focused on that program. How it riveted America. We need the urgency of the Manhattan project. And this is not going to be cheap. But living without oil is not going to be cheap either.

What are we doing about it? The next chart shows what I have been personally doing about it. I have a bill that is a companion bill to a Senate bill S. 2821 which passed 88-8, and our bill is 5984. What it does is to extend the alternative energy tax credits. With oil at \$140 a barrel, it still isn't high enough for the business world to make investments. And so they have got to be encouraged to do that. And this is one of the things that government can do with tax credits is encourage the right thing there. We really need to do that.

Renewable domestic sources, H.R. 6107. Peak Oil Caucus and resolution. We have a resolution and a Peak Oil Caucus with about equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats. These are members that recognize that peak oil as an inevitability and a huge challenge. I'm really enthusiastic about ARPA-E. DARPA has been enormously effective for our military. I think we need a similar thing for our energy. ARPA-E, deciding where to invest the precious time and dollars in energy that we have. What is likely to pay the biggest benefit?

I am a big fan of improving CAFE standards. H.R. 80 is self-powered farms. If our farms can't be energy independent and produce a little bit of energy for those in the city, we're in trouble, aren't we, for the future? Tax credit for hybrids. We really need to do that. It's still cheaper not to buy the hybrid even with gas at \$4 a gallon. But you really need to do that because we need to conserve the oil because we need it for other purposes. So we need tax incentives to buy more hybrids.

Fuel flexibility, neutrality, plug-ins. It costs only about \$100 more to make a car that can burn any fuel, any reasonable fuel. They do that. Every car made in Brazil is that kind of a car. Well, can we do this and live happily? The next chart is an interesting chart. This looks at some quantitative measures of quality of life, such as how long you live, your education level and relative income. And that is on the ordinate. Here on the abscissa is how much energy you use. Of course, we are all alone, way out there at the right. We use more energy per capita than anybody else in the world. But on these quantitative things, are we that much better off than other countries in the world? No, not at all. There are a number of countries using essentially the same amount of energy that we use that live as long, have as high an education level and have the same relative income that we have. A number of countries here.

The next chart shows a subjective look at this. And this is even more compelling. What we're doing here is simply asking people, how good do you feel about your quality of life? Here we are. We feel pretty good about quality of life. But notice there are 22 countries I think who feel better about their quality of life than we do. The former chart was qualitative. This one is quantitative. They feel better about their quality of life than we do and use very much less energy. They use half as much energy as we do. Yes, we can consume much less energy and still live a very high quality of life. Lots of other people are doing it.

The next chart shows what can happen in our country when there is an incentive. The people in California—I don't even know if they know this. But people in California use only 65 percent as much electricity as the rest of us. That is because they were told 3 years ago that you are going to have rolling blackouts and brownouts unless you use less electricity. So they voluntarily use less electricity. Who will argue that Californians don't live as well as the rest of us? They use 65 percent as much energy as we.

The next chart shows something else. Inefficiency. This chart shows at what speed you should be driving your car to get the highest efficiency. And that depends on when your car was built. If you have an older car, it is much less efficient. CAFE standards really helped, didn't they? But the 1984 cars, it peaks down here, the 1997 cars, you see two peaks here, but the big peak, you should be driving around 55, 60 miles per hour. And do notice how rapidly the efficiency falls off if you drive faster than that? If you are concerned about \$4 gas, slow down. It will go a whole lot further. It will cost you a whole lot less and be safer too.

The next chart is another look at efficiency. And there are a number of things like this. And this shows efficiency of lighting. The incandescent bulb is primarily a heat source. I brewed chickens with it. You get that much light and that much heat. Fluorescent is very much better. But they pale in efficiency compared to light-emitting diodes. I have a little LED flashlight that I carry in the pocket of my work clothes. I forget when I put batteries in it. It is so efficient.

The next chart is a look at the alternatives that we have and the finite resources that we can turn to, and we need to come to the floor and spend a lot of time talking about these, because I think one of the biggest challenges today is realistic expectations of what we can get out of these sources. They're all there, like tar sands and oil shale and coal and nuclear and so forth. Those are transition sources. The nuclear could be there for a long time if we can go to breeder reactors. And then the renewable sources. But these are finite sources. They will run out. Alan Greenspan, when he was talking about the dot com

market and how that bubble broke, he said that it rose because of "irrational exuberance" was the term he used. Well, a lot of people today have irrational exuberance.

□ 1730

Two bubbles have already broke. One was the hydrogen bubble. You hardly ever hear anybody talk about hydrogen any more. The corn ethanol bubble has broken with disastrous results, people hungry in the world because of this program.

And the next bubble—and remember that you heard it here—we will get nothing like a lot of people believe we will get out of cellulose ethanol. And next time we will have a chance to talk in more detail about that.

Well, I am excited about this. There is no exhilaration like the exhilaration of meeting and overcoming a big challenge. This is a huge challenge. The American people are up to it if they know what the challenge is and if they know what they need to do.

I think we can again become the major exporting country in the world. I think we can again be filled with manufacturing, making the technologies and the equipments necessary to transition to these renewables. I am excited about the future. I am excited about where my children and grandchildren will be living.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 1:35 p.m.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical procedures.

Ms. BORDALLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 2 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DOOLITTLE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of the President's invitation to visit the wildfires in California.

Mr. HERGER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of the President's invitation to visit the wildfires in California.

#### 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. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 23.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, July 23.

Mr. McCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McHENRY, for 5 minutes, July 22, 23 and 24.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 21, 2008, at 12:30 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7599. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Accounting Requirements for RUS Electric Borrowers (RIN: 0572-AC08) received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7600. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Acquisition Policy, and Strategic Sourcing, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Export-Controlled Items [DFARS Case 2004-0010] (RIN: 0750-AF13) received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7601. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7602. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to the Hospital Mortgage Insurance Program: Technical and Clarifying Amendments [Docket No. FR-4927-F-03] (RIN: 2502-A122) received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7603. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers (RRTCs)—received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7604. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects

and Centers Program—Disability Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRPPs) and Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers (RRTCs)—received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7605. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7606. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7607. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Elephant Trunk Scallop Access Area to General Category Scallop Vessels [Docket No. 060314069-6069-01; I.D. 031307A] received May 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7608. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Observer Program [Docket No. 070316061-7124-02; I.D. 031907B] (RIN: 0648-AV13) received September 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7609. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS); Atlantic Shark Management Measures [Docket No. 0612242866-8619-02] (RIN: 0648-AU89) received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7610. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the first annual report on statistics mandated by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 159(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7611. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive and President, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the Boy Scouts of America's 2007 Report to the Nation, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 28; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7612. A letter from the President, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 2007 Annual Report of independent auditors who have audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4514; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7613. A letter from the General Counsel, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the National Tropical Botanical Garden for the period from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4610; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7614. A letter from the New York State Tri-Level Legislative Task Force, transmitting the Task Force's report on improving public confidence in law enforcement and our criminal justice system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7615. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa “PZL-Bielsko” Model SZD-50-3 “Puchacz” Gliders [Docket No. FAA-2008-0045; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-100-AD; Amendment 39-15339; AD 2008-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7616. A letter from the Attorney U.S. DOT/RITA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Airline Service Quality Performance Reports and Disclosure Requirements [Docket No. RITA 2007-28522] (RIN number 2139-AA12) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7617. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0185; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-246-AD; Amendment 39-15337; AD 2008-02-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7618. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Canby, MN [Docket No. FAA-2007-27676; Airspace Docket No. 07-AGL-2] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7619. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Poplar Bluff, MO [Docket No. FAA-2007-28773; Airspace Docket No. 07-ACE-9] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7620. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318, A319, A320, and A321 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-26812; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-199-AD; Amendment 39-15006; AD 2007-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7621. A letter from the Acting Director of Regulations, DOT/PHMSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pipeline Safety: Protecting Unusually Sensitive Areas From Rural Onshore Hazardous Liquid Gathering Lines and Low-Stress Lines [Docket ID PHMSA-RSPA-2003-15864] (RIN: 2137-AD98) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7622. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—OST Technical Corrections [Docket No. OST-2008- ] (RIN: 2105-AD74) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7623. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hours of Service of Drivers [Docket No. FMCSA-2004-19608] (RIN- 2126-AB14) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7624. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Facility Charge Program Debt Service, Air Carrier Bankruptcy, and Miscellaneous Changes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23730; Amendment No.

158-4] (RIN: 2120-AI68) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7625. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Standards; Aircraft Engine Standards for Engine Life-Limited Parts [Docket No.: FAA-2006-23732; Amendment No. 33-22] (RIN: 2120-AI72) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7626. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Standards; Safety Analysis [Docket No. FAA-2006-25376; Amendment No. 33-24] (RIN: 2120-AI74) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7627. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nationality and Registration Marks, Non Fixed-Wing Aircraft [Docket No. FAA-2007-27173; Amendment No. 45-25] (RIN: 2120-AJ02) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7628. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Proposed Establishment of Class E5 Airspace; Eagle Pass, TX [Docket No. FAA-2008-027; Airspace Docket No. 08-ASW-3] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7629. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Marshalltown, IA [Docket No. FAA-2007-27679; Airspace Docket No. 07-ACE-4] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7630. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Monticello, IA [Docket No. FAA-2007-27678; Airspace Docket No. 07-ACE-3] received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7631. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to Cockpit Voice Recorder and Digital Flight Data Recorder Regulations [Docket No. FAA-2005-20245; Amendment No. 23-58, 25-124, 27-43, 29-50, 91-300, 121-338, 125-54, 129-45, and 135-113] (RIN: 2120-AH88) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7632. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Operation of Civil Aircraft of U.S. Registry Outside of the United States [Docket No.: FAA-2007-0020; Amdt. No. 91-299] (RIN: 2120-AJ14) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7633. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Performance and Handling Qualities Requirements for Rotorcraft [Docket No.: FAA-2006-25414; Amendment Nos. 27-44 and 29-51] (RIN: 2120-AH87) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7634. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Airplanes

[Docket No. FAA-2007-28989; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-070-AD; Amendment 39-15319; AD 2007-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7635. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flight Simulation Device Initial and Continuing Qualification and Use [Docket No. FAA-2002-12461; Amendment No. 60-3] (RIN: 2120-AJ12) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7636. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drug Enforcement Assistance [Docket No. FAA-2006-26714; Amendment Nos. 47-28, 61-118, 63-36, and 65-51] (RIN: 2120-AI43) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7637. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on the Tribal-State Road Maintenance Agreements, pursuant to Public Law 109-59, section 1119(k); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7638. A letter from the Director, APO/Dockets Unit AD/CVD Operations Support, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures [Docket No. 0612243018-8043-01] (RIN: 0625-AA73) received July 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7639. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the first quarterly report of the Department's Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, covering the period from October 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

7640. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the Economic Development Administration for Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3217; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Financial Services.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1108. A bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products; with an amendment (Rept. 110-762). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 6528. A bill to impose a limitation on lifetime aggregate limits imposed by health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on

Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 6529. A bill to greatly enhance the Nation's environmental, energy, economic, and national security by terminating long-standing Federal prohibitions on the domestic production of abundant offshore supplies of oil and natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 6530. A bill to amend United States trade laws to eliminate foreign barriers to exports of United States goods and services, to restore rights under trade remedy laws, to strengthen enforcement of United States intellectual property rights and health and safety laws at United States borders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 6531. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 17, United States Code (relating to the vessel hull design protection), to clarify the definitions of a hull and a deck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MICA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DENT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SPACE):

H.R. 6532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the Highway Trust Fund balance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 6533. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out conservation reserve program notice CRP-598, entitled the

“Voluntary Modification of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) Contract for Critical Feed Use”; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 6534. A bill to rescind certain earmark projects under SAFETEA-LU for the purpose of eliminating the shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DELAHUNT:

H.R. 6535. A bill to amend the Vietnam Education Foundation Act of 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 6536. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain Tibetans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FARR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H.R. 6537. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act to establish a National Marine Sanctuary System, to strengthen and clarify management authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HODES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H.R. 6538. A bill to provide funding for home energy assistance under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 and the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 6539. A bill to provide for the use of information in the National Directory of New Hires in enforcing sex offender registration laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 6540. A bill to create a Trade Agreement Enforcement Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6541. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct laboratory space to accommodate the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute's terrestrial research program in Gamboa, Panama; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6542. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct laboratory and

support space to accommodate the Mathias Laboratory at the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center in Edgewater, Maryland; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 6543. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the demonstration project on adjustable rate mortgages and the demonstration project on hybrid adjustable rate mortgages; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 6544. A bill to provide immediate relief from high fuel and food prices and to pursue alternatives in renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Armed Services, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAZAYOUX (for himself, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. CHILDERS, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. HODES, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 6545. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a national intelligence assessment on national security and energy security issues; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 6546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-exempt bond financing for fixed-wing emergency medical aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 6547. A bill to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydro-power by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 6548. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 6549. A bill to amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that any hours worked by Federal firefighters under a qualified trade-of-time arrangement shall be excluded for purposes of determinations relating to overtime pay; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland):

H.R. 6550. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to make

modifications to the Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SOLIS (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 6551. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a loan repayment program for faculty members at programs of general dentistry or pediatric dentistry to alleviate faculty shortages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 6552. A bill to provide incentives for the reduction of green house gases; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Rules, Energy and Commerce, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 6553. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System lands subject to ski area permits; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6554. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the personal exemption deduction for a stillborn child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. PLATTS):

H. Con. Res. 390. Concurrent resolution honoring the 28th Infantry Division for serving and protecting the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Con. Res. 391. Concurrent resolution recognizing the disparities that are associated with predatory lending abuses in minority communities and expressing the sense of the Congress that as new abuses continue to emerge, such laws should ensure that all those responsible for representing and protecting families have the authority to act to address these new problems; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 392. Concurrent resolution supporting the goal of increased and sustainable homeownership in the United States and recognizing the importance of homeownership programs, fair lending laws, and fair housing laws in achieving that goal; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Res. 1352. A resolution honoring Theodore Roosevelt, the 26th President, for his invaluable contributions to this Nation as a soldier, naturalist, statesman, and public servant on the 150th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself and Mr. SCALISE):

H. Res. 1353. A resolution remembering Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, known as the "best surgeon who ever lived", who served our Nation throughout his career and was the father of

cardiovascular medicine and Veterans Administration Medical Research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina:

H. Res. 1354. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a vote each year on whether to increase Members' pay; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Res. 1355. A resolution expressing support for designation of Disability Pride Day and recognizing that all people, including those living with disabilities, have the right, responsibility, and ability to be active, contributing members of our society and fully engaged as citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. FOX, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POE, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SALLI, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MACK, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H. Res. 1356. A resolution celebrating the 221st anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WU, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BACA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. HIRONO):

H. Res. 1357. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 by President Ronald Reagan and the greatness of America in her ability to admit and remedy past mistakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

333. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Resolution No. 74 urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would prohibit the Federal Emergency Management Agency from requiring the purchase of new flood insurance based on revised flood insurance rate maps developed as part of the National Flood Insurance Program's Map Modernization Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

334. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial No. 2007 urging the Congress of the United States enact legislation to provide adequate school facilities in tribal

lands; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

335. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, relative to House Resolution No. 5037 urging the Congress of the United States to appoint an independent counsel to investigate the Prisoner of War-Missing in Action issue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

336. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 155 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Youth Prison Reduction through Opportunities, Mentoring, Intervention, Support, and Education Act, H.R. 3846; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

337. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 111 urging the Congress of the United States to pass necessary and appropriate legislation to resolve the illegal immigration crisis; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

338. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 209 requesting that the Congress of the United States enact legislation to waive single state agency requirements with regard to the administration of funds under the Homeland Security Grant Program; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. CROWLEY introduced a bill (H.R. 6555) for the relief of Wahab Munir and Hunain Munir; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 111: Mr. PITTS.  
 H.R. 303: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. BIGGERT.  
 H.R. 333: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 736: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
 H.R. 1063: Ms. FALLIN.  
 H.R. 1113: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 1117: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 1174: Mr. TURNER.  
 H.R. 1283: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 1376: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1419: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 1472: Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 1552: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. SUTTON.  
 H.R. 1584: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 1606: Mrs. GILLIBRAND.  
 H.R. 1610: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1671: Mr. RENZI and Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 1776: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1820: Mr. FILNER and Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 1927: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1932: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 1944: Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 2020: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 2104: Ms. FALLIN.  
 H.R. 2232: Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 2266: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 2279: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. LINDER.  
 H.R. 2332: Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. WALBERG.  
 H.R. 2519: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
 H.R. 2706: Ms. FALLIN.

H.R. 2809: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 2915: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2965: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
 H.R. 2994: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 3014: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 3109: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 3148: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 3175: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
 H.R. 3186: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. KAGEN.  
 H.R. 3202: Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 3283: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3334: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 3339: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 3363: Ms. GIFFORDS.  
 H.R. 3394: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 3689: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 3737: Mr. COSTELLO.  
 H.R. 3834: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 3989: Mr. McNULTY.  
 H.R. 4105: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 4138: Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 4544: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H.R. 4651: Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 4789: Ms. GRANGER.  
 H.R. 4838: Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 4990: Mr. GORDON.  
 H.R. 5229: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 5265: Mr. EVERETT.  
 H.R. 5449: Mr. SIRES.  
 H.R. 5454: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 5466: Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 5513: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. POE.  
 H.R. 5543: Ms. GIFFORDS.  
 H.R. 5546: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 5564: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5573: Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 5585: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 5595: Mr. KILDEE.  
 H.R. 5656: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PORTER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
 H.R. 5673: Mr. EVERETT.  
 H.R. 5775: Mr. MCHENRY.  
 H.R. 5823: Mr. HOLDEN.  
 H.R. 5825: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 5833: Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 5897: Mr. CHILDERS.  
 H.R. 5925: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. GILCREST.  
 H.R. 5987: Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 6057: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 6067: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.  
 H.R. 6078: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 6079: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 6100: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 6107: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 6113: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 6126: Ms. SUTTON.  
 H.R. 6144: Mr. SIRES.  
 H.R. 6160: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
 H.R. 6195: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 6209: Mr. FILNER and Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 6210: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
 H.R. 6268: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. KUHL of New York.  
 H.R. 6282: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 6288: Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 6293: Mr. ISSA, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
 H.R. 6310: Mr. PORTER.  
 H.R. 6311: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 6316: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 6330: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
 H.R. 6335: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 6363: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
 H.R. 6373: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 6384: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 6392: Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 6397: Mr. SALLI.  
 H.R. 6399: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 6401: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 6419: Mr. PAUL.  
 H.R. 6427: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HODES, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HARE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 6435: Mr. SIRES.  
 H.R. 6438: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 6458: Mr. FARR and Ms. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 6460: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 6461: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. KUHL of New York.  
 H.R. 6462: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
 H.R. 6478: Mr. BOUSTANY.  
 H.R. 6479: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mrs. TAUSCHER.  
 H.R. 6508: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 6521: Mrs. BIGGERT.  
 H.R. 6523: Ms. CASTOR, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. SPACE, and Ms. GIFFORDS.  
 H.R. 6525: Mr. FILNER and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 6527: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.  
 H.J. Res. 96: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. LATTA.  
 H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H. Con. Res. 327: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
 H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. HULSHOF and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H. Con. Res. 351: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. WEINER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KIND, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H. Con. Res. 376: Mr. WAMP, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. BOREN.  
 H. Con. Res. 378: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SIRES.  
 H. Con. Res. 386: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H. Res. 645: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. WATSON.  
 H. Res. 671: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H. Res. 870: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 1042: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CAZAYOUX.  
 H. Res. 1045: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
 H. Res. 1078: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. OLVER.  
 H. Res. 1143: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H. Res. 1151: Mr. REYES, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H. Res. 1159: Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H. Res. 1202: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. GALLEGLY.  
 H. Res. 1239: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H. Res. 1245: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H. Res. 1273: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H. Res. 1287: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. COBLE.  
 H. Res. 1288: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. KIND.  
 H. Res. 1316: Mr. HILL.  
 H. Res. 1324: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H. Res. 1328: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CALVERT.  
 H. Res. 1332: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. TIBERI.  
 H. Res. 1337: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

#### DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1650: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 2125: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 2488: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,  
 293. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of New Orleans, Louisiana, relative to Resolution No. R-08-325 calling upon the Congress of the United States to fund fully the Green Jobs Act and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program in the 2009 Appropriations Bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 13, July 15, 2008, by Mrs. THELMA D. DRAKE on H.R. 2493, was signed by the following Members: Thelma D. Drake, John R. "Randy" Kuhl, Jr., Roy Blunt, Rodney Alexander, Scott Garrett, Thaddeus G. McCotter, W. Todd Akin, John Shimkus, David Davis, Nathan Deal, Robert E. Latta, Adrian Smith, K. Michael Conaway, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Henry E. Brown, Jr., John Kline, Daniel E. Lungren, Ted Poe, Todd Russell Platts, Kay Granger, Kevin Brady, Todd Tiaht, Lynn A. Westmoreland, J. Gresham Barrett, Mike Rogers (AL), Jean Schmidt, Ron Paul, Thomas E. Petri, Lamar Smith, John Linder, Bill Shuster, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Michele Bachmann, Joe Wilson, George Radanovich, Donald A. Manzullo, Sam Johnson, David Dreier, Judy Biggert, Spencer Bachus, Candice S. Miller, Robin Hayes, Mark Steven Kirk, Jeff Miller, Geoff Davis, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Dan Burton,

Steve King, Terry Everett, Harold Rogers, Rob Bishop, Tim Walberg, Ginny Brown-Waite, Patrick J. Tiberi, Bill Sali, Joe Knollenberg, Michael K. Simpson, Patrick T. McHenry, Ron Lewis, John Boozman, John Campbell, Zach Wamp, Mac Thornberry, Gus M. Bilirakis, Phil Gingrey, Jim Jordan, John A. Boehner, Deborah Pryce, Pete Sessions, Michael T. McCaul, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Steve Scalise, Virginia Foxx, Ralph M. Hall, Tom Price, Mario Diaz-Balart, John Sullivan, Marsha Blackburn, Tom Latham, Doug Lamborn, Howard Coble, Gary G. Miller, Joseph R. Pitts, Paul C. Broun, Dave Camp, Frank R. Wolf, Wally Herger, Walter B. Jones, Eric Cantor, Marilyn N. Musgrave,

Edward R. Royce, Ander Crenshaw, Trent Franks, Steve Chabot, Michael R. Turner, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Jeff Flake, Randy Neugebauer, Mark E. Souder, Sam Graves, Dennis R. Rehberg, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Connie Mack, John E. Peterson, Tom Cole, Peter Hoekstra, Thomas M. Reynolds, Jerry Weller, Peter J. Roskam, John R. Carter, Jeb Hensarling, Mike Ferguson, Greg Walden, Charles W. Dent, Jo Ann Emerson, Adam H. Putnam, Jeff Fortenberry, John T. Doolittle, Louie Gohmert, Robert B. Aderholt, Ed Whitfield, Ric Keller, John L. Mica, Mary Fallin, Michael C. Burgess, John Abney Culberson, Joe Barton, Tim Murphy, Fred Upton, and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—  
ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 10 by Mr. KUHL, Jr., on H.R. 5656: David Dreier and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Petition 12 by Mr. ROSKAM on H.R. 2208: John A. Boehner, Lamar Smith, John Linder, Patrick J. Tiberi, John Campbell, Wally Herger, David Dreier, and Spencer Bachus.