

With that, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the debate tomorrow. I encourage all the Members of our conference and our colleagues in the Congress to support this very important bill to help them carry out that important mission.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. HOWARD "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Budget Committee takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4310 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. HOWARD "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in matters being considered in H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4310 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over certain sections of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives,

reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House. I also ask that you support my request to name members of this committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. PETER KING,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

□ 1930

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AN ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY STRATEGY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has often claimed that we have 2 percent of the world's proven oil reserves, which is nothing but an excuse for inaction when developing American-made energy. As The Washington Post's fact-checkers noted, the President's claim is "true, but false." False because "proven oil reserves" is only one category of oil, a fraction of the overall oil in the ground. "Proven reserves" refers to amounts of oil where seismic studies have identified available resources.

Due to the long Presidential and congressional bans on Outer Continental

Shelf development, the inventory of resources has not been tracked in over 30 years. The U.S. Geological Survey and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management estimate the U.S. has a 16 percent share of the world's undiscovered, technically recoverable, conventional oil resources. The Middle East also has a 16 percent share.

Rather than saying what we can't do, the President should be doing more to facilitate the safe discovery and development of U.S. resources.

Mr. Speaker, the President says he supports "an all-of-the-above strategy for the 21st century that develops every source of American-made energy." The question now is whether he is willing to prove it.

DOMESTIC OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I will be joined during this hour by my good friend and colleague from California, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI.

I would like to just begin this discussion on oil prices by recalling that in 2008, the constant refrain that was heard in this Chamber over and over again was "Drill, baby, drill" by my colleagues on the Republican side. And the good news is that's precisely what we've done. In fact, in USA Today, Citigroup analysts are quoted as saying in a recent report, Energy independence "is no pipe dream. The U.S. is already the world's fastest-growing oil and natural gas producer. Counting the output from Canada and Mexico, North America is 'the new Middle East.'"

So it's interesting to note that as much as we've been wringing our hands, there is oil being produced here in the United States. In fact, a lot of oil is being produced in the United States. And we're going to go over a few charts now to show how, in fact, things are looking a little bit better.

This first chart really shows what happened with oil production. When George Bush was still the President of the United States, the price of gas hit \$4.10 a gallon. It was very high. And then gas prices hit rock bottom when President Obama took office because of the global financial crisis that hit. When President Obama took office, there were fewer than 400 oil rigs operating in the United States, falling below 200 rigs by mid 2009. Then, despite safety reviews after the BP spill, oil rigs operating in the United States quadrupled over the next 3 years. There are now more than 1,300—I repeat that, 1,300—oil rigs operating in the United States, more than all operational oil drilling in the rest of the world combined.

So in the last 3 years of the Bush administration, we were producing 1.78 billion barrels of oil; but in the first 3

years of the Obama, we have already produced 2 billion barrels of oil. The U.S. oil production has continued to increase under President Obama and is now at an 8-year high.

Jim Burkhard, who is Cambridge Energy Research Associates managing director, said in Senate testimony in February of this year, "A 'great revival' in U.S. oil production is taking shape."

So for all the hand-wringing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, talking about what isn't being done, the truth is a lot is being done, and we now have more oil rigs operating in the United States—some 1,300—than all the other places in the world combined.

BP projects that the U.S. will get 94 percent of its energy domestically by the year 2030. That's going to be a huge benefit for all of us. Economists at Citigroup argue that North America can be energy independent by 2020. That's only 8 years away. We could be energy independent by 2020. Citigroup says, if that happens, we will create 3.6 million new jobs, and we will see the unemployment rate cut by 2 percent.

An interesting example is that of North Dakota. Do you know what the unemployment rate is in North Dakota today? It's 3 percent. In California, it's 11 percent. In North Dakota, it's 3 percent. And North Dakota can now boast having the lowest unemployment rate in the country, and it is now the fourth-largest oil producer in the country as well.

So we create new jobs. We reignite manufacturing and chemical businesses. And guess what. American families see a lot of savings, too. In fact, the price of natural gas has dropped substantially. And if we keep going the way we're going, it will drop some 80 percent, giving the American family a \$926 a year savings.

Georgia Power is another great example. Their fuel costs dropped 19 percent. And guess what. All of their utility customers saw a decrease in their electrical costs, in their utility bills, by some 6 percent. So there is some good news in all of that.

The second chart looks at U.S. oil production versus gas volatility. World market factors are really driving up oil prices. And if you look at this particular chart, you see that the oil production stays pretty much the same. It goes up a little bit in 2010, as you can see; but, for the most part, it stays pretty consistent. But what does change and changes dramatically up and down, as if you are reading an EKG, is the price of gas in this country. So gas prices are going up and down irrespective of the production of oil.

The Associated Press conducted an investigation over the past 36 years of U.S. oil production and gas prices and found that there is no statistical correlation between how much oil comes out of U.S. wells and the price at the pump. More U.S. drilling has not

changed how deeply the gas pump drills into your wallet, and we know that.

□ 1940

The price of oil is determined on a global market. More oil production in the United States does not mean consistently lower prices at the pump. However, if we become less dependent on foreign oil, we will see some dramatic shifts take place in the country.

So why does more drilling have so little effect on gas prices? The answer is because oil is a global commodity. The United States owns less than 2 percent of the global reserves and pays the same world market price that everyone else does.

So, with that, let me introduce my good friend, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, from the great area of Sacramento and the Valley.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SPEIER, and thank you for bringing this very, very important issue to the attention of the American public this evening as we spend this hour talking about gas prices in the United States.

I was really struck by the charts that you put up. Wow. But they tell us that the story is we don't pump oil in America. Not so. We do. We really do. And they tell us that we're going in the wrong direction. But if you take a look at those charts, we're actually producing more and more energy. Today, in the Resources Committee, on which I have the honor of sitting, we had a debate about this. And our Republican colleagues were saying that we're not producing as much. And so we show them the energy institute's statistics, and they say they're wrong. That's an independent agency and they collect the statistics, and in fact they're right. And your charts clearly pointed out that we are in fact making it in America.

This is my favorite chart. This is what I'm often on the floor talking about: Manufacturing in America and making it in America. It's not often that we take this subject of making our energy in America, building an American energy machine, one that will supply the energy that our Nation needs to meet a growing economy and the needs of our society.

So very, very much what we're talking about here is making it in America. There are so many different pieces to this. I'm going to just bring up two of those, and then we'll carry on our dialogue here.

First of all, conservation. I think you're going to talk about this a little later—about automobile conservation, the gasoline in automobiles, which is very, very important, but there's so much other conservation that we must be doing in housing, in commercial buildings, in this building. This building is over 150 years old. We've got serious lack of energy conservation here within the Nation's Capitol.

But if we carry on a major effort on conservation, we will reduce our ex-

penses and simultaneously make the available energy—the energy that is currently available—much more widely available and at a lower cost because of the market forces. So conservation is absolutely critical not only in oil and gas but in all of the other energy that we consume in this Nation.

Now the second thing, and then I'll circle back around quickly, is what I call substitution. We can substitute energy forms for oil, and in doing so, increase our domestic availability for oil—and that's diesel and gasoline. And in the substitution we also reduce our importation of oil. So substitution is really important.

So what is substitution? Well, substitution is going electric. We can go to electric cars, go to hybrids, which are a combination of electric and gasoline. There are many different ways on the transportation sector. But oil is also used in the production of electricity. Natural gas is the big thing today, and it is a wonderful substitution for coal. And we'll come back to that.

Finally, biofuels. The point I want to do here leads me to this little chart that I've used before, and it talks about where your tax money is going. Where is your tax money going? Well, I'll tell you that about \$5 billion of your tax money every year goes to the oil industry. It goes to the oil industry to provide a subsidy that's now been in place for more than a century. And in doing so, it worked. That subsidy worked. It created one of the wealthiest—not one of—the wealthiest industry in the entire world. That's the oil industry. And, again, I know you're going to pick this up and carry it a little bit further.

But just here, our subsidies, our tax dollars handed over \$5 billion a year to the Big Five, who earn billions and billions of dollars of profit every quarter. Why do we continue to do that when we really starve the substitutions?

You look at here, this is the biofuel area. This is the green technologies—wind, solar energy, biofuels. This is ethanol down here. You just compare this. The subsidies from \$70 billion a year going to coal and oil, that's well beyond the Big Five. And over here on this side we're talking about some \$12 billion. And down here, some \$16 billion a year.

So what's happened is that your tax money continues to subsidize oil and coal and just a little teeny, tiny bit on the substitutions, where the opportunity for real energy independence will exist. So we should keep this in mind as we look at how we use your tax dollars.

Now there's a huge fight going on here in the Congress, appropriately so, about changing this substitution; that we ought to stop subsidizing the oil industry, put some of that money over here into the substitutes, that is the green technologies, and into paying off our deficit or taking care of our seniors and our sick. There's much, much more to be done on that.

I would love to see your charts and we'll get into this in some, hopefully, elegant way.

Ms. SPEIER. The next chart that we're going to put up is one that you'll find particularly interesting. This is the Big Five oil companies and how much money they made just in 2011. As can you see, \$137 billion last year—a 75 percent increase in the profits over the year before. And as you can see each of them: ExxonMobil, 31 percent increase; Shell, a 54 percent increase; BP, 114 percent increase; Chevron, 42 percent increase; ConocoPhillips, 9 percent increase.

These companies are doing extraordinarily well and yet we're still giving them \$5 billion in subsidies.

I guess the question I have for you, Congressman, is one of the things that we're told by the industry often enough is that if you take away our subsidies, the cost of gas at the pump is going to go up. And what is the answer to that question?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, you have another chart there that showed the oil that is pumped and the price of gasoline. Congresswoman SPEIER, you used this before. And you asked me: If we take away the subsidies, will it increase the cost of gasoline? The answer is, categorically, No.

First of all, it is an international market that sets the price of gasoline. I should add one little caveat to that. International market and speculation. And I'm going to come to the speculation in a little bit.

Anyway, the international market sets the price of gasoline that these Big Five companies buy and the value of the oil that they extract. So the barrel of oil is set internationally. Now if it's set internationally and you take out the speculation, it remains fairly constant. Here's the production. And it has gone up, but it's been rather steady over this period of time.

The subsidy is to encourage the production of oil. Well, they've had the subsidy and so the production has been rocking along here. The price of oil is set internationally. What explains this enormous variation in the price of fuel at the pump? Well, it's not production. That's from here. Is it the subsidies? The subsidies are a very, very small part. You're looking at a \$137 billion total profit. The subsidy is \$5 billion. So it's inconceivable that the subsidy has much to do with the bottom line, other than adding \$5 billion, which would be, I guess, if you took the subsidy out, it would be \$132 billion. Oh, my, let's whine about that. I don't think so.

So the subsidy doesn't have much to do, if anything, with the price of gasoline. The price of gasoline, however, is set by those companies. And that leads directly to that bottom line there—this \$137 billion. They choose to set that price.

Now what are we going to do about it? Well, take the subsidies back and begin to move away from dependence

on oil, whether that's imported oil or oil that is pumped out of the ground here in the United States, and move to these alternatives.

□ 1950

Move to the alternatives, electricity and natural gas and the biofuels. All of those will further reduce the demand for oil which will bring down the cost of a barrel of oil within this country and around the world and, in so doing, allow us to have a lower gasoline price; and to do that, capture the subsidies. It's not going to increase the cost of a gallon of gasoline at all.

Ms. SPEIER. So we know that we're pumping more oil out of the ground in this country right now than ever before in our history, more than is being pumped anywhere else in the world—1,300 oil rigs. We know that we are still giving the industry a huge subsidy, and we know that they're making lots of money. Right? So what is going on? Is there, in fact, speculation? Is that driving the price of gas up?

Now, Bart Chilton, who is a Commodity Futures Trading Commission commissioner, recently said that consumers are now paying what amounts to a Wall Street premium every time they fill up their car with gas. In fact, he said every time you fill up your Honda Civic, you're paying a \$7.50 Wall Street tax, in effect. You're paying that because of the speculation that's going on in the market. If your car is a Ford Explorer, you're actually paying an extra \$10.41. So over the course of a year, it turns into real money. You're now talking about \$700 more a year that we're paying because Wall Street speculation is driving this price.

Now, we've asked the Justice Department on three different occasions, the President of the United States has asked the Justice Department on three different occasions to look into, to investigate the speculators. And we're waiting. We're waiting for that particular review to take place because what we do know is that if we can get oil down to \$70 a barrel, we're going to bring gas down to \$3 a gallon, which will be a huge benefit to the consumers in this country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The speculation issue, this morning we had a fellow from the Connecticut Petroleum Retailers Association come in and talk to us about speculation. You and I didn't have enough time to put this together, we talked about this beforehand, because we were both taken by the information he provided. It is really not new information, but it is very interestingly put on the issue of speculation. Forgive me, general public and forgive me, Ms. SPEIER, but I just decided to put this together on the back of this Make It in America chart because America was taken to the cleaners in 2008.

This is what happened to the price of a barrel of oil in 2008. Now keep in mind in 2008 the wars were going on, but there was no real change in the

wars. In March of 2008, a barrel of oil cost \$70 a barrel in the United States, and I guess worldwide also. So March of 2008, it was \$70 a barrel. Nothing happened, no big change. The Straits of Hormuz were not shut down; Venezuela and Nigeria and other countries continued to pump oil, as they had before.

But between March of 2008 and July of 2008, what's that, 4 months, 5 months, the price went from \$70 a barrel to \$147 and gasoline was very close to \$5 a gallon. So oil went from \$70 to \$147—doubled, doubled in price—in just a period of time from March, April, May, June until July of 2008. And then the speculators broke and the price plummeted between July to November to \$32 a barrel.

Now this has nothing to do with the production of oil around the world. It has nothing to do with major international crises of any kind. Obviously, we had a problem in the United States with our economy; but the consumption of gasoline remained about the same, but the price of a barrel of oil doubled and then in the same year, July to November, plummeted to \$32 a barrel.

If there is ever, ever a situation that says somebody is speculating in this market, it's this extraordinary change that occurred over a period of time from March to July to November. And there's no supply and demand, no international crisis that could even begin to explain this extraordinary shift in prices. It is, I think, beyond a doubt that all of this, this was the great gasoline crisis of 2008, was caused by speculation. Now, we need to do something about that.

Here is an issue before the House of Representatives, and every day somewhere in the buildings here in Washington there are a group of Republicans that are doing their level best to eliminate the one law that we have been able to put in place to control speculation. This is the Dodd-Frank legislation. The Dodd-Frank legislation has very powerful tools to control speculation. And you can draw your own conclusions why our Republican friends would try to torpedo, to end, to eviscerate the Dodd-Frank legislation so that the speculators can continue this kind of activity.

Now, keep in mind that this is not ending. If we go to 2010, 2011, the current period, my guess is that we would see something similar to this kind of speculation. So the Dodd-Frank legislation is the only tool we have available today to deal with speculations such as occurred in 2008 and is in all likelihood continuing today.

Ms. SPEIER. An interesting point along the same lines, maybe 4 or 5 years ago, the percentage of speculation in the oil market was 30 percent. The speculators were involved in about 30 percent. About 70 percent were end-users that were in the market. But interestingly enough today, those numbers have just flipped so that the end-

users of gas, of gasoline, that are betting on the future are 30 percent, and it's the speculators that are 70 percent.

The other thing that the experts said this morning, I don't know if you were there at the time, they were talking about Katrina. When Katrina hit, it blew out all of those oil rigs in the gulf. It shut down oil production for a period of time. And you know what happened to the price of oil? It went from \$50 a barrel to \$60 a barrel for about 4 months, not from \$70 a barrel to \$147 a barrel. So over 4 months, it went up ever so slightly, but significantly nonetheless; and then it came down.

So this, this is ripe for an investigation, I believe, because it would suggest that there is a lot of speculation going on in the market today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was there for that, and I was struck by the very same statistic. As you look at what happened then, \$10 here, a doubling in price. Consider for a moment what it would mean to somebody that had purchased back here in March a million barrels of oil at \$70 a barrel, and they come up to July, that million barrels of oil has doubled in value. So this is why speculation occurs. It occurs because somebody by playing the market, by speculating, is able to make a vast sum of money.

There's the other side of that coin—somebody lost a vast sum of money coming down here. But the American public, however, was the single biggest loser in all of this because as that went up, the price at the pump also went up, and Americans paid more and more for the price of gasoline. It was about \$5 a gallon when it came up here. And it didn't go down from \$147 to \$32; that proportion didn't happen. It did drop from near \$5 down to \$3.50, in that area.

So the American public was stuck with an exceedingly high price which continues to this day, which leads to those extraordinary profits which you were showing just a few minutes ago. Now, I'm not saying the oil industry was involved in the speculation; but I will say this, the oil industry benefited from the speculation that left a very high price for oil into the future. This didn't last very long. This went back up to \$70, and today it's over \$100 a barrel.

So we need to consider all of these things about what's going on in the oil market. The bottom line of this is we need to change. And this is, I think, where you want to go. You want to talk about conservation. You're the leader here, take us where you want and I'll follow.

Ms. SPEIER. So let's talk about what the solution is to protect Americans from volatile gas prices and to kick our dependence on foreign oil. That becomes the secret.

□ 2000

I mean, by every focus, if we kick our dependence on foreign oil, we are going to be so much better off.

So let's look at this next chart. In 2005, America's dependence on foreign oil peaked at about 60 percent. Then it dropped down in 2010 to 49 percent. Then last year, it dropped down even more to 45 percent. 2010 marked the first time U.S. dependence on foreign oil fell below 50 percent in 13 years, and our dependence on foreign oil is now at the lowest level in 16 years. At this rate, the Energy Information Administration predicts that the U.S. will slash its dependence on foreign oil to as low as 36 percent in the year 2035.

The U.S. transportation sector consumed nearly 5 billion barrels of petroleum in 2009, accounting for over 70 percent of the consumption in the United States. The lion's share of that—45 percent of total consumption—was in passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks.

So, what do we do about that gas guzzling that's going on? Well, the thing we do about that is to look at how we can change how many miles to the gallon we get. To the President's credit, his administration has put in place these new corporate average fuel economy standards—known to all of us as CAFE standards—that will nearly double the efficiency of the U.S. fleet of automobiles, achieving a fleet-wide average of 54.5 miles per gallon by the year 2025.

So what does that do once we get there at 2025? Well, it means that we, as consumers, will save \$1.7 trillion at the pump over the life of the program. A family that purchases a new vehicle in 2025 will save \$8,200 in fuel costs when compared with a similar vehicle in 2010. So over the life of the program, the standard will save 12 billion barrels of oil and eliminate 6 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution.

So the solutions are really there for us. The solutions are that we move to these CAFE standards, that we address the issues around speculation, and that we keep the robust drilling that is going on in this country right now so that we can continue to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I took a look at that before we began this hour, and I go, Oh, my, do I have to wait until 2025 to buy that vehicle? No, not really. There are pure electric vehicles that are available today that get not 54 miles per gallon but like infinite, by using electricity only. You can buy those. Unfortunately for me, in my district where a Saturday run around the district is 600 miles, it doesn't make much sense yet, but it's coming.

The battery technology is improving for automobiles. You can store that energy or take down that energy at night. This is part of the electric grid and the changes that are occurring in the electric grid all across this Nation. Given the low price of natural gas today—just over \$2 per 1,000 Btus—we're seeing the electric utility industry shifting from coal to natural gas. As they do that shift, we get an enormous reduction in the carbon emis-

sions—which is good for the environment and good for the climate change issue—and, simultaneously, we're able to then see a path to an electric vehicle, or at least a hybrid plug-in, hybrid electric vehicle. All very, very good. Biofuels will be part of that also.

So it's very, very powerful that we continue to increase. And let's keep in mind that there had been no increase until the Obama administration came in. I think it was over 20 years that the standards had been in place, and then President Obama came in and said, Listen, we need to move to conservation. And the result is the incredible savings.

I don't want to wait until 2025. Let's do something about it today.

Ms. SPEIER. Well, we can certainly try to encourage it.

I don't know if you have any more thoughts.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have a couple more things that I'll pick up along the way. Let me just share one of them, since we're on the gasoline issue.

You and I go back to our district every weekend. A month ago, 2 months ago, the rage was the price of gasoline. I was doing town halls. I knew you were also, and so I was doing some research about where the gasoline is and what it's being used for and what the cost was.

I came across a statistic from the Energy Information Institute that was absolutely surprising to me. The talk on the radio and on television and the talk radio and talk television was that we have this enormous shortage of gasoline, that the threat of a war in Iran was responsible for driving it up, and somehow problems in Nigeria or Venezuela—or wherever—were somehow shorting the market and that gasoline was in short supply. But the information, the statistics were exactly the opposite. There was a glut of gasoline in the United States, so much so—get this—so much so that the oil industry—Chevron, Exxon, BP, all of the rest—were exporting 28 million gallons of gasoline a day. At the same time they were exporting, they were driving the price up towards \$5 a gallon.

And we go, wait a minute. What's this all about? You're telling me we have a shortage? If we have a shortage, why are you exporting 28 million gallons of gasoline a day? And from the information I've been able to obtain, it appears as though that export continues to this day—an export of 28 million gallons of gasoline a day out of the United States at the same time that the industry is saying, Oh, woe is us. We have a short supply. Well, if it's short supply, it's because they are creating it to the deficit and to the harm of the American traveling public who has to buy that gasoline.

Now, one other thing—and check me on this; I was trying to recall all of the information this morning—that in the last quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of this year, the United States, for the first time in—help me here, 40 years?

Ms. SPEIER. Sixty years.

Mr. GARAMENDI. —60 years was a net exporter of oil, a net exporter. We had achieved energy independence. We were exporting more than we were importing for the last quarter of last year and the first quarter of this year. I don't know if that's going to continue, but it flies right in the face of what the oil industry was telling us as the fake, false crisis of the spring occurred. My guess is it was speculation. My guess is it was greed on the part of the oil industry.

My solution is to end the subsidies, bring that money back and use it on the green technologies and conservation. My solution is to enforce the Dodd-Frank laws and to make certain speculators are not robbing the American people day in and day out. Those are two things we can do. And as you said earlier, we will continue to produce energy in the United States, and we'll Make It In America.

I thank you so very much. I do have another meeting. I'm going to have to run, but this is good. It's good to get the information out there. Thank you for bringing us together tonight.

Ms. SPEIER. Well, thank you, Congressman, for your great presentation and your passion around making it in America, which should be underscored, because one of the great things that happens in my district is a lot of innovation.

Tesla, which is an electric car company that is making it in America, building it right there in Fremont, has a showroom right outside my district. And a gentleman came in to test-drive the sports—the Roadster, which has a hefty price associated with it, but very fast.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Is this the one that goes a gazillion miles an hour in 5 seconds?

Ms. SPEIER. Yes. It goes very fast, and it's all electric.

So he took it for a little spin, came back and said, I want to buy it. The salesperson says, Well, you're the first person who has ever come in here and literally bought it after just a test-drive. The purchaser said, Well, my neighbor on one side and my neighbor on the other side have already bought one.

Now, the funny thing about that story is not the keeping up with the Joneses so much, but the fact that in terms of the grid, having three electric cars on the same block charging overnight is going to create a little indigestion. So that's one of the good problems that we're going to get as more people are driving electric cars.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was going to head out the door, but your Tesla story caught me as I was about to leave.

The grid, we need to have a smart grid. This is one of the things that is in contention here. This is about energy research. Now, we need to understand, how can we make that grid smart enough and robust enough that we will be able to charge, on any given block,

one, two, three, four, five, or six more homes at night?

□ 2010

To do that, we need to have research and understanding, not only on how we produce the energy in an environmentally sound way that reduces the carbon emissions, but we also need to know how to distribute that power and when it's going to be needed. That's called the smart grid.

Now, to do that requires research. It requires us to invest in research to understand how the grid works, how it can be improved, how we can create the efficiency in the grid, how that power can be distributed to where it is needed when it is needed. That takes money. The Federal Government has, over the last several years, provided that research money in the budget that we're debating here now. Well, we're not debating it. It actually passed.

The blueprint for the current budget from this House reduces the energy research in the United States. So it may be some time, if our Republican colleagues have their way about the energy research, before those three people will be able to plug that thing in at the same time at night.

Ms. SPEIER. Well, let's hope we do it sooner than later so that they can be driving their Tesla Roadsters.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much.

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you. And I think at this point we have covered all of the issues we wanted to cover during this Special Order tonight. And I just want to leave my colleagues with this message. Again, this was quoted in USA Today. Citigroup analysts declared in a recent report, energy independence in the United States is not a pipe dream. The U.S. is already the world's fastest growing oil and natural gas producer. Counting the output of Canada and Mexico, North America is the new Middle East.

We've got many exciting things happening in the oil and gas industry.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHARLES COLSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUNYAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HULTGREN. 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 topic of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I come to this

body tonight and will have many of my colleagues joining me over the next hour to remember someone who has had a huge impact, not only on this city and on this Nation, but on our world, a gentleman who had a very personal impact on my life, who passed away on April 21, 2012, Charles W. Colson.

Chuck Colson, as many of us knew him, was a very intelligent man, a very well-spoken man, a passionate man who served people, who looked for ways to honor them, recognizing the value of every single person. His life dramatically changed through a circumstance that he went through by going to prison. And I'm going to pull out some information here.

We were honored to have a service today, a memorial service at the National Cathedral that was a memorial and remembrance of Charles Colson's life. Charles Colson was born on October 16, 1931, in Boston, Massachusetts. He graduated from Brown University. He served in the Marine Corps, went to law school at Brown, and then went on to practice law.

At a very young age, in 1969, while he was under 40, he was selected by President Nixon to be Special Counsel to the President, and served directly under the President from 1969 until 1973. During that time, he was known as a very tough guy. He was known as Richard Nixon's hatchet man, and was very intelligent, understood policy, understood politics, understood how to get things done, very driven, very focused, very tough. So he used his Marine Corps background, his tough upbringing in Boston, and his sharp intellect to be a huge impact for President Nixon.

Well, he was also, in that time, involved peripherally with Watergate, and through that, he felt that he was called to be honest with his involvement in there and pled guilty and entered a plea of obstruction of justice and was sentenced to serve time in prison. And it was really as he was preparing for that time in prison that he started to examine his own life and to see what he had done, why he had done it, and what life was all about.

It was really through a writer that he had read, a book that had been given to him, a book by a great author and great thinker, C. S. Lewis, "Mere Christianity." And through that book, and through the testimony of one of Chuck's good friends, that Chuck Colson came to see his own failings, his own sin, his need for a Savior and his need for a change. And it was really in the friend's driveway, as they were talking, that he heard his friend's testimony of what Jesus Christ had meant to his friend, and the floodgates just opened up.

All of a sudden Chuck Colson understood what the fact of his need for a Savior, the fact that he needed to turn his life around, that he was going to have to pay a heavy price for his involvement in Watergate, that he was