only way companies could obey its orders. Upon learning MTBE was linked to environmental concerns, Congress did not accept responsibility, change the policy, or invest in alternatives. Congress told the companies to clean up the mess themselves. Trial lawyers loved it. Congress's inaction signaled that obeying law warrants a lawsuit. Now they sue anyone who might have even had a thought of using MTBE.

Mr. Speaker, these companies did not cover up bad data. They did not set out to save money by cutting corners. They did not even choose to use MTBE over a cleaner alternative. Congress made them do it.

The Democrats' own energy chairman in 1990 admits that. He says MTBE ''was the only commercially viable alternative at the time.''

Democrats are quick to blame corporations, but slow to take responsibility for their own foolish actions. Maybe that is why they are still in the minority.

SUGGESTION FOR THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while I am not an expert in time management, I do have a suggestion that would allow the House to better use its time.

Last night we spent well over an hour here, a lot of very busy people, while the leadership variously cajoled, bribed, browbeat, et cetera, a few Republicans who wanted to have it both ways, who wanted to give people the impression they were opposed to CAFTA while they were ready to cave in for sufficient inducement.

What we should have done, and I propose this for the future, is the next time we have one of those tough votes where they are going to have to do that with their Members, let us schedule an evacuation drill from the House.

The fact is at the time the plane was flying over here and a roll call was open and we evacuated the House, it took about the same time as it took them to cajole and blackmail and browbeat their people last night.

So why not do two things at once? The next time they know there is a bill they are going to cram down people's throats that they do not want to vote for and want to pretend to their voters they are against it, and it is going to take them an hour or 2 to find out ways to get them to help fool people, why not schedule in advance an evacuation drill, and that way we can kill two birds with one stone? And since people might not know it is a drill, they can threaten people who do not vote with them: They can make them stay here in case there is a plane crash.

VIDEO CHOICE ACT OF 2005

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the laws governing delivery of television programming in this country are outdated, and we have not kept up with emerging new technologies.

I have introduced the Video Choice Act of 2005 to bring these laws into the 21st century.

Current law requires that all companies interested in offering cable service or video service, as it is called in the industry, must negotiate an individual agreement with a local franchising authority. This mandate serves as a barrier to competition, effectively preventing new technologies from entering the market. The Video Choice Act of 2005 will streamline the franchising process for new marketplace entrance and give American consumers choice over their video and cable service at a lower cost.

Our telecommunications services are rapidly changing and expanding. Congress must act to ensure our laws do not crush innovation and competition.

The bill is H.R. 3146. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is the cosponsor on this legislation with me. I look forward to working with him for its passage here in the House of Representatives.

WE NEED A NEW ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we will adopt a so-called energy policy for the United States later today. We are in the beginnings of a 21st century energy crisis, skyrocketing prices at the pump, consumers are being gouged, growing dependence on foreign oil. And what is the answer of the Republican majority and this administration? Let us obligate the taxpayers of the United States to borrow $15.4 billion as a gift, a needed incentive to the oil industry to go out and produce more.

At 60 bucks a barrel and $2.40 a gallon and record profits and huge piles of cash they do not know what to do with, we need to subsidize the oil industry? I do not think so.

We need a new energy policy that will serve this country and the challenges of the 21st century with new technologies, new efficiency, and breaking our dependence on foreign oil. Unfortunately, we are getting exactly the opposite here today.

RECOGNIZING DANIELLE SIMONETTA

(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, I rise today to salute an individual without whom Members on this side of the aisle and indeed Members of the entire House would be lost.

Danielle Simonetta has been a public servant for the last 8 years, 5 of which have been spent with us here in the House. A New York native and a graduate of my alma mater, Washington Lee University in Virginia, Danielle began her Hill career with the legendary Gerry Solomon and then the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) as a Committee on Rules staffer. After 2 years with Mitch Daniels at the Office of Management and Budget, she came back to us again and has spent the last 2½ years as the senior floor assistant to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader.

In her time with leadership, she has worked tirelessly for the members of the Republican Conference. Those who know Danielle know she is a reliable source of information to us here on the House floor and a constant advocate for us in scheduling the floor. Whether it is adding a Member's last-minute suspension to the House schedule, advising Members on the merits of a particular amendment, or bragging about her beloved dog Otis, Danielle has always been here when we need her.

This fall Danielle will be leaving us to pursue an exciting new career opportunity. In addition, she is putting the finishing touches on her upcoming wedding. Congratulations to Danielle. We will miss her, and we wish her well.

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

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE ANSWERS

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as the questions surrounding the Bush administration's case for war continue to mount, and the administration continues to stonewall, the American people deserve answers.

I want to read from an editorial from yesterday's Los Angeles Times. It says: ''Scandals metastasize. That is the pattern since Watergate. What starts out looking like a small, isolated incident gradually reveals itself to be a part of a larger abuse of power. Meanwhile, an unraveling cover-up adds new elements. Is that happening now with the scandal over White House leaks of the identity of a CIA agent?''

As new elements of this unraveling cover-up are revealed, we should not lose sight of the larger abuse of power and the real scandal here.

As Chris Matthews said on Hardball on July 24: ''The larger scandal in this White House/CIA leak story is not just who leaked the name of an undercover agent, but whether we were given a case for war, the deciding factor for many of us, knowing that it didn't hold water. As we work to find our way out of Iraq, we should focus a bit . . . on how we got in.''

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve answers.

RECOGNIZING STEVE SAULS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Steve Sauls, an extraordinary advocate for the students and the school of Florida International University in my hometown of Miami.

As an experienced member of the administration and leadership at the university, Steve has worked incredibly hard to promote the needs and the interests necessary to make FIU the fine institution that it is today.

Steve is retiring from his current position as vice president of government affairs for the university after 14 wonderful and productive years and has accepted a job as vice president of corporate relations in a private sector firm. I know that Steve will be immensely missed at the university, my alma mater, and will leave a void that will be difficult to fill. I have no doubt that Steve will continue to lead and excel in his new position, and I wish him all the best and FIU all the best in the years to come.

□ 1015

SOCIAL SECURITY CELEBRATES ITS 70TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, we will be celebrating the 70th anniversary of Social Security, and that is 70 years of a guaranteed, promised benefit to all Americans of a certain age.

I have to say, I was interested to note that I looked on the Social Security Administration Web site, and I did not see any mention of the 70th anniversary. I think the reason is clear. This President, who basically is trying to dismantle Social Security, does not want the Social Security Administration to celebrate this landmark achievement.

Now, the President and House Republicans want Americans to forget how important Social Security has been for seniors and for the disabled for the last 70 years. It is a guaranteed benefit the Republicans want to turn into a risky privatization plan.

I know that the President continues to be on the road pushing his risky privatization plan. Most recently he was there with his mom, Mrs. Bush. And we are hearing that when we come back after the August break, we are going to see the Republican leadership in the House once again move forward with their privatization plan that is going to only aggravate Social Security's insolvency.

Remember: 70 years of a guaranteed benefit.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2361, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 392 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 392

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

This resolution waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, we now have before us the first appropriations conference report. The gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) and those who have been working with him on the House side, as well as on the Senate side, should be applauded for taking this appropriation process and concept of prioritization and presenting the product that we have before us. The Interior conferees have produced a conference report which is fiscally responsible and does live within strict budget discipline. It recommends for the fiscal year 2006 budget $26.2 billion, which is actually below last year's enacted level of $27 billion.

Even though the total number is lower, it still takes into account significant and important and high-priority items, such as wildland firefighting, $2.7 billion; a $61 million increase for our National Parks; a $31 million increase in our National Forest System; and $106 million increase for the Indian Health Service. Indian programs have been represented at a record $5.6 billion, which means the funding will provide for schools and hospitals, construction, education, human service needs, as well as law enforcement there.

With those increases there, it has to be significant, and there have to be offsetting balances somewhere else, and that is where the process of prioritization takes place. Once again, whether you like the total and the way it has been done, at least this committee has indeed done that process of prioritization.

I commend the Subcommittee chairman (Mr. TAYLOR); the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS); the ranking members who were involved in this, as well as all the conferees, for shepherding this measure, this funding measure through the conference process in a timely and orderly fashion in the midst of a very lean budget climate.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is obviously not perfect; none of these ever are. We are not totally happy with all of the aspects of it. I, for example, still have a concern over our process that we are doing with Payment in Lieu of Taxes, or the PILT program. This House was wise enough to fund that program at $242 million; the conference funds it at $6 million less, at $236 million. That still is $30 million above what the Senate tried to accomplish. This program, for example, is the basic funding for rural communities; it is rent that is due on the land that is government owned. If the Federal Government is going to own the land, they need to be able to fully support that.

Hope springs eternal, and we in the West will continue to work on this program in the future with the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR), the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), and others to make sure that these programs are adequately addressed in the future as well.

In closing, and notwithstanding these concerns, Mr. Speaker, the overall conference agreement is a good, bipartisan product. It has been done in a timely manner. It is the first one before us. It deserves our support.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleague from the majority mentioned, the rule is typical to that for all conference reports, and I will not oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not in opposition to the Interior and Environmental Appropriations conference report, but, rather, in disappointment that we have not done enough. Indeed, we live in trying times with enormous fiscal constraints, many of which we have brought upon ourselves. As the chairman and ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies will probably note today, they did the best that they could with what they were given. Indeed, they did, Mr. Speaker.

I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for their hard and, perhaps most important, their bipartisan work on this legislation. I do believe that they did the best with what the majority gave them.

The Interior conference report includes $84 million for Everglades restoration in my district and throughout