

Senator McCain should have shared some of his views there to American voters.”

Obama said he talked to Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper on June 9 after he secured the Democratic presidential nomination. “I believe that the U.S. has an enormous interest in maintaining robust trade relationships with Canada and Mexico, and I expect those to continue under an Obama administration,” he said.

McCain’s trip to Canada was unusual if not unprecedented for a presidential candidate, one that his campaign paid for yet aides insisted was not political.

Democrats criticized plans for a scheduled \$100-per-person “finance event,” and raised questions about U.S. Ambassador David Wilkins’ involvement in the trip. McCain’s aides said Wilkins had done nothing wrong. They also countered that the money was to pay the cost of the Economic Club luncheon, then canceled the event without explanation.

The free trade agreement is intensely controversial in the United States, supported by most businesses, opposed by many unions, and has already emerged as a flashpoint in the presidential race.

McCain supports it, while Obama and former rival Hillary Rodham Clinton vied for support among blue-collar workers in the Democratic primaries by stressing their desire to force changes.

“Since NAFTA was concluded, it has contributed to strong job growth and flourishing trade. Since the agreement was signed, the United States has added 25 million jobs and Canada more than 4 million,” McCain said.

In an unmistakable reference to Obama, he added, “Demanding unilateral changes and threatening to abrogate an agreement that has increased trade and prosperity is nothing more than retreating behind protectionist walls.”

Aides said that was a reference in part to comments the Illinois senator had made in a Feb. 26 debate during the primaries.

“I will make sure that we renegotiate in the same way that Senator Clinton talked about,” he said at the time. “. . . I think we should use the hammer of a potential opt-out as leverage to ensure that we actually get labor and environmental standards that are enforced.”

In his speech, McCain expressed his appreciation for Canada’s deployment of 2,500 troops to Afghanistan, and skipped lightly over Iraq, where the government declined to send forces.

“. . . This nation has done all that those differences would allow to help the Iraqi people. In characteristic form, Canada has given generous humanitarian aid and development assistance,” he said.

Later, at a news conference, he said he hoped officials from the two countries could resolve the issue of Omar Khadr, a young Canadian citizen who is imprisoned at Guantanamo as a detainee in the war on terror.

“I have always opposed torture and any interrogation technique that would be constructed in any way as torture,” McCain added, unprompted.

McCain has made several trips outside the United States since he became a presidential contender, including European and Middle Eastern countries.

He arrived in the Canadian capital aboard his chartered campaign jet and was greeted on the tarmac by Wilkins. The senator said it was not a political journey, yet told reporters he did not feel it was appropriate to have U.S. taxpayers pick up the cost.

McCain was still on Canadian soil when the Democratic National Committee filed a Freedom of Information Act request with the State Department seeking information about possible violations of federal law in connection with the trip. Under the law, federal officials are limited in their ability to undertake political activity.

Aides said in advance McCain would come to Canada to highlight trade, and there has been widespread speculation that he will soon travel to Mexico and perhaps elsewhere to make the same point as he made before his lunchtime audience.

“Last year alone, we exchanged some \$560 billion in goods, and Canada is the leading export market for 36 of the 50 United States,” the Arizona senator said.

“This country stands as America’s leading overall export market, and America is Canada’s leading agricultural market. With 60 percent of all direct foreign investment in Canada originating in the United States some \$289 billion in 2007—our economies draw strength from one another.”

He also said improvements are needed. “Complying with NAFTA’s rules of origin can be cumbersome and costly. Border delays can pose a serious impediment to trade, the equivalent of a tariff,” he said.

**REVISIONS TO BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FOR CERTAIN HOUSE COMMITTEES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2008 AND 2009 AND PERIOD OF FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under section 210 and 212(b) of S. Con. Res. 70, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 2009, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revision to the budget allocations and aggregates for certain House committees for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 and the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013. This revision represents an adjustment to certain House committee budget allocation and aggregates for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and in response to consideration of the bill H.R. 6331 (Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008). Corresponding tables are attached.

Under section 323 of S. Con. Res. 70, this adjustment to the budget allocations and aggregates applies while the measure is under consideration. The adjustments will take effect upon enactment of the measure. For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, a revised allocation made under section 323 of S. Con. Res. 70 is to be considered as an allocation included in the resolution.

**BUDGET AGGREGATES**  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2008 <sup>1</sup>	Fiscal Year 2009 <sup>1,2</sup>	Fiscal Years 2009-2013
<b>Current Aggregates:</b>			
Budget Authority	2,454,256	2,455,920	n.a.
Outlays	2,435,860	2,490,920	n.a.
Revenues	1,875,400	2,029,644	11,780,107
<b>Change in Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act (H.R. 6331):</b>			
Budget Authority	1,942	6,633	n.a.
Outlays	1,924	6,516	n.a.
Revenues	1	9	156
<b>Revised Aggregates:</b>			
Budget Authority	2,456,198	2,462,553	n.a.
Outlays	2,437,784	2,497,436	n.a.
Revenues	1,875,401	2,029,653	11,780,263

<sup>1</sup> Current aggregates do not include spending covered by section 301(b)(1) (overseas deployments and related activities). The section has not been triggered to date in Appropriations action.

<sup>2</sup> Current aggregates do not include Corps of Engineers emergency spending assumed in the budget resolution, that will not be included in current level due to its emergency designation (section 301(b)(2)).

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2010 through 2013 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

**DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES**

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2008		2009		2009–2013 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Current allocation:</b>						
Energy and Commerce	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Change in Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act (H.R. 6331):</b>						
Energy and Commerce	89	81	839	802	3,163	3,157
Ways and Means	1,853	1,843	5,794	5,714	–7,022	–5,227
Total	1,942	1,924	6,633	6,516	–3,859	–2,070
<b>Revised allocation:</b>						
Energy and Commerce	89	81	839	802	3,163	3,157
Ways and Means	1,853	1,843	5,794	5,714	–7,022	–5,227

AMERICA'S FAILED ECONOMIC  
AND ENERGY POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago, there was an election. The Democrats won. They won fair and square. And for 18 months, Mr. Speaker, they have controlled the economic policies and the energy policies of our great Nation. Let's look back and take a look at what has happened in those 18 months.

Since Democrats have taken control of these policies, the price of bread, Mr. Speaker, has increased 21 percent; milk, 26 percent; eggs, 34 percent; gasoline, the price that we pay at the pump, has increased 71 percent under the energy policies of this new Democrat majority. As an aside, in the last 18 months, the value of one's home has decreased 7 percent under their policies.

Mr. Speaker, tonight many of us have gathered to specifically talk about the energy policies of the Democrat majority and how they differ so greatly from the policies of the Republican party.

All over America, families are going to convenience stores and they are having to make a decision: Do I buy a gallon of milk, or do I buy a gallon of gas? They are having to make decisions about do I take my children to school, or do I go to work? Families are in pain, having seen their gasoline prices increase 71 percent.

What has the Democrat majority brought us in the way of an energy policy? Well, their first policy was to beg. "Let's beg OPEC. Let's see if maybe we beg them, they will bring down the price of gasoline at the pump."

Well, that didn't work, Mr. Speaker. What was their next policy? Their next policy was to sue. "Let's sue OPEC. If we somehow bring in the trial attorneys, we will lower prices at the pump."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that didn't seem to work either.

Well, here is another one they want to try. "Let's tax. Let's tax oil producers, and somehow that will bring down prices at the pump."

Well, something I remember from my eighth grade economics about supply and demand and cost. You impose another cost on a producer, well, he is going to do his best to put it in the price of the product. Well, in fact, that is what will happen. It almost sounds the like the policies of Jimmy Carter and a Democrat Congress of a bygone era which made us even more dependent upon foreign oil.

Here is another one: "Let's try to castigate. Let's bring up people who produce energy and let's say nasty

things about them and their companies and their families. Surely that will bring down the cost of energy at the pump."

Well, that hasn't seemed to work either.

The new one we tried today, the Democrat majority, "well, let's outlaw people who charge unreasonable prices. Let's criminalize that activity."

What they never have thought of, Mr. Speaker, is why don't we try to produce more American energy in America? I mean, not only have they not thought about it, Mr. Speaker, they are moving in the complete opposite direction. They are passing policies that make it more difficult to produce American energy in America to bring down the cost at the pump.

In fact, in one of the many non-energy energy bills that this Democrat majority has brought to the floor, they passed a provision known as section 526 of Public Law 110-140 that would prohibit Federal agencies, in this case specifically the United States Air Force, from contracting, taking in long-term contracts in order to get energy from oil shale, tar sands, coal-to-liquids, alternative fuels, which is one, one of the ways that we could make ourselves more energy independent and quit relying so much on foreign sources of oil that are driving up the cost of gasoline at the pump.

Because of this section that was introduced in one of the many Democrat non-energy energy bills, or, as one of my colleagues say, the Democrat lethargy bills, myself and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, have introduced H.R. 5656, which almost has 100 cosponsors now, that would repeal this section, which would allow the Federal Government to contract for these alternative fuels to try to bring in more energy independence to help jumpstart some of these alternative technologies, which is a huge part of the solution in order to bring down the price of gasoline at the pump.

Mr. Speaker, many of us will come to the floor to talk about this very critical issue to American families, and those who have town hall meetings know it is the number one issue on the minds of our constituents, as it well should be.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to lead this Special Order tonight. At this time I would like to yield to the coauthor of H.R. 5656, which would repeal this needless section making it more difficult to enact alternative energy policies, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, for his opening comments.

□ 2200

Mr. CONAWAY. Well, I thank my colleague from Texas, and I want to say a few things. We'll get to some of our other speakers who are here tonight before we get into the heart of what you and I intend to talk about.

Mr. Speaker, the serious business of providing energy for America, whether that energy is electricity to light the lights in this hall or to run manufacturing facilities or gasoline, whether it is diesel or jet fuel to move people and goods and us around, is serious business. Yet our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not treating it seriously. This week's get-out-of-town energy strategy included four peripheral bills that are not intended to really deal with it or intended to give cover, political cover, for the folks who voted for these four bills.

Next week, when we all go home to our constituents, we'll have to look them in the eye and tell them that, yes, we've done absolutely nothing to address the cost of gasoline that you're paying. The interesting thing about gasoline is that we may not buy gasoline every single day, but as we drive around, we see the price posted all over town, and I dare say that every single driver looks at the price to check to see what it is. Even though you may not intend to buy gasoline that day, you check those prices constantly. So it's constantly in front of our minds as it is when we have town halls or telephone town halls.

The get-out-of-town strategy included a price-gouging bill—again, puffery—because seven DOE and Federal Trade Commission price-gouging studies over the last decade have shown absolutely no evidence whatsoever of price gouging. This serious business of providing gasoline to consumers at prices that they can afford has been reduced to sloganism: "Use it or lose it." "We can't drill our way out of these problems." They're casual, off-hand, flippant comments that don't do the seriousness of this issue justice. A 30-second sound bite works well on a television commercial, but at the heart of the matter, these are complicated issues that deserve and that should get serious consideration on both sides of the aisle.

The solutions aren't Republican. The solutions aren't Democratic. The solutions are what are best for America. To the extent that we can begin to delve deeper into what the issue might be and into what the solution might be, the better off we are, but as long as we're just very cavalier about what we're doing with the get-out-of-town energy policy or with the sloganism that seems to permeate everything that we do with respect to energy, we will not solve this issue.

Gasoline prices will continue to rise. Electricity costs will continue to go up as natural gas prices rise and as we use more and more natural gas to generate electricity. So we are not about the good work of trying to find solutions. We are simply about the bad work of being very casual, very cavalier and very unthoughtful, quite frankly, about this particular issue.