Mr. Speaker, this legislation not only repeals the excesses given to oil companies, our bill uses the money to create a Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve. This will invest in clean renewable energy resources and alternative fuels, promote new energy technologies, develop greater efficiency and improve energy conservation. Investing in alternative and renewable energies and efficiency is not only about protecting the environment and homeland security, it is about promoting new industry and creating jobs.

This type of new investment will help create jobs and support industries in northeast Ohio, where we are already working on new energy technology through organizations like the Ohio Fuel Cell Coalition, which is working to strengthen Ohio's fuel cell industry.

I am proud to say that this coalition includes the University of Akron and the Lorain County Community College in my congressional district. This investment in new energy technology, combined with new incentives and initiatives to make higher education more accessible recently passed by this Congress, will help ensure that our students have the education and the skills necessary for the jobs of the future.

That is what we are doing here today, eliminating the abuses of the past and investing in our Nation's future. Let's pass the CLEAN Energy Act.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 475, HOUSE PAGE BOARD REVISION ACT OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House H.R. 475; the bill shall be considered as read; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, and one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Reserving my right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I may not object, but I don't have a copy of what the gentleman, my friend, was talking about. If the gentleman would explain the motion, because I was not shown a copy before.

Mr. MCGOVERN. This is on the Page Board issue, and the explanation is here. My understanding is that your side has had a copy of this.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I have received it now. I certainly see no reason to object, and I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1045

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that this is the seventh bill that has come to this floor that has not gone through committee, that has not had ample opportunity for amendment in subcommittee or full committee, no opportunity for an amendment on the floor on any of these bills, nor the opportunity for our side of the aisle to offer a substitute.

I am encouraged that the Rules Committee this week has organized and met, but I would note that as the Rules Committee opened, the first debate on the first rule where there was going to be a rule on the bill yesterday, the chairwoman of the Rules Committee made it clear before there were any witnesses before the Rules Committee, before there was any testimony, before there was any discussion, that this would be a closed rule, there would be no amendments, and there would be no substitute offered to the Members on our side of the aisle.

I come here today to talk to my colleagues. The gentleman from Massachusetts who is managing this rule for the majority knows exactly what I am talking about. We have had this discussion here for a long time.

I understand the need for the majority party to want to make its move, to make its first impression; and I understand the first couple of bills had to come flying right to the floor. But we are short-circuiting democracy here, and I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand that.

On the opening day, when I handed the new Speaker the gavel, the first woman in the history of our country to be Speaker, I said that the House needed to work in a more bipartisan way. Over the course of the last several years, I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the need to work in a more bipartisan way.

I said also on the opening day that we do have different ideas about how to solve America's problems and that we should cherish the differences that we have, we should debate them, that we can disagree here without being disagreeable. I also said that we should be nice.

What I didn't say is that we shouldn't be silent, and I won't be silent on behalf of our Members on this side of the aisle.

I think that there is a lot to be gained in bringing legislation to the floor that has been through the subcommittee process, that has been through the committee process, that has an opportunity for a real Rules Committee debate and an opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments, to allow the minority the opportunity to offer a substitute. That is what the American people want. Our Members represent some 48 percent of the American people, and we are being silenced in this process.

I understand it is in the process. The new majority has only had the majority for 2 weeks. But I am here today to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to live up to the promises that were made, to live up to the desire to be treated fairly.

When we took control of this House in 1995, we had a lot of Members in the new majority then who said we ought to treat the Democrats the way they treated us, and I argued vociferously that that was not the right thing to do, that we should treat the new minority as we had asked to be treated. We worked and I worked to be sure that we were living up to our commitment to treat the then-Democrat minority as we wanted to be treated back in the early nineties when we were making an awful lot of noise.

Over the last year, there has been an awful lot of conversation coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they were in the minority to make things more fair.

Let me quote one of the pledges: ''Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.''

What we are asking for here is fairness, fairness in this process, so that all Members can participate in a deliberative process on behalf of our constituents. Our constituents are just as important as your constituents, and they have a right to be heard and their Members have a right to participate in this process.

So I ask my colleagues, when? When is the time going to come to live up to what you asked for, to live up to your promises, and to live up to your commitment?

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 233, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—184

Aderholt	Bachus	Bilbray
Akin	Baker	Bilirakis
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)
Bachmann	Biggert	Blackburn

Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Barton (TX)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Costa
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Donnelly
Engel
Johnson, Sam
Levin
Lucas
Marchant
McMorris Rodgers
Norwood
Peterson (PA)
Ramstad
Waters

□ 1122

Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. BERRY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. GOODLATTE, SOUDER, KNOLLENBERG, ISSA, and PLATTS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on this vote that just occurred, when the clock expired, the yeas were ahead of the nays and the majority of the Members were voted.

According to H. Res. 6, a recorded vote by electronic device shall not be held open for the sole purpose of reversing the outcome of such vote.

Would the Speaker agree with me that this vote then was in violation of the rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the gentleman is aware, the 15-minute period is a minimum and, in the case of the first vote of the day, and an unexpected vote at that, a longer time may be necessary to complete the vote.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Can the Speaker tell me how often the majority party will hold open votes on issues regardless of the result?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you very much. I appreciate your yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me confess off the top, it is true, I committed an act of honesty in the Rules Committee, something we hadn't seen in over 12 years.

I also explained at the time that rules H.R. 5 and H.R. 6 were coming up under the point of privilege with which we started this session.

We are working on an agenda that the minority would not or could not do and we are fulfilling our promise to the American people, and all the whining you can do and all that you can produce will not deter us from it. The majority is pleased and gratified by the minority votes on all of these issues.

I thought I heard a faint chorus yesterday after the bill on student loans was passed, I thought I heard someone singing, Free at last. Free at last.

Obviously, helping the majority to do these bills for the American people has not been any too painful for you. But these have not been addressed for 12 years. We said that we were going to. It was under the beginning rule of the personal privilege. There was nothing amiss there; we were simply being honest.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here in opposition to this rule. I don't feel as strongly about the bill because I don't really think the bill is a serious piece of legislation. I don't think it addresses the issues that need to be addressed.

I think the fact that this bill has come to the floor without going to committee, without any opportunity for debate, without the freshmen Members having any opportunity to ever be part of anything except one vote today is truly outrageous.

This should be the premier issue for this Congress. Energy independence and all of that affects everything we are, everything we do as a people. It affects foreign policy, it affects our international situation in so many ways, it affects the economy, it affects the environment. And here we are with a bill today that hopefully is just checking off the list and we really get back to serious discussions of energy legislation.

Mr. Speaker, energy independence is critically important, and it is not going to be achieved in this bill in this

way. This bill does take a problem, a problem that was created in 1998 and 1999, a problem that was created when the Secretary of the Interior failed to put in a contract, what the laws that we passed clearly allowed the Secretary of the Interior to do. It didn't happen later, it didn't happen in 2000, it never happened in the current administration. It was a problem. It is a problem in a contract. Whether that is worth 3 hours of debate on the House floor or not, I don't know. I do know that contracts are normally dealt with in a court of law, not on the floor of the House of Representatives.

This is a problem that was created by a past administration that needs to be clarified, but is so far off base from what we ought to be talking about today. We ought to be talking about energy independence for the country.

This rule doesn't allow us to have that kind of debate because the process didn't allow that kind of debate. I guess we are going to be told later today that we are at the end of the 100 hours, which is an interesting calculation in and of itself. And maybe when we will get to the end of the 100 hours, we can get this checklist. I wondered for some time why we didn't have an agenda that would last 100 days.

□ 1130

Since Franklin Roosevelt that has sort of been a mark of the work of the Congress. I have really decided there is not enough work here to do for 100 days, but these 100 hours are checking a list off that will not produce legislation that results in anything happening. At the end of the day today we hopefully can move on to the real business of this Congress, none of it more important than energy independence. This doesn't solve that problem, doesn't even take a significant step in solving that problem.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize once again that Chairman RAHALL, in his testimony before the Rules Committee 2 days ago, said that this was the first step, that there are a lot more issues that we need to address as a Congress to achieve our goal of energy independence, and we are going to do that. What we are doing today really is responding to the outcry of the American people who are outraged by the fact that in the midst of being gouged by Big Oil, the previous Congress decided to pass a bill to provide billions of dollars in subsidies and tax breaks to those very companies.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, let me yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I find it amusing to be lectured about energy independence and working hard to get things done from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who for the last 6 years could have solved these problems, but instead watched us sink further into dependence on foreign and polluting sources of energy.

In April 2005, President Bush was quoted as saying, ''With oil at more than $50 a barrel, energy companies do not need taxpayer incentives to explore for oil and gas.'' Then, even as prices went higher, he and the Republican Congress went ahead and gave them a goodie bag of taxpayer subsidies. Gas prices topped $3 per gallon, Big Oil made record profits of $97 billion, and record dependence on foreign oil still leaves us vulnerable to the whims of unfriendly regimes.

Today, we are going to take back the tax giveaways to Big Oil so we can give the American people a break at the pump, a breath of fresh air, and a more secure nation.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I obviously join my colleagues, rising in strong opposition to this closed rule, which did not allow for any kind of deliberation whatsoever.

I have to begin by saying that I am somewhat troubled at the fact that we continue to see this pattern of name calling from the other side of the aisle.

We recognize that we have begun a new Congress. I am very proud, as a Californian, that we have the first Californian and the first woman Speaker of the House of Representatives. I am very proud of that fact and I think it is a great thing. I am proud that our State has been able to do that. And she is the first Italian American Speaker of the House of Representative, and she always likes to state that, and I congratulate her for that.

I believe we need to, as members of the minority, give the benefit of the doubt to this new majority. It has been 12 years since they have been in the majority, and I think we should provide an opportunity for people to understand their new roles in this institution. But I have to say that while we have continued to have name calling—and the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee has just said that for the last 12 years the Rules Committee was dishonest. I don't know exactly what that means. I am very proud of the record that we have had the last 12 years in the majority in the Rules Committee, and I am proud of the fact that we have been able to put together strong policies to encourage economic growth in this country, we have been able to ensure that we have not had an attack on our soil since September 11. These kinds of policies have come from committees in the Congress, through the Rules Committee to the floor, and I am proud of that fact. So I don't know exactly what it means to simply say the Rules Committee has been dishonest for the last 12 years. We all know that there has been a lot of name calling that has come from the other side of the aisle.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are at a point right now where it is important for us to recognize that it is not about what we did, it is about what the new majority promised they were going to do.

Now, the distinguished Republican leader stood here and talked about the fact that we have, over the past several days, gone through this process right now; it has been under a closed rule. Yes, Speaker PELOSI announced there would be no opportunity for debate and discussion through the regular order process. So that was an announcement that was made. As the Republican leader said, the Chair of the Rules Committee announced before the process even began that we were going to have closed rules on both the education bill and on this energy bill. I have to say that it is a troubling indication because it is 180 degrees from what was promised by the new majority when they were in the midst of their campaign.

I have to also say, Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts get up and congratulate our friend from Miami for having supported a couple of the items. I am proud that I have supported a number of these items. I think something important to note is that at least half of the items in the Six for '06 were voted on and passed by the Republican Congress. Stem cell research, in a bipartisan way, passed. It would not have come to the floor had the Republican leadership not seen fit to bring it to the floor.

On the issue of the minimum wage, we brought to the House floor, Mr. Speaker, the issue of increasing the minimum wage. We simply said that we should recognize that those who create jobs might want to have the wherewithal to pay those people the minimum wage. And so we had a vote on that.

Earmark reform. We are very proud of the fact that last fall we passed very broad-sweeping earmark reform that enjoyed bipartisan support here.

So what we are doing in many ways on this Six for '06, Mr. Speaker, is simply voting again on initiatives that passed in a Republican Congress.

I also have to say that we passed lots of energy legislation in the past, and we have been able to see a reduction in oil costs. Oil prices are dropping right now. We continue to see that, and that is because of the fact that we want to encourage alternative sources and attaining domestic energy self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is just important for us to take a moment to look at this issue of fairness and balance and recognize that we do want to work in a bipartisan way, but the issue of this name calling I think should come to an end, and let's try to look to the future rather than the past.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule, and the underlying legislation, H.R.

6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007. I am a firm believer that Congress should do everything possible to address the Nation's energy needs and reduce our dependence on foreign oil while still protecting the environment and maintaining reasonable energy prices. I believe, however, that this bill falls short of fulfilling this responsibility. Not only that, the Democrats have shut out any hope of fixing the bill's problems by reporting a closed rule for H.R. 6.

The basis of this bill is very simple—it raises taxes on domestic oil producers and then turns around and spends that money to subsidize ethanol, solar energy, and windmills. In the process, Democrats also want to tell the market how to work. Common sense would tell us that if you increase the cost of domestic oil production by $10 billion, you are ensuring that U.S. imports of foreign oil will rise and domestic production will fall. These are basic market principles.

Consumers want affordable gas prices, Mr. Speaker, and unfortunately this bill does nothing to lower them. Raising taxes on firms in the oil and gas industries does nothing to lower the price of a barrel of oil. We all know that numerous factors affect gas prices—Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and OPEC members in the Middle East, for example. These are complex domestic and international market factors that are hard if not impossible to control. The Democrats are apparently oblivious to this reality.

We also understand that this bill would raise $5 to $6 billion in revenue by removing the tax breaks provided to the oil companies in the 2005 energy bill. But in fact, the Congressional Research Service has reported that the net impact of the 2005 energy bill was an increase in taxes to the oil and gas industry by some $300 million. So how will removing this provision help raise revenues? Furthermore, as Members of Congress, we want to enable companies to take every step forward in the exploration of domestic sources of oil and natural gas. It is counterintuitive to take away incentives for companies to participate in this exploration.

The Democrats talk about keeping America competitive, yet this legislation would impact a domestic company's eligibility to remain competitive with foreign manufacturers by repealing a 2004 tax provision that reduced the effective corporate income tax rate to 32 percent from 35 percent. Why would we deliberately put American producers at a disadvantage with their foreign competitors?

Included in this piece of legislation, which, I will remind my colleagues, did not receive any committee consideration in the 110th Congress, are provisions for a trust fund for alternative fuels. The Democrats say this trust fund money, created by funneling the revenue from abolishing crucial tax incentives and the tightening of royalty regulations, will accelerate the use of clean energy resources and alternative fuels and promote the research and development of renewable energy technologies. This trust fund is an idea that's been heralded by Members on both sides of the aisle. And the objectives that I just mentioned are surely noble ones. However, this bill creates a trust fund and then ends there. There is no mention in the bill as to how this new revenue is to be spent, just suggestions. In this respect, this is a bill with good intentions but no teeth.

Mr. Speaker, we are not arguing that more time and money deserves to be spent on the development of alternative energy. It should. In fact, studies have shown that between 2004 and 2006, investment in alternative energy doubled to $63 billion. And the market is responding. Venture capital funding of green-energy technologies has quadrupled since 1998. Members of Congress have submitted numerous amendments to H.R. 6 mirroring these efforts. The Rules Committee received almost 20 amendments with thoughtful suggestions as to how to direct trust fund money, and other productive approaches to solving our energy needs. Not one amendment, Mr. Speaker, was made in order. In fact, even before the Rules Committee had heard testimony from any of the amendment sponsors, Chairwoman SLAUGHTER announced that she would be granting a closed rule. The Democrats had already made up their minds and closed their ears before they even heard the first amendment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 was referred to four committees. In another instance in denying the due process and minority rights that Democrats promised the American people, those committees never once met on the bill at hand. Members on both sides of the aisle never had the chance to draft, review or amend the bill. The Democrats campaigned on honesty and openness, and heralded a new era in minority rights, but again have failed to live up to their promises. Again, they completely ignored regular order and pushed this bill to the front of the line, and the deficiencies in the bill are evident because of it.

Mr. Speaker, once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have missed yet another opportunity today to craft comprehensive legislation that would address issues that are important to the energy debate. During the 109th Congress, we worked with Members on both sides of the aisle on legislation that increased refinery capacity. This legislation received strong bipartisan support, and yet is noticeably absent from this legislation we have before us today.

This bill is just like Proposition 87—the 2006 ballot initiative that would have taxed California's home-produced oil in order to subsidize ''green technology'' alternatives. Thankfully those in my home state were smart enough to defeat Proposition 87, knowing full well it would have damaged California's home oil and gas industry, increased foreign oil consumption, and raised the energy bills of the state's residents.

Mr. Speaker, this bill raises taxes and raises prices at the pump. And all the American people are getting in return is a promise that we'll actually do something down the road. The new majority is well on its way to fulfilling another empty promise and at the expense of the American consumer. Let's vote down this rule, and force the majority to take this bill through committee where we can have a real energy bill with real solutions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished former chairman of the Rules Committee and the distinguished minority whip have made it clear that they are not impressed with the first 100 hours of this Congress, but the American people are and, quite frankly, that is what counts.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), who is a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, the issue for us in this Congress is procedure, but it is really about substance. In the last Congress, what happened was something that you can't make up. Oil companies have enjoyed $125 billion in profits over 3 years, were the beneficiaries of legislation that lowered taxes for them by about $14 billion. You can't make it up.

What this legislation is about is addressing that and for the first time taking a step in the direction of providing incentives for what every American knows is long overdue, and that is to provide incentives for alternative energy opportunities. We need that to strengthen our economy and create good jobs; we need that to strengthen our position in foreign policy so that we are independent; and we also need it to begin addressing global warming.

This legislation is the beginning, it is only a beginning. There is going to be an enormous amount of time for the committees to take up the large issues and for us together to take the broader steps that are required to become truly independent on energy.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to go to the Rules Committee the other evening. Of course it was after the distinguished Rules Committee chairwoman said that they weren't going to accept any of our amendments or a substitute. I made a comment at that point that I was essentially wasting my time in the committee, which is unfortunate.

Today we have an opportunity to debate in front of the American people what should be an important policy about energy independence, but this bill doesn't do anything like that, Mr. Speaker. All this bill does is get back at the oil companies. We had many members of the Rules Committee say essentially that it was vengeance. They didn't use the word ''vengeance,'' but essentially I believe that that was the point that they were making because they are putting up a facade that this bill actually does something to lower energy prices to the American people. In fact, all this does is roll back some tax cuts, specifically takes out oil and gas for domestic producers, does nothing to the Middle East producers, and now we are basically going to be left with a bill that isn't going to go anywhere. The majority knows it is not going to go anywhere, and that doesn't even include the process that we have gone through to get this legislation.

Earlier one of the speakers—I forget who said it—for the majority side said that the Republicans crafted their energy bills in the backrooms. Well, I would ask the majority if the backrooms included the subcommittees and the full committees, like the normal process that this Congress is supposed to go through where we have full committee debate, we have a bill introduced, we have debate on the bills.

Maybe that was the backrooms that you guys were referring to on the other side.

In this case, you essentially had a few staff people in the Speaker's office write up a bill. Then they put out a facade that this is going to lower the gas prices to Americans and lower energy costs and be the bridge to the next renewable energy trust fund that they are going to create.

It is interesting in the last Congress we had a bipartisan bill that did put money into a trust fund, but you know what we did? We went out and I said, let's take our resources that we have, like in Alaska, let's go and drill in ANWR. Let's put those royalties into a trust fund, and then we can bridge ourselves into the next generation of energy. That is good energy policy. Taxing small domestic oil producers in America is only hurting American-made energy.

I am frustrated not only by the policy that has been put out here as an end-all-be-all perfect solution to America's energy solutions, which it is not, but I am even more frustrated—and I normally don't come down here to speak on rules, but I had to come down here and speak on this rule because I was in the Rules Committee the other night and I wasted my time, and everyone in that committee wasted their time because the Rules Committee chairwoman said, before we even met, that she was not going to accept any amendments or even a substitute.

This is frustrating. I hope that the majority will live up to their promise to the American people and will have full open and honest debate.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just respond to the gentleman from California by saying to him that I appreciated him being in the Rules Committee. I thought his testimony was very thoughtful, and I look forward to his engagement in a lot of these issues as, again, the chairman of the Resources Committee said, this is the beginning, not the end.

I just want to point out one thing to him so he understands one thing, and that is, in the last year, when the Republicans were in control of the Congress, there were 34 rules provided to bills that were not reported out of committee. I point that out not to make a partisan point, but simply to kind of illuminate him on the fact that there were a lot of bills that no one ever saw before they came before the Rules Committee.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Florida, a member of the Rules Committee, Ms. CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, instead of giving away billions of dollars to big oil companies which made multibillion-dollar profits last year, the new Congress intends to chart a course in a new direction by investing in alternatives for the American people. This will help America become energy independent and ultimately lower the utility cost for average Americans.

Big Oil has held too much sway in the halls of Congress in past years. They even targeted drilling off of Florida's beautiful coastline, putting our tourism industry at risk. The Bush administration refused to get serious about a sensible and sustainable energy policy, even after President Bush proclaimed last year that our country is addicted to foreign oil.

The American people understand that what we really need is a far-sighted plan for energy independence, and they did vote for change. The new Democratic Congress will plan for a more sustainable future, independent of foreign oil entanglements that interfere with our foreign policy. The new Democratic Congress will encourage conservation and development of alternative fuels which in turn will lessen our dependence on polluting fossil fuels.

In my own district, the University of South Florida has developed initiatives at its Clean Energy Research Center to develop and promote new sources of alternative energy, and we can do more.

□ 1145

So let's take the first step together today and then commit to launching a broad new energy strategy for future generations.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

In 2005, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Energy Policy Act, or EPACT, the first comprehensive energy package enacted with bipartisan support in well over a decade. I supported it for one reason, because it made a much needed and sustained investment in the basic science and applied energy research that will end our reliance on foreign oil.

Congress and the Federal Government must make a steadfast commitment to support the development of advanced energy technologies and alternative fuels that will help end our addiction to oil and gasoline. That is why in the 109th Congress I introduced H.R. 6203, the Alternative Energy Research and Development Act. This bill reflected the latest research, the emergence of innovative technologies, and new ways of thinking about our power problems. Among other things, it supported the development of biofuels, solar and wind power, and battery technologies. It also promoted energy conservation in a number of important ways.

This bill received bipartisan support from the Science Committee. It was approved unanimously by this body in September of last year, but the other body, on the other side of the rotunda, failed to act on it before Congress adjourned. So why aren't these widely supported provisions included in the bill we are considering today? Good question.

I tried to offer an amendment to include provisions from H.R. 6203 in this bill. I went to the Rules Committee to explain my amendment and how it might contribute to our energy independence. But before I could speak, a decision had already been made by the Democratic leadership not to allow any amendments to this bill, not even those whose provisions had been passed unanimously just 4 months ago.

So how does this bill contribute to our energy independence, Mr. Speaker? I supported fixing the Clinton administration oil and gas leasing errors, but I believe we are missing the opportunity to take the next step. We should know where the money will go. Instead of creating a slush fund, as this bill does, for some unknown use in the indefinite future, we should take the steps today to invest in the kind of research, development, and demonstration projects outlined in H.R. 6203 that will ultimately lead to advanced energy technologies. We need to start today.

If we are serious about energy independence, we should put that money to work today as an incentive for consumers to become more energy efficient and use alternative fuels. This could be accomplished by extending and expanding the tax credits created in EPACT for the purchase of vehicles that run on alternative fuels. Let us lift the cap on the number of vehicles that can qualify for these credits. Let us expand incentives for the installation of alternative refueling infrastructure.

I introduced another bill in the last Congress that would do just that by using the revenue generated from repealing certain tax credits for oil and gas production. These are the kind of concrete initiatives that will bring us measurably closer to achieving true energy independence. These are the kind of worthy initiatives we should consider.

I will have to support this bill, I guess, but I think it could be better, so much better, and that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in strong support of the underlying bill, H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007.

Mr. Speaker, my State, New Hampshire, is a State known for its pragmatism. The energy crisis that this country faces is no mystery to my constituents. They see our independence on foreign energy sources, they see our climate changing, and they see the tax breaks for Big Oil while their own resources are stretched thin. They have

seen roller-coaster high prices at the pumps, giveaways to Big Oil, and those same Big Oil companies reporting record profits.

This should not be a Democratic or Republican issue because it is a common sense issue. And the bill we will consider today is a commonsense and much needed start to solving the problem. H.R. 6 would repeal the billions of dollars in subsidies given to Big Oil in the ill-conceived 2005 energy bill and reinvest those funds in clean renewable energy and energy efficiency.

The bill would require oil companies to pay their fair share in royalties, and would close glaring loopholes in the Tax Code. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill would create a Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve to unleash the entrepreneurial spirit in this country, to jump-start our investment in renewable and alternative energy resources, and to promote conservation and the development of critical new technology.

Energy independence is an issue of national security, it is an issue of jobs, and it is an environmental imperative. No issue is more important to our future or our children's future. Mr. Speaker, I am exceedingly proud of this new majority's 100-hour agenda, but I am perhaps most proud and most ardently supportive of H.R. 6.

It is time to invest in a new energy policy, and I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and support H.R. 6.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished friend from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and salute my colleagues for working at a concept really that we all agree on: Energy independence. I refer only to the second title in these comments, where I oppose the rule which says there will be no amendments.

Title II is the one where the Washington Post says ''This House bill would break its deadlock by imposing heavy penalties on firms that do not renegotiate on terms imposed by the government.'' They go on to say, ''This heavy handed attack on the stability of contracts would be welcomed in Russia and Bolivia.''

Let's look at just a couple of things that have occurred recently. In 2005, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez mandated private oil firms to cooperate with new contractual changes, much as we are doing in section 2. The investment from foreign firms, which is vital for Chavez's economic plan to succeed, are already being curtailed due to the uncertain investment environment.

In 2006, Bolivia threatened to expel oil companies that refused to agree to new terms on existing contracts. These actions were done for short-term increases in revenue, yet they are leading to massive economic problems in the country through the oil and gas industry.

Also, in Russia, 2006, companies such as Shell, Exxon, and BP have held valid oil and gas leases for years, yet Putin has declared that the agencies are going to pull these leases for a number of suspect reasons. In section 2, title II, we have those same sorts of heavy handed approaches that the Washington Post editorial complains about.

Our colleagues have said that President Bush refused to get serious. If getting serious is undermining the full faith and credit of this government, then I will agree that President Bush failed to get serious.

I had also heard a comment from one of my distinguished colleagues on the other side that this agenda includes things that the minority would not do, and I will agree the minority would not do those things which undermine the contractual basis of this government.

I think this bill should be back in committee to have the hearing and the amendments that would occur, because you know that these things are not valid and will not promote more production from U.S. companies but less.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Rules Committee for yielding.

I rise in support of this rule. I am a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I watched 2 years ago as my Republican colleagues larded up the Energy Policy Act. While we were trying to talk about energy efficiency and we were trying to talk about energy conservation, they were giving over $8 billion in tax breaks to the oil and gas companies, the companies that are making huge profits right now.

What this bill does is roll back that tax break as well as require the oil and gas companies to pay appropriate royalties to the government, appropriate royalties to the taxpayer.

This bill is looking forward. I am afraid my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are looking backwards. They are still talking about oil and gas. We on the Democrat side, however, get it. We understand that, yes, we are using oil and gas today, but we are also running out of oil and gas in the world and in this country and that we must have alternative energy sources.

So what do we do? We say, let's take this unnecessary tax break of $8 billion and let's collect our royalties and let's put that money in a trust fund to develop alternative energy, renewable energy that can last us well into the latter part of this century.

Now, personally, I am very enthusiastic about hydrogen fuel cell development because hydrogen fuel cell development definitely leads us down the road to energy independence. Hydrogen fuel cells don't have any emissions; they don't leave any emissions. Hydrogen fuel cells aren't dependent on foreign countries. It is a technology we can develop here in this country that will really make us energy independent and will also address the problem of global warming. But we must invest in it.

So let's not look backwards and give oil and gas companies more tax breaks. Let's look forward and invest in renewable energy, in hydrogen, in wind and solar, and the things we have in this country that can make us truly independent. I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the chairwoman's honesty earlier about the fact this was going to be a closed rule. We listened for 2 years about the whining on closed rules and the fact that it reflected a closed mind. So on our side, for the next 2 years, we will try to keep our whining to a minimum.

Words are inflammatory. Title I to this act says ''Ending Subsidies for Big Oil Act of 2007.'' I have a title I would like to put on title II of section 1, and that would be the ''Congressional Abrogation of Contracts Using Blackmail Act of 2007.'' We can throw these wild words around at each other all we want to.

I speak against the rule and the process. This is staff-developed underlying legislation. Not one Member of Congress had any input into it at a point in time where you could actually do something about it. There are flaws throughout it.

I offered an amendment yesterday, which turned out to be for no good reason, that would simply say if you are in fact going to hamper domestic production of crude oil, and clearly in the near term increased domestic production is a way to get us to the point where we are no longer as dependent on foreign oil, if this act works to hamper that, then it wouldn't take effect. In other words, get the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior to tell us this won't have a negative effect on oil production.

The other amendment I offered would simply say if you are taking those profits, whether you consider them obscene or not, if you are taking those profits and putting them back in the ground to find additional sources of domestic crude oil and natural gas, then this act wouldn't apply. Evidence shows the small oil companies, to which the tax provisions affect, not just Big Oil but it affects the small companies, those small E&P companies reinvest 617 percent of their profits back in the ground finding additional supplies.

The bill is flawed in its mechanics, and I will speak later this afternoon against the underlying concepts, but one of the flaws is, if I am an owner of one of those covered leases and I sell it to somebody else and am no longer in the loop, I am still covered and tainted with that until everybody else in that loop subjugates themselves to this

American government and renegotiates those contracts.

The price threshold mechanism is flawed. At 34.73 a barrel there is no threshold, yet at 34.75, I have a $9 pop, which means I am only really making $25 a barrel. These are the kind of things that, had it gone through committee, or I guess it did. Oh, it did not go through committee, that is right. This came straight to the floor without any input from anywhere else. Whether you agree with our positions or not, your closed mind on this issue is clearly evident in this.

My only caution is, and we have heard we are coming to the end of this railroad train, that the other side has now become so intoxicated with the power and authority that they have being in the majority, that they do not continue to misuse that power and authority and continue to ignore open debate and honest ideas and an exchange of honest ideas that the committee process typically allows and that brings better legislation to this floor and helps us address these things.

The consequence of the taint may be intended. I don't think it is, but we ought to know that. And there is no real way to know that without debate within the committee structure where there is adequate time to go at this.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this closed-minded rule, a little bit of whining just to keep up appearances, to vote against this rule, and I will speak against the underlying bill later this afternoon.

□ 1200

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill today is a historic bill. What it is going to do is to reclaim billions of dollars, the GAO says upwards of $10 billion, which will then be moved over from unnecessary tax breaks and royalty relief for oil and gas companies, and moved over to a Strategic Renewable and Energy Efficiency Reserve so that we can change the direction of energy in our country by just taking back that which is undeserved in tax breaks and royalty relief.

So, what's the issue? Well, the issue is that back in 1998 and 1999 the oil industry received royalty breaks that didn't require them to pay any royalties back to the American people, the American taxpayer, as they drilled on the public lands of our country.

What this bill does is it gives a choice to the oil and gas industry: either renegotiate those leases or pay a fee going forward for the drilling on those lands. And that money will then go into a trust fund for renewables, for energy conservation, for ethanol, so that we can move in a new energy direction for the 21st century. It is a quite simple formula.

Now, the royalty relief, the change in how royalties are collected, it has already passed here on the House floor. But it was then blocked by the Bush administration. The $9 fee was the Pombo amendment. That has already passed on the House floor. So we are not talking about things that haven't already been debated. We are not talking about things that have already passed. What we are talking about are things that the Bush administration then blocked from becoming law. And what the Democrats are adding is just that it be put into a renewable and a conservation and ethanol trust fund so that we can move this country into a new energy direction.

I hope that this rule passes, and then I hope that we have an overwhelming vote, as we have had twice before in the past, by the way, on this royalty issue by all Members of the House, so that we can finally move in a new direction for the 21st century in energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we will consider later today represents the important first step in charting a new direction for the Nation's energy policy. H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007, which repeals the unnecessary and wasteful tax breaks and royalty-free drilling rights for big oil and gas companies, and instead creates a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve that would invest in clean, renewable energy sources and clean alternative fuels like ethanol, as well as energy efficiency and conservation.

H.R. 6 will put an end to oil companies drilling for free on public land no matter how high oil prices climb. The Government Accountability Office has estimated that the American taxpayers stand to lose at least $10 billion from leases issued in the late '90s that do not suspend so-called royalty relief. H.R. 6 would correct this problem by barring companies from purchasing new leases unless they had either renegotiated their existing faulty leases or agreed to pay a fee on the production of oil and gas from those leases.

The House has already adopted the royalty relief fixes included in H.R. 6 by overwhelming, bipartisan votes. By a vote of 252–165, the House adopted the Markey-Hinchey amendment to the Interior appropriations bill to provide a strong incentive for these companies to renegotiate. The House also voted last year to impose a $9 per barrel fee on oil produced from these leases in a bill authored by former Resources Chairman Pombo. Both those provisions are in H.R. 6. So two times this House has said that we want to put real pressure to renegotiate on all the oil and gas companies holding those 1998–1999 leases.

However, the Bush administration has consistently opposed our efforts to bring every oil company holding one of these leases back to the negotiating table and it continues to oppose the provisions in H.R. 6 that would do so. Instead, the Bush administration has argued that we should allow oil companies to "voluntarily" renegotiate with the Minerals Management Service. However, of the 56 companies holding these leases, only 5 have voluntarily agreed to renegotiate. When billions of taxpayer dollars are at stake, that is simply not an acceptable rate of return. This bill says that it's time for the oil companies to stop playing Uncle Sam for Uncle Sucker.

Passage of H.R. 6 will allow us to begin to move in a new, clean direction on energy and put an end to the free ride that big oil has had under the Bush administration. H.R. 6 represents the beginning of a change in direction, away from subsidizing industries that don't need extra financial incentives, and towards the technologies that do need a helping hand and I urge its adoption.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. For 12 years, Mr. Speaker, I have engaged in an energy brain trust that would hopefully engage the industry but help to reform the industry. And so I say to my colleagues, today we are making that first step, not ignoring the industry, but opening our doors to engagement and discussion so that we can truly have a reformed energy industry that focuses on energy independence and security for the American people.

Now, we realize in 1998 and 1999 the price per barrel for oil was very low. And the administration, at that time, reasonably addressed the question of royalty relief. Today we have a different economic structure, and the price per barrel is $50-plus and up.

And so what is this Congress and this leadership doing? It is doing the right thing. It is making a determination that we can now place some $14 billion in trust to support clean alternative energy and, of course, renewables, renewables and alternative energy that have been proposed by Members on both sides of the aisle.

I look forward to an engagement of the energy industry so that it can diversify its own portfolio. It is necessary for our independence from foreign oil, and it is necessary for our homeland security.

But what we do not do in this bill is important. For example, we do not repeal refinery expansion expensing. We don't repeal the intangible drilling cost deduction, nor do we impose a windfall profits tax.

We are balanced. We are respectful of this process of engagement, and we don't repeal the natural gas line depreciation or the foreign tax credit.

And so we understand that the industry, one, has to work to ensure that it is productive and that it moves away from total dependence on foreign oil to give relief to the American people as they proceed to develop greater energy independence and conservation.

This is a good bill that focuses, in a balanced way, to begin the march toward energy reformation and opens the door towards new ideas for the energy industry that will allow energy independence and security for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6, which will create long-term energy alternatives for the Nation. The Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation, CLEAN, Act of 2007, includes two components that will roll back the unnecessary tax

benefits and costly federal oil and gas leasing provisions included in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The legislation would also help to correct the mistakes of the leases issued by the Interior Department between 1998 and 1999—which, if left unchanged, could cost the Federal Treasury an estimated $60 billion over the next 25 years.

The CLEAN Act calls for investing in clean, renewable energy by repealing $14 billion in subsidies given to Big Oil companies by requiring these companies which were awarded 1998 and 1999 leases for drilling without price thresholds to pay royalties or pay a fee. H.R. 6 also eliminates unnecessary tax deductions which exist in the tax code and in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. In the first ten years, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that these fees will generate $6 billion in revenue and the Joint Commission on Taxation estimates that the elimination of these deductions will result in $7.6 billion in revenue.

The CLEAN Act also creates a Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve which would promote energy efficiency by investing in clean, renewable energy and alternative fuels, promote new energy technologies, develop greater efficiency, and improve energy conservation. We cannot justifiably continue to allow big oil companies to reap astronomical financial benefits while the citizens of this country continue to struggle to pay their living expenses due to the outrageous cost of oil and gas.

These high costs derive primarily from our overwhelming dependence on foreign oil. The Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States imports nearly 60 percent of the oil it consumes. Moreover, the world's greatest petroleum reserves reside in regions of high geopolitical risk, including 57 percent of which are in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot even remotely begin to reduce the high price of oil and gas which has caused many of our citizens to change their standards of living, unless and until we find ways to create a more self-sufficient energy environment within the United States. Investing in clean, renewable energy is an important first step to achieving this goal. For example, an innovative solution to our national energy crisis is in the 21st Century Energy Independence Act, which I introduced in the 110th Congress. This legislation alleviates our dependence on foreign oil and fossil fuels by utilizing loan guarantees to promote the development of traditional and cellulosic ethanol technology. Investing in domestic alternatives such as traditional and cellulosic ethanol can not only help reduce the $180 billion that oil contributes to our annual trade deficit, but it can also end our addiction to foreign oil.

According to the Department of Agriculture, biomass can displace 30 percent of our Nation's petroleum consumption. In addition to ensuring access to more abundant sources of energy, replacing petroleum use with ethanol will help reduce U.S. carbon emissions, which are otherwise expected to increase by 80 percent by 2025. Cellulosic ethanol can also reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 87 percent. Thus, transitioning from foreign oil to ethanol will protect our environment from dangerous carbon and greenhouse gas emissions. Cellulosic ethanol technology requires initial governmental investment and policy support to achieve the necessary scale to become self-sufficient and gain market-penetrating capacity. That is why I introduced the 21st Century Energy Independence Act since it ensures that America achieves energy independence and improves our environment.

In addition to being from the energy capital of the world, for the past twelve years I have been the Co-Chair of the Energy Taskforce of the Congressional Black Caucus. During this time, I have hosted a variety of energy braintrusts, panels, conferences, and symposia designed to bring in all of the relevant players ranging from environmentalists to producers of energy from a variety of sectors including coal, electric, natural gas, nuclear, oil, and alternative energy sources as well as energy producers from West Africa. Bringing together thoughtful yet disparate voices to engage each other on the issue of energy independence has resulted in the beginning of a transformative dialectic which can ultimately result in reforming our energy industry to the extent that we as a Nation achieve energy security and energy independence.

The CLEAN Act strikes energy bill provisions suspending royalty fees from oil and gas companies operating in certain deep waters of Gulf of Mexico. The bill also repeals royalty relief for deep gas wells leased in shallow waters of the western and central areas of the Gulf. It includes a provision from the President's FY 2007 budget restoring drilling permit application cost recovery fees; fees which the 2005 Energy bill prohibited. The measure also strikes royalty relief for specific offshore drilling in Alaska, and special treatment for leases in the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska (NPR–A).

H.R. 6 requires companies, which unfortunately have been able to escape paying royalties as a result of the 1998 and 1999 leases, to pay their fair share in order to be eligible for new federal leases for drilling. Specifically, the measure requires current offshore fuel producers who are not paying federal royalties to either: (1) Agree to pay royalties when fuel prices reach certain thresholds, $34.73 per barrel for oil and $4.34 per million Btu for natural gas, or (2) to pay new fees established in the bill—in order to be eligible for new federal leases for drilling. Under the bill, a new conservation of resource fee would be based on the amount of oil produced and will apply to new and existing leases and shall be set at $9 per barrel for oil and $1.25 per million Btu for gas.

The changes regarding royalties offered under H.R. 6 are not entirely new. Similar royalty relief provisions have been debated and passed by the House as part of the OCS drilling bill, H.R. 4761, and in the Interior Appropriation bill with bipartisan support of 67 Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 would also close gaping loopholes and end gigantic giveaways for Big Oil in the tax code and in the 2005 Energy bill. The bill would eliminate a loophole written into the international tax bill, H.R. 4520, which allowed oil companies to qualify for a tax provision intended to encourage domestic manufacturing. According to the New York Times, this loophole provided ConocoPhillips $106 million in 2005, even though its profits totaled $13.5 billion.

The benefits which ConocoPhillips reaped from the tax loophole, represents just a snapshot of the lopsided picture that overwhelmingly favors the financial well-being of big oil companies over average American families. While big oil companies continue to rake in millions and millions of dollars, American families see their budgets shrinking because of high costs of oil and gas. It is our responsibility to refocus our legislative lenses on solving this Nation's energy dependence problem so that we may rescue American families from the recent oil and gas price hikes.

Because I represent the city of Houston, the energy capital of the world, I realize that many oil and gas companies provide many jobs for many of my constituents and serve a valuable need. That is why it is crucial that while seeking solutions to secure more energy independence within this country, we must strike a balance that will still support an environment for continued growth in the oil and gas industry, which I might add, creates millions of jobs across the entire country. We have many more miles to go before we achieve energy independence. Consequently, I am willing, able, and eager to continue working with Houston's and our Nation's energy industry to ensure that we are moving expeditiously on the path to crafting an environmentally sound and economically viable energy policy. Furthermore, I think it is imperative that we involve small, minority and women owned, and independent energy companies in this process because they represent some of the hard working Americans and Houstonians who are on the forefront of energy efficient strategies to achieving energy independence.

H.R. 6 is a vehicle by which we can drive this country in the direction of energy independence. Under this bill, we can invest in clean, renewable energy resources through the creation of the Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve which would: Accelerate the use of clean domestic renewable energy resources and alternative fuels; promote the utilization of energy-efficient products, practices and conservation; and increase research, development, and deployment of clean renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.

It is critical that some of the additional funding created by this bill is invested in small, minority and women owned business and minority serving institutions. By investing in minority owned business and minority serving institutions, we are ensuring that sectors of our Nation and economy which are often overlooked are given an opportunity to compete against much larger businesses and institutions of higher learning.

Madam Speaker, the changes we propose to the CLEAN Act will allow us to move this country in the right direction—the direction of becoming less dependent on foreign oil and in turn, more reliant on renewable energy. Because of these changes, we anticipate a win-win situation. These changes should stimulate the expansion of research into renewable energy because such changes positively impact oil companies that choose to reinvest in new and emerging technology. Thus, H.R. 6 offers great incentives for oil companies to contribute greatly to our efforts to create an energy-independent America.

Moreover, the provisions that oil companies care about the most are preserved under the CLEAN Act. In part due to the concerted effort of the Houston/Harris County delegation, this bill WILL NOT include the following provisions: (1) Repeal of last-in-first-out (LIFO) accounting; (2) Refinery expansion expensing repeal; (3) Imposition of a windfall profits tax; (4) Repeal of intangible drilling costs deduction; (5)

Repeal of natural gas distribution lines depreciation; and (6) Foreign tax credit repeal.

For all of the foregoing reasons, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6 to create long-term energy alternatives and to create a more energy-independent and secure America.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, as we debate this rule and debate how we are going to debate this rule, an F–16 is burning 25 gallons of fuel every minute. A Stryker combat vehicle on which our troops travel is traveling at the rate of about 7 miles per gallon. I was on a C–17 recently. It is burning 3,000 gallons an hour.

Energy is a national security issue. It is a vital national security issue. And we can't afford to continue to debate the debate to adjourn this House. The decision before to ask this House to adjourn, I think, is emblematic of failed energy policies. There is no more debating or delaying. It is time to act.

Last year the Department of Defense spent $10.6 billion on basic energy costs. Of that, the Air Force spent $4.7 billion on one thing, buying fuel for its planes.

Now, I believe in a robust defense. We have got some significant challenges in the world. China is a significant challenge. Iran is a significant challenge. But the policies on energy that we have had for the past 6 years have put us in the position where we are borrowing money from China to fund our defense budgets, to fuel our military, which requires buying oil from the Persian Gulf to protect us from China and the Persian Gulf. How does that make sense? It makes no sense.

I was in China just several weeks ago. They are going to reduce their energy consumption by 20 percent and keep growing, and increase their use of renewables, while we continue to rely on our adversaries to power our military to protect us from our adversaries.

This dependence on foreign oil, Mr. Speaker, is as glaring a threat to our national security as Sputnik was, as the Cold War was, as the space race was. And our answer to those threats was, we will research and develop and manufacture and engineer and land men on the Moon by the end of the decade. We confronted those threats and beat those threats.

It is time to quit debating and quit delaying and quit stalling. It is time to put the protection of our troops ahead of the profits of the big oil companies. It is time to understand that this is a critical national security issue that has been tried and debated and delayed for 30 years. It is time to act now.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we are so concerned about and opposed to this process of having closed out all of the Members from bringing forth their ideas to improve this legislation is because we seriously believe that this legislation, as drafted, if it were to become law, would increase our dependence on foreign oil. That is why we are so adamant in our opposition to the unfairness of the process, because of the product that this process has brought forward.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can amend this closed rule and allow the House to consider H.R. 6 under a fair and open process. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to consider H.R. 6 under an open rule. This is the least we can do for the Members of this Congress who have had absolutely no input into this far-reaching piece of legislation, or any other piece of legislation that has been brought to the House floor so far. By considering this bill under an open rule, Members will be finally afforded an opportunity, for the first time in the 110th Congress, to offer meaningful amendments to this bill. For the new majority it is a novel concept, I know. In fact, it is the very concept, though, on which they campaigned. This vote on the previous question represents their last opportunity to live up to their promise to join together in these first 100 hours to make this Congress, in their words, the most honest and open Congress in history; and yet they have closed the process completely down and allowed no amendments by no Member from either side of the aisle.

According to the official 100-hour clock, and I see the clock there, Mr. Speaker, we are only about 35 hours into the first 100 hours. That means we have approximately 65 hours left. If this is, as we are informed, the last item of the Six in '06, 100 hours in '06, agenda, it seems to me that we have plenty of time to consider this bill under an open and fair rule, rather than closing out all the Members and rushing it to the floor as they have.

By defeating the previous question, we will give the Democrats the opportunity to live up to their campaign promises of a more open and transparent legislative process. Let's allow all Members, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to create a real energy bill with real answers to diminish, not increase, our dependence on foreign oil.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me, first, begin by reiterating something that has been said many times here.

One of the great features of H.R. 6 is that it would create a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve. It could be used to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Everybody talks about wanting to become energy independent, but they don't want to do anything about it; and this would actually create a reserve to do that, to accelerate the use of clean domestic renewable energy resources and alternative fuels, to promote the utilization of energy-efficient products and practices and conservation, and to increase research development and deployment of clean renewable energy and energy-efficient technologies.

Again, this is the beginning of our dealing with this issue. There is a lot more to do. And I look forward to more debates and hearings and more ideas from Members from both sides of the aisle to figure out how we can achieve our goal of energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for participating in the debate today. Over the past 100 hours, this House has made tremendous progress in addressing the needs of the American people. We have strengthened the ethical rules of this House. We have made the homeland safer by adopting the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. We have given low-wage workers a much needed raise. We have embraced the promise of stem cell research. We have made student loans and prescription drugs more affordable.

And with the passage of this rule and the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007, we will take our energy policy in a new direction, toward cleaner, renewable energy and away from tax giveaways to huge oil and gas companies.

If you want the same old same old, vote against this rule and vote against the underlying bill. If you want a new direction, then support the rule and support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with a word about process. I understand the concerns expressed by my friends on the other side of the aisle. I served in the minority party during the last Congress, and I suspect my friends are worried that they will be treated as poorly and disrespectfully as we were.

I was here when the Republican majority passed exactly one open rule on a non appropriations bill. I was here when votes were held open for 3 hours to change people's votes. I was here when special interests provisions were tucked into conference reports after they were signed.

This House is broken, Mr. Speaker, and the Democratic majority was elected to fix it, and that is what we are going to do.

All I can tell my friends on the other side of the aisle is what I believe. I believe that every Member of this House deserves to be respected. I believe that one party does not hold a monopoly on good ideas; and I believe that openness should be the rule, and not the exception. And all I can offer my friends is my word that I will work as hard as I possibly can to make sure that this

House runs in a more open, democratic fashion than was the norm over the past 12 years. We will not be perfect, because human endeavors never are. But we will be better.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 66 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

''That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived except those arising under clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed three hours, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII.

Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.''.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and 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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Edwards
Johnson, Sam
Levin
Lucas
McMorris Rodgers
Norwood
Ramstad

□ 1237

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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 230, noes 194, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

AYES—230

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Edwards
Johnson, Sam
Levin
Lucas
McMorris Rodgers
Napolitano
Norwood
Ramstad

□ 1247

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:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 36, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 66, I call up the bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6

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 ''Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act of 2007'' or the ''CLEAN Energy Act of 2007'' .

TITLE I—DENIAL OF OIL AND GAS TAX BENEFITS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Ending Subsidies for Big Oil Act of 2007''.

SEC. 102. DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 199(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to exceptions) is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting '', or'', and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

''(iv) the sale, exchange, or other disposition of oil, natural gas, or any primary product thereof.''.

(b) PRIMARY PRODUCT.—Section 199(c)(4)(B) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

''For purposes of clause (iv), the term 'primary product' has the same meaning as when used in section 927(a)(2)(C), as in effect before its repeal.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 199(c)(4) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i)(III) by striking ''electricity, natural gas,'' and inserting ''electricity'', and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii) by striking ''electricity, natural gas,'' and inserting ''electricity''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2007.

SEC. 103. 7-YEAR AMORTIZATION OF GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL EXPENDITURES FOR CERTAIN MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special rule for major integrated oil companies) is amended by striking ''5-year'' and inserting ''7-year''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—ROYALTIES UNDER OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASES

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Royalty Relief for American Consumers Act of 2007''.

SEC. 202. PRICE THRESHOLDS FOR ROYALTY SUSPENSION PROVISIONS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall agree to a request by any lessee to amend any lease issued for any Central and Western Gulf of Mexico tract during the period of January 1, 1998, through December 31, 1999, to incorporate price thresholds applicable to royalty suspension provisions, that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)). Any amended lease shall impose the new or revised price thresholds effective October 1, 2006. Existing lease provisions shall prevail through September 30, 2006.

SEC. 203. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE PRICE THRESHOLDS FOR CERTAIN LEASE SALES.

Congress reaffirms the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under section 8(a)(1)(H) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)(H)) to vary, based on the price of production from a lease, the suspension of royalties under any lease subject to section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (Public Law 104–58; 43 U.S.C. 1337 note).

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY FOR NEW LEASES AND THE TRANSFER OF LEASES; CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES FEES.

(a) ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not issue any new lease that authorizes the production of oil or natural gas in the Gulf of Mexico under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) to a person described in paragraph (2) unless—

(A) the person has renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the person to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)); or

(B) the person has—

(i) paid all fees established by the Secretary under subsection (b) that are due with respect to each covered lease for which the person is a lessee; or

(ii) entered into an agreement with the Secretary under which the person is obligated to pay such fees.

(2) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person referred to in paragraph (1) is a person that—

(A) is a lessee that—

(i) holds a covered lease on the date on which the Secretary considers the issuance of the new lease; or

(ii) was issued a covered lease before the date of enactment of this Act, but transferred the covered lease to another person or entity (including a subsidiary or affiliate of the lessee) after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any other person or entity who has any direct or indirect interest in, or who derives any benefit from, a covered lease;

(3) MULTIPLE LESSEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), if there are multiple lessees that own a share of a covered lease, the Secretary may implement separate agreements with any lessee with a share of the covered lease that modifies the payment responsibilities with respect to the share of the lessee to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(B) TREATMENT OF SHARE AS COVERED LEASE.—Beginning on the effective date of an agreement under subparagraph (A), any share subject to the agreement shall not constitute a covered lease with respect to any lessees that entered into the agreement.

(b) CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior by regulation shall establish–

(A) a conservation of resources fee for producing Federal oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico; and

(B) a conservation of resources fee for nonproducing Federal oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico.

(2) PRODUCING LEASE FEE TERMS.—The fee under paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) subject to subparagraph (C), shall apply to covered leases that are producing leases;

(B) shall be set at $9 per barrel for oil and $1.25 per million Btu for gas, respectively, in 2005 dollars; and

(C) shall apply only to production of oil or gas occurring—

(i) in any calendar year in which the arithmetic average of the daily closing prices for light sweet crude oil on the New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX) exceeds $34.73 per barrel for oil and $4.34 per million Btu for gas in 2005 dollars; and

(ii) on or after October 1, 2006.

(3) NONPRODUCING LEASE FEE TERMS.—The fee under paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) subject to subparagraph (C), shall apply to leases that are nonproducing leases;

(B) shall be set at $3.75 per acre per year in 2005 dollars; and

(C) shall apply on and after October 1, 2006.

(4) TREATMENT OF RECEIPTS.—Amounts received by the United States as fees under this subsection shall be treated as offsetting receipts.

(c) TRANSFERS.—A lessee or any other person who has any direct or indirect interest in, or who derives a benefit from, a lease shall not be eligible to obtain by sale or other transfer (including through a swap, spinoff, servicing, or other agreement) any covered lease, the economic benefit of any covered lease, or any other lease for the production of oil or natural gas in the Gulf of Mexico under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), unless—

(1) the lessee or other person has—

(A) renegotiated all covered leases of the lessee or other person; and

(B) entered into an agreement with the Secretary to modify the terms of all covered leases of the lessee or other person to include limitations on royalty relief based on market prices that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)); or

(2) the lessee or other person has—

(A) paid all fees established by the Secretary under subsection (b) that are due with respect to each covered lease for which the person is a lessee; or

(B) entered into an agreement with the Secretary under which the person is obligated to pay such fees.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) COVERED LEASE.—The term ''covered lease'' means a lease for oil or gas production in the Gulf of Mexico that is—

(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) issued by the Department of the Interior under section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 104–58); and

(C) not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(2) LESSEE.—The term ''lessee'' includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 205. REPEAL OF CERTAIN TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED ROYALTY RELIEF FOR THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY.

(a) REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005.—The following provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58) are repealed:

(1) Section 344 (42 U.S.C. 15904; relating to incentives for natural gas production from deep wells in shallow waters of the Gulf of Mexico).

(2) Section 345 (42 U.S.C. 15905; relating to royalty relief for deep water production in the Gulf of Mexico).

(3) Subsection (i) of section 365 (42 U.S.C. 15924; relating to the prohibition on drilling-related permit application cost recovery fees).

(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLANNING AREAS OFFSHORE ALASKA.—Section 8(a)(3)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''and in the Planning Areas offshore Alaska'' after ''West longitude''.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA.—Section 107 of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (as transferred, redesignated, moved, and amended by section 347 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (119 Stat. 704)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (i) by striking paragraphs (2) through (6); and

(2) by striking subsection (k).

TITLE III—STRATEGIC ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLES RESERVE

SEC. 301. STRATEGIC ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLES RESERVE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For budgetary purposes, the additional Federal receipts by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be held in a separate account to be known as the ''Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve''. The Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve shall be available to offset the cost of subsequent legislation—

(1) to accelerate the use of clean domestic renewable energy resources and alternative fuels;

(2) to promote the utilization of energy-efficient products and practices and conservation; and

(3) to increase research, development, and deployment of clean renewable energy and efficiency technologies.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) BUDGET COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, providing funding for the purposes set forth in subsection (a) in excess of the amounts provided for those purposes for fiscal year 2007, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress shall make the adjustments set forth in paragraph (2) for the amount of new budget authority and outlays in that measure and the outlays flowing from that budget authority.

(2) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are to be made to—

(A) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(C) the budget aggregates contained in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget as required by section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(3) AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not exceed the receipts estimated by the Congressional Budget Office that are attributable to this Act for the fiscal year in which the adjustments are made.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under what rule are we considering H.R. 6?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule that the House just adopted.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Does the rule under which we are considering H.R. 6 allow any amendments to H.R. 6?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only through the motion to recommit.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, because of the rule being adopted on the floor, I demand the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman demands the question of consideration. Under clause 3 of rule XVI, the question is: Will the House now consider H.R. 6?

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—193

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bachus
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Chandler
Holt
Johnson, Sam
Levin
Lucas
McMorris Rodgers
Murphy, Patrick
Norwood
Ramstad

□ 1308

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 66, debate shall not exceed 3 hours, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) each will control 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

We are here to take one small and bipartisan step toward making clean renewable energy a reality in America. And imagine my surprise, Big Oil doesn't think it is a good idea. But let's set the stage for this debate.

Two years ago, Big Oil muscled their way into a corporate tax break they had never earned and didn't need. They are siphoning off $1 billion a year right out of the pockets of U.S. taxpayers, and they want it to last forever, right along with $10 billion in quarterly profits that they have been reporting.

Their answer to everything is more drilling and more money. The President completely agrees. He thinks it is unfair of us to expect Big Oil to actually earn money. He would actually just give it to them. That is what they think; that is what the American people face.

According to a report by the Department of Energy, it is expected that 86 percent of our energy supply will come from oil, coal, and natural gas in the year 2030. That is the same proportion of our energy consumption that carbon provides today.

That same report states that we should expect oil, gas, and coal prices to continually climb. In other words, if this country does not pursue a radically different approach to energy, we can expect dirty air, more pain at the pump, and more reliance on foreign oil.

The bill before us takes the vital first step in the pursuit of a new energy policy that looks to American innovation to provide renewable energy. This bill is a down payment, and only that, on a commitment to an energy policy that is fitting for the 21st century. The bill before us is fundamentally fair.

In 2004, the Congress sought to help American manufacturers better compete in the global economy, but in doing so they provided a 10 percent reduction in the Federal taxes owed by Big Oil. That translates into a tax subsidy for over $1 billion a year, a real boondoggle.

What is more, the Congress gave this subsidy to oil at a time when the industry was enjoying recordbreaking

profits that were resulting from $60 a barrel oil. That is wrong. Today we take the first step back in the right direction.

Today we're taking the taxpayer money and putting it to better use. Today the House of Representatives will decide that it's wiser to invest in renewable energy, innovation, and a future for our economy and our planet.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle have proposed a so-called energy bill that they claim will promote America's energy independence. In reality, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats have presented the House Chamber with a placebo that will ultimately reduce domestic energy production, give American energy companies less of a reason to invest in exploration here at home, encourage greater dependence on foreign oil, and damage America's manufacturing base.

H.R. 6 has become another political football for the Democratic Party. And, frankly, Mr. Speaker, as The Washington Post rightfully editorialized yesterday, energy policy deserves more serious treatment.

The Democrats' solution to America's energy crisis is to single out oil and gas producers for a tax increase. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not likely to impact oil producers' profits in any way, shape, or form. This is energy policy by focus group, not a serious prescription for achieving America's energy future.

The one thing that we can be assured that this bill will do is raise prices at the pump for America's consumers. Furthermore, it creates disincentives that will decrease the supply of domestic natural gas and oil and increase our country's energy imports.

While H.R. 6 not only forces our country to become more dependent on foreign oil, it will also force America's working families to bear the brunt of increased energy costs.

The $6.6 billion tax increase embedded in this bill will inevitably be borne entirely by consumers in the form of higher gasoline and home energy prices. The effects of high gas prices will ripple throughout the economy, increasing prices on everything from electronics to school supplies. Like the Keystone Kops, the House leadership aims at one target but ends up hitting the American public.

□ 1315

In addition, the Democrats have yet to detail what exactly they will do with an additional $14 billion in revenue. In my view, such excess revenue will provide the Democratic leadership with a liberal slush fund to curry favor with one industry over another.

If Democrats want to invest in new energy technologies, they should debate and define their priorities openly. This, Mr. Speaker, is political pork barrel at its worst.

Finally, H.R. 6 is an assault against America's manufacturing base. Using nearly one-third of the Nation's energy, both as fuel and feed stock, energy production is the very heart of American manufacturing. With such an energy-intensive industry, raising energy prices will make domestic manufacturers less competitive in the world market. This is one reason why the National Association of Manufacturers has firmly opposed this bill.

By making the oil and gas industries ineligible for the section 199 deduction for domestic manufacturing activities and changing current amortization rates for the geological and geophysical costs incurred in energy exploration, H.R. 6 will further erode the U.S. comparative advantage, forcing more and more of our good-paying manufacturing jobs overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated for a comprehensive energy policy to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and increase America's access to clean, affordable and dependable energy for their cars, homes and businesses. H.R. 6 is simply not the answer.

This legislation is bad energy policy and bad tax policy which explains why the Democratic leadership shoehorned it through the process without a committee markup or even a single public hearing.

We must stand up for American manufacturers, stand up for American consumers, and preserve our domestic energy supply. So I urge my colleagues to join me today in opposing H.R. 6 and supporting the Republican alternative.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. McDERMOTT for yielding me this time.

After I got done hearing my friend from Pennsylvania speak, I was reminded once again of a recurring theme in this town from Republicans: have they ever met a special interest they didn't love.

The struggles of Big Oil: profits last year of 117 percent. Remember as we heard these arguments just a couple of minutes ago from those champions of the average guy, as they would have you believe today, these are the people who in a craven moment in the closing days of the 109th Congress tied an increase in the minimum wage to repeal of the estate tax, conveniently forgetting about that individual who had to work one day a week at minimum wage just to fill their gasoline tanks.

This is good policy. It is sensible, and it speaks to the idea of returning $14 billion to the Treasury that will be redirected to renewable and energy-efficient programs resulting in a cleaner and more efficient America where both consumer and business reap the benefits.

Advancing progressive energy will wean us off of foreign oil, which all Americans agree is needed. It has been said that American needs another Manhattan Project, not to create weapons of mass destruction, but to create masses of jobs by harnessing America's technological innovation.

We all know how many jobs have been lost due to foreign competition, and we are going to continue to lose them if we fail to make the necessary investments in energy technology and the people who are behind the research and its development.

Put the American people and their interests first here. The idea that we would drill on public land and not seek some sort of compensation for the Federal Government, relief for the taxpayer, is ridiculous.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and a strong advocate of energy policy, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

(Mr. WELLER of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today politics trumps policy. If regular order had been followed in this House, allowing this tax increase to go through the Ways and Means Committee, we would have a better understanding of the consequences of today's $14 billion tax increase.

You know, if the House of Representatives was subjected to the truth-in-labeling requirement, H.R. 6 would be called the Ship Jobs Overseas Act because it imposes a $14 billion tax increase on investing in America.

We have all heard the campaign rhetoric; both sides use it: you know, the Tax Code sends jobs overseas. Well today, this House may well do that if it votes to pass this $14 billion tax increase.

I support replacing imported oil with home-grown biofuels like ethanol and biodiesel, as well as alternatives sources of energy like wind power and solar. And thanks to the energy bill we passed in the previous Congress, there are hundreds of millions of dollars in new wind investment in the district I represent, six new ethanol and biodiesel plants moving forward in our districts; and because I am concerned about climate change, I believe we need to do more.

That is why I believe 25 percent of our energy that we consume by 2025 should come from nonfossil fuel sources.

This bill doesn't do anything about that because H.R. 6 only raises taxes. I would note that one of the biggest refineries in America is in the district I represent, providing 600 jobs. That particular company is investing $1 billion right now to expand. They chose to expand in America, creating American jobs. They could have expanded in Venezuela, making Hugo Chavez happy; but they chose to invest here. And what is their reward? Higher taxes.

That is why this legislation, H.R. 6, should be called the Ship Jobs Overseas

Act. Think about it, if you invest in energy in America, you invest in oil and natural gas development in America, my friends on the other side of the aisle want you to pay higher taxes. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6, the Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act of 2007. I rise in opposition because this bill before us today will make our country more dependent on foreign oil and less secure.

It's pretty safe to say that every Member here supports the goal of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. It's a national security issue and it hits home every single day when people go to the pumps to fill up their vehicles.

And I agree with the concept of this bill that our Nation must invest in renewable sources of energy like ethanol, biodiesel, wind and solar. In the upcoming weeks I will be introducing multiple pieces of legislation that will increase our use of renewable energy and I look forward to working in a bipartisan way with those in the majority to make some of these ideas a reality.

What really doesn't make sense to me is that, in this bill, the majority do the complete opposite of achieving the goal of reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

They are going to raise the taxes of oil companies that produce oil here domestically and make it more difficult to produce oil here at home.

In my district, ExxonMobil has one of the largest domestic refineries in the country, employing approximately 509 people.

Over the last 5 years, they have invested more than $500 million in the Joliet Refinery of which about $300 million was for equipment to produce low sulfur gasoline and ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel.

In 2007 and 2008 they plan to invest more than $400 million to install additional control equipment.

Now, by passing this bill, we are going to be sending the message to companies like Exxon who by 2008 will have invested close to a billion dollars in central Illinois, saying "Thanks for investing in America, now we are going to raise your taxes."

Bills just like this here before us today should be labeled "the send jobs overseas act" because that is exactly what it will do. Close to a thousand energy related jobs in my district and the approximately 1.8 million jobs in the U.S. are put in jeopardy now because of this policy that discourages investment in America.

And who are the big winners of this bill? Leaders like Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and OPEC who are watching this and loving the fact that we are passing punitive tax policy on domestic energy producers.

With the Energy Policy Act of 2005, we took steps forward in reducing our dependence on foreign oil by creating policy that increased the use of renewable energy in tandem with increasing our domestic production of energy sources.

Due to the Energy bill, we have seen hundreds of millions invested in wind energy and four to five new ethanol and biodiesel plants in my district. In total, we saw investment in renewable energy double in the United States to $68 billion.

We need to go back to those roots of encouraging investment here in the United States.

This bill makes us less secure and more dependent on foreign oil.

Vote against this send jobs overseas act that will raise taxes and discourage investment here in America.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my gentleman friend from Illinois that the United States is among the lowest countries in the world in terms of corporate taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2⅓ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. MCDERMOTT, the gentleman from Washington, for yielding me this time and bringing this piece of legislation to us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. More than ever, we need to get our priorities straight. We need to stop helping big oil companies and start helping American families. We need to stop dancing while Rome burns and reverse the damage we have done to our environment.

Oil companies are making record profits. They do not need our help. They are not begging for our help. They made more than $96 billion in profit in 2006. It is time to end the massive giveaway to the big oil companies. It is time to end corporate welfare. It is time to take taxpayer dollars back from the oil companies and use them to solve our energy problems.

It is our moral duty to use other forms of energy, and H.R. 6 starts us on this process. Global warming can no longer be ignored. 2006 was one of the hottest years on record. The weather in Washington during the last 2 weeks has felt more like the warm weather I am used to in my home State of Georgia. We need to act now. H.R. 6 will start to address global warming and turn back the damage we are doing to our environment.

We also need to reduce our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. It is our duty to help inspire the next generation of energy technology: hydrogen, ethanol, wind and other sources of energy that will not harm our little planet, our little spaceship we call Earth.

The American people need relief from energy costs. By improving our energy efficiency, we can all spend less to light and heat our homes and fuel our cars with gas.

Do the oil companies really deserve tax breaks while they earn billions of dollars in profits? It is time to end this waste. It is not right. It is time to start improving our quality of life. The people have a right to know what is in the air we breathe and what is in the water we drink. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege now to yield 3 minutes to a strong advocate of a strong American energy policy, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6, the so-called CLEAN Energy Act of 2007. I oppose this bill because in it our Democratic friends are putting America's security and economic vitality at risk. This bill is fundamentally a tax-increasing and job-destroying piece of legislation that will result in less energy independence, not more.

Mr. Speaker, there are several provisions within this bill that I take exception to. As one of the Representatives from Oklahoma, I would focus on a particularly onerous provision that will assist in the destruction of small American producers in the domestic oil and gas industry.

In 2005, the Republicans worked for and passed legislation with substantial Democratic support creating clear incentives for domestic production of oil. That policy contributes directly to our efforts to achieve energy independence in America. Today, the Democratic Party claims the oil and gas industry has become too profitable and believes this industry needs to be reined in by burdening it with increased taxes. This conclusion is wrong, and the end result will be increased reliance on foreign oil production, less energy independence here in America, and higher prices for every American consumer.

This legislation is based on the false premise that the oil and gas industry is too profitable. In fact, according to the Census Bureau and the American Petroleum Institute: ''The oil and gas industry earned 8.5 cents on every dollar of sales compared to 7.4 cents for all U.S. manufacturing, mining and wholesale trade.'' The API further states: ''For the last 5 years, the oil and gas industry has earned 5.9 cents compared to an average for all U.S. industry of 5.2 cents for every dollar of sales.'' This is hardly greedy or out of line with other U.S. businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the negative ripple effects of this tax on one of the most basic industries in America are dire; and this will affect the whole oil and gas industry, both large and small. Eliminating this tax break is certain to increase the price of gasoline, natural gas and heating oil, as the extra costs will be passed on to consumers. Consumers should oppose it for the same reasons they oppose taxes on imported oil and gas production: it will raise prices. Moreover, it will discourage domestic energy exploration, extraction, production, and refining, thereby making America more dependent on foreign sources of oil and gas. And it will harm State and local economies as smaller producers are forced to shut down marginal wells. Oklahoma has roughly 70,000 wells producing less than 10 barrels of oil a day, and these will be among the first wells to close down due to unsustainable costs in this tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 will have profound and long-lasting harmful effects on our economy and our security. Overall, this bill takes our country in the opposite direction than the one in which we need to go. H.R. 6 is nothing more than a ploy by the Democratic Party to create political sound bites at

the expense of sound energy policy. Frankly, I hope my Democratic friends from energy-producing States do not feel compelled out of blind partisan loyalty to vote for this bill.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I am a Democrat representing an energy-producing State, and I will be proudly supporting this bill.

This bill creates a very important reserve, a reserve that will serve as a funding base for our efforts to significantly expand critical research in order to develop greater energy independence for our country while continuing those tax credits that have been absolutely essential to the growth of renewable fuels in our country.

We face the promise of not looking to the Middle East, but looking to the Middle West for our energy future, and we are seeing across the plains of this country wonderful developments. A 10-fold increase of ethanol production alone in my State is under construction at the present time due essentially to these tax credits that continue to fuel this revolution.

What about the issues of a new tax, something that will crack people right at the pump. The reality is we are addressing something that was slipped into a massive bill dealing with the tax needs of manufacturers.

□ 1330

As we restructured the tax base on the Nation's manufacturers, in light of international trade pressures, we constructed a bill, moved the bill forward, and at no point in the debate in the Ways and Means Committee or on the floor of the House was there notice provided that a similar tax treatment was slipped in for the oil companies. This is something they did not have before; it is something that has not been long critical to their operations. This was an ill-gotten windfall amounting to $700 million a year, and it is time it be withdrawn.

In the withdrawing, however, it is not going to the General Treasury. We are dedicating it, dedicating it to the energy picture. So as we try to move from big oil into renewables, we will have the wherewithal to do it. I urge passage.

This bill is an important step for our growing renewable energy industry. H.R. 6 will set up a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve, which will allow this Congress to begin to get serious about developing America's renewable energy industries.

Through enhanced investment in renewable energy we will not only build a sustainable industry for our State but we will also be helping make America more energy independent and more secure.

There will be many new proposals made in the coming months regarding how we should use this reserve, but we must make sure that while we place significant funds into research and development we also continue to place importance on policies and tax credits that have an immediate impact on the creation of renewable energy. These tax credits include those for ethanol, biodiesel and the production tax credit for wind and other renewables.

The tax credits for biodiesel and ethanol are set to expire in the next few years. These credits must be extended to ensure that the biofuels industry is able to continue its expansion and meet more and more of our transportation fuel needs. These credits helped spur the development of 350 million gallons of ethanol and over 100 million gallons of biodiesel in my State, North Dakota, over the last 2 years alone.

In 2006 over 1 billion gallons of ethanol production capacity came online with another 5.4 billion expected to become operational in the next 18 months easily surpassing the 7.5 billion gallon Renewable Fuels Standard set for 2012. Meanwhile the biodiesel industry has tripled its production capacity each year since 2004. Expansion of these credits will have a direct effect on the volume of biofuels produced, encouraging the development that we need to lower our dependence on foreign oil.

In addition to the biofuels incentives, the production tax credit, which expires at the end of next year, must be extended for 5 years to allow industries such as the wind industry to operate under stabile conditions. Without stabilizing the tax credit, companies like DMI Industries in West Fargo and LM Glassfiber in Grand Forks are in constant limbo. DMI manufactures wind turbine towers and had furloughed over 100 employees in late 2003 after the expiration of the wind production tax credit. LM Glassfiber, which manufactures wind turbine blades, had previously idled all production due to the delay in extending the wind tax credit and was forced to furlough 60 to 70 employees.

America has great potential for meeting our energy needs domestically. In order to achieve energy independence we must enact policies that will take full advantage of our renewable fuel potential but at the same time we must also continue to invest in traditional sources of energy such as clean coal and domestic oil production. Technologies such as coal-to-liquids, enhanced oil recovery through carbon sequestration and clean coal technologies hold great potential for increasing the efficiency of these industries while at the same time making them more environmentally friendly.

Reliance on foreign sources for our energy supply and the volatility of the Middle East create a national security risk that cannot be ignored. We must work to harness our own Nation's energy resources while also bolstering new and inventive methods of meeting our growing energy needs. We are taking an important first step today and I look forward to the debate on renewable energy that will occur in the coming months.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20½ minutes and the gentleman from Washington has 21½ minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2½ minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Before my friend from North Dakota leaves the floor, the bill to which he referenced, he, in fact, along with 72 of his colleagues, voted for. The FSC/ETI bill that actually we are now pulling back that tax reduction. We are repealing that.

It has been an interesting 2 weeks, Mr. Speaker. We have now forced small businesses to take on additional labor costs, yet we have done nothing to cushion the blow for the mom and pop stores across the country. Last week, the majority wanted to stick it to those drug companies that develop life-saving miracle drugs, while we all have family members who actually live longer and healthier lives because of those miracle drug therapies. Today, we are considering a tax increase on the domestic energy companies.

Now, how many Members have come to the floor and made speeches and beat their breasts and lamented the loss of the manufacturing base in this country? And it is something we agree with, except that the majority's response then is to tax those very domestic energy producing companies?

Let me make a prediction, not a bold one, but as we are wrapping up this 6 in 2006, I suspect that the newly elected Speaker will actually be in the Chair as the vote is called, and as the votes are there to pass this measure there will be thunderous applause from one side of the Chamber, with handshakes and back claps all around.

You know who else is going to be applauding today's measure? The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Companies, upon whom we are already so dependent. You know who else is going to applaud today's efforts? Another big fan. The dictator from Venezuela.

And, of course, there are some on the majority side who have actually called upon Mr. Chavez in Venezuela, visited him during the last Congress, and came back to this country speaking of his benevolence?

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Research Service has reported that the net impact of the 2005 energy bill was to actually raise revenue from the domestic oil and gas industry by $300 million. But let not the facts get in the way of good bumper sticker politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 6.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the majority for making it a whole 2 weeks before deciding to raise taxes—34 hours if you are keeping track by the clock on the Speaker's website. It must have been tough to wait this long.

I've been around here long enough to follow the twists and turns of the FSC/ETI case, and I'm somewhat puzzled by what we are doing today.

It is true that oil and gas companies were not able to claim the previous FSC benefit. It is also true that Chairman RANGEL championed an approach to replace FSC

with a broad benefit targeted at domestic manufacturing. The JOBS bill ultimately provided a broad definition of manufacturing activity to avoid arbitrarily creating winners and losers. Yet today, we find ourselves here picking and choosing among domestic activities, without concern for the broader policy implications, based solely on the need for the majority's Leadership to put out a splashy press release about getting tough on big oil.

The bill before us provides an insight into the governing philosophy of the new majority. The concern of people in my district—and across the country for that matter—is that we need to maintain an affordable supply of energy by breaking our dependence on foreign oil. By any common-sense measure, domestic exploration must be part of a multi-faceted solution to this problem. So in that regard, it is counter-intuitive to think that tax hikes on U.S. exploration activities will help provide an affordable, steady supply of gasoline to consumers.

Put another way—most of us took Econ 101 in college. I must admit, it was a few years ago when I took this class, but the way I remember it, if an added cost is put on an industry—in this case a tax—those costs will eventually get passed on to the consumer. And in that regard, I guess the majority's desired policy aim is to make gasoline more expensive.

Everyone agrees that we must break our dependence on foreign oil, and I take a backseat to no one when it comes to promoting homegrown renewable fuels like ethanol and biodiesel as a way to reduce our consumption of petroleum. In fact, had the Rules Committee made my amendments in order, the House could have voted to extend these important incentives.

But the majority's answer to this problem—tax hikes—is simply misguided, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on H.R. 6.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), who is an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud conservative and Republican, as well as a cosponsor, to urge support of H.R. 6.

Oil and natural gas are not forever. When we burn them, they are gone. The U.S. has only 2 percent of known oil reserves. We use 25 percent of the world's oil and import two-thirds of what we are using. We pump our reserves four times faster than the rest of the world.

I just returned from a trip to China. China is preparing for a post-oil world.

There are three reasons to pursue renewable alternatives to fossil fuels. One is climate change. A second reason is preparing for peak oil. A third reason is for national security risk of our dependence on foreign oil.

As predicted by M. King Hubbert, and ratified by a recent SAIC report, the world either has or will shortly reach peak oil. As a cofounder and cochairman of the Congressional Peak Oil Caucus, I can assure you that halfway through the age of oil, there is an urgent need for the U.S. to pursue conservation efficiency and alternative renewable sources of domestic energy.

We have a moral obligation to leave younger generations some oil. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to a leader in the area of energy policy on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, would it be correct if I asked about the long title of this bill? Is the long title of this bill, to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a long title, but that is the title of the bill, yes.

Mr. NUNES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to confirm the long title, because it appears today that we are talking about this bill being about energy independence. And earlier, during the rule debate, it was brought up by the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, who referred to the process that was used under the last Congress, referring to Mr. DREIER's process, as being dishonest.

Mr. Speaker, this whole process that we are going through today is about dishonesty, and I want to be clear that I am talking about the process. This is unacceptable to me. Because if this is about energy independence, this bill we are going to pass today, then why is there this quote this morning in the Wall Street Journal, and I will read the quote. "Tomorrow we finish our 100 hours and I will talk about what comes next. And included in that is energy independence."

Ms. PELOSI made this statement in the Wall Street Journal this morning. So are we debating today about energy independence? We are going to pass this bill about energy independence, or is this going to be something that we are going to do after this? If so, then something about this process is dishonest. I don't know if this bill is about energy independence or, as the Speaker said, in the future we are going to talk about energy independence. I thought this bill was about energy independence.

So I hope for the rest of this debate that the majority will clarify this, because I don't understand what this is about. And we have had a lot of strong words stated during the rules debate about dishonesty in the process, and I am thoroughly confused as to who is right. Are we doing energy independence today or are we going to do that tomorrow, as the Speaker said?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, let me assure the gentleman that after 12 years of Republican misrule here in the House, it will take much more than 100 hours to undo the damage. Today is a first step toward energy independence. It is certainly not the conclusion of what will be a long process that will involve all Members of this House.

We began this 100-hour legislative agenda with ethics laws to clean up this Congress—and it sure needed cleaning up—and we conclude it today with this effort to clean up our environment and clean up our tax code. Although modest, the CLEAN bill is truly a breath of fresh air.

Our oil and gas giants are experts at drilling holes. They drill holes into our earth to get the resources that we need, but they have also been pretty fortunate in drilling holes into our tax code and comingup with tax break after billion dollar tax break.

Allowing Big Oil to convert valuable public assets to private gain also exploits public resources, but we should not also exploit the American taxpayer. Leases should be set at a fair market rate.

Under the former Republican Leadership, Big Oil's best prospecting was not in Texas, not in the Gulf of Mexico, it was right here on the floor of the House and in secret meetings with Vice President CHENEY. They prospected in Washington and they never came up with a dry well. It was one gusher of tax benefits and special privileges after another.

Now, we finally have an opportunity to rewrite a genuine energy policy. We don't just end unreasonable tax breaks in this bill—tax breaks that I think even most of my Republican colleagues, will admit were unjustified—but we use the proceeds of those tax breaks to focus on renewable energy, on energy independence.

We now begin moving toward using our all-American ingenuity for what could be a job creation program of new leadership in energy technology, in clean energy. That is our objective. This CLEAN bill is an important start to restoring fiscal discipline and embarking on genuine energy independence.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.R. 6 and encourage my

colleagues to vote against this bill, because one of its consequences is to raise revenue for some of America's most adamant and ardent enemies, such as Mr. Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and Mr. Ahmadinejad in Iran.

As I travel my district, my constituents have a consistent message for me: Find a way to achieve energy independence and end our reliance on foreign oil from unstable regions of the world. I am extremely disappointed that the Democrat leadership has chosen to pursue an energy bill that does nothing to achieve this goal and is simply a ruse perpetrated on the American people.

In the past, I have worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to promote alternative energy legislation. In previous Congresses, I have sponsored bills to offer incentives for the development of biodiesel and ethanol, to encourage investment in coal-to-liquid technology, and increase the use of renewable fuels. Each of these received bipartisan support.

I attempted to offer an amendment to this bill on an issue that has received bipartisan support, but it was refused. This is the sole piece of energy legislation in the 100-hour agenda, yet our party was not allowed even a single amendment. Why has this legislation not been an opportunity to discuss real solutions to our Nation's energy crisis? Why does this bill include no provisions to move our Nation away from oil use at all?

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the majority doesn't want a real solution. They only want to stand here today and play politics with our Nation's future.

I truly wish this debate could have been about the virtues of developing alternative energies. Instead, this is a veiled tax hike to create what some may say is a slush fund for future use. This is unconscionable, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, let's review the score. Big Oil, one; taxpayers, zero. But today we are about to even the score.

When he took office, President Bush said this country was in need of a comprehensive energy policy. He was right, and unfortunately we are still waiting.

We are still waiting because rather than a solution we got a $14 billion taxpayer handout to oil and gas companies. Taxpayers were forced to pay twice, once at the pump and then again on April 15. At the same time, the five big oil companies made record profits of $97 billion in 2006, and the taxpayers were asked to subsidize their industry.

Where are gas prices today? Almost double where they were when George Bush took office. Today, as we complete our first 100 hours, it is the beginning of clean energy and the end of dirty politics.

Just last week, my colleagues on the other side were saying that we were subsidizing; that the private sector was working in the prescription drug area, and today they argue in favor of a $14 billion taxpayer handout for big oil companies. I am proud the inconsistency doesn't seem to get in the way of a good argument.

I think this serves a fitting end to our first 100 hours agenda and the 6 in '06. Two weeks ago, we began the 100 hours by enacting the most comprehensive ethics reform since the Watergate era, and we end the culture of corruption where the special interests had a free rein in determining national policy. Nowhere was that corruption of the system more apparent than the handouts to the energy companies.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years, I have come to this podium and said that that gavel was supposed to open up the people's House, not the auction house. Today, I proudly can say that we have given the people a voice, stood up to the special interests, and fought for hardworking families. The score is tied, and we are just getting warmed up.

□ 1345

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I now have the privilege of yielding 2 minutes to a distinguished and very articulate member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with our Democrat friends: we need to invest more in renewable energy. It is the right thing to do, and it is long overdue. But doing it by taxing American energy companies more for exploring and creating jobs here at home makes no sense.

Let's be clear. This bill says, foreign oil and foreign jobs are good; American oil and American jobs are bad. And that is crazy.

The new House leadership may believe it scores in political points to target Texas energy companies and refiners, many of whom are union workers. But our communities don't think it is so funny and our union workers don't think it is so funny.

This bill punishes energy companies for doing the research that leads to successful wells. The old Tax Code had a perverse disincentive. If you failed in finding a successful well, you could write off expenses. If you are successful, though, we punished you for it. We changed that, because we think companies ought to do more research, not less, drill accurate wells, drill fewer of them, and have smaller footprints.

This provision is an anti-research and an anti-environmental provision. This bill declares energy jobs in America aren't manufacturing jobs. Under this bill, we treat energy workers, including high-paying union workers, as foreign workers. We treat our people as foreign workers. And farmers are manufacturers under this bill. Cartoonists are manufacturers under this bill. But those who work on oil rigs and refineries in Texas are foreign workers, and we don't touch the foreign oil companies at all.

Ladies and gentlemen, this bill will not lower gas prices one penny. It won't lessen our dependence on foreign oil one barrel. This bill does not strengthen our energy security. Just the opposite. It does not deserve our support.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, after 12 years of failure to deal meaningfully with a comprehensive energy policy Republicans instead, gave this Congress and the American public a legislative grab bag. Today, under Democratic leadership, we are starting in the right direction to give conservation and energy choice, which Americans understand will take more than 100 hours, given the schizophrenic approach to energy by this administration and the previous Republican Congress.

We want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with an overall framework to reduce greenhouse gases, to deal with carbon emissions, to provide predictability for all the players, whether they are people who are going to be dealing with alternative energy or they are the American consumer.

By eliminating unnecessary subsidies to form a fund to deal with alternative energy conservation and global warming is a terrific start. I am pleased that we are doing it at the conclusion of these first 100 hours and look forward to more in the months to come.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 2½ minutes to a new Member of the House who I think brings a strong perspective on energy policy to this House, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN).

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time today. This bill today is a disappointment to those of us who care about the goal of energy independence. This legislation sabotages the incentives with American energy companies to expand their drilling operations and undermines the opportunities to take advantage of our Nation's untapped resources.

American energy reserves are very real. The Bureau of Land Management recently estimated the United States territory contains over 2 trillion barrels of oil shale, 100 billion barrels of energy just alone on the North American slopes of Alaska, enough oil to trump Saudi oil by 10-fold. And it is our U.S. policies that keep us from accessing the U.S. reserves.

Ladies and gentlemen, when we import over 63 percent of our foreign energy supplies from foreign energy sources, who are, many times, not friendly to the United States, and spend almost $300 billion of revenue in buying those foreign energy sources, it is both a national security threat and an economic threat to this Nation. That is why it is important that we

carefully review this legislation, that we look at all the ramifications of it, and that we work carefully together towards a process that will move us towards energy independence and also towards the exploration of renewable energy sources.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation that will undermine the goal of energy independence in the United States and, in doing so, also drains the resources of the average American. The solution to America's energy crisis lies in expanding our oil production capacity in the short term, while investing in the alternative energy sources in the long-term solution.

To subject new exploration to punitive taxes would surrender our role and our goal as an energy-independent Nation to the Middle East. And, Mr. Speaker, this logic is not an option for us at all.

There is no doubt that meeting America's energy needs is one of the most daunting challenge we face as a nation. It is not, however, an impossible challenge I believe as most Americans believe that this Congress can and must take steps towards making our Nation energy independent, so that America is not held hostage by the oil reserves of the world's most volatile regions. The path forward is clear—we must move towards energy independence by increasing domestic production of oil in he short term while we invest in alternative sources of energy in the long term. I agree with the concept of this bill but believe this path is the wrong answer. Instead of moving towards energy independence, this bill tightens the noose around our neck by making us even more dependent on foreign oil. Never before has it been clearer that we should not and cannot depend on the Middle East for our resources, and yet that is exactly what this bill proposes we do at the expense of our own national security.

Slowing down the production of American oil by instating an irresponsible tax increase also represents a grave economic threat to my State. Oklahoma oil and gas producers—large and small—will be hit hard by this. Make no mistake this legislation will cost Oklahoma jobs. This tax increase will mean less money for new production and ultimately less money in State revenue. We cannot today impose a tax increase which American workers will pay tomorrow at the gas pumps.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H.R. 6, begins the process of weaning off of corporate welfare. This is the beginning of it, so you had better get used to it.

I am very shocked to hear what the opponents are saying to this legislation. Ensuring that oil companies actually pay their fair share in royalties is reasonable and prudent.

Why isn't this welfare looked at as our tax money that we provide for these corporations?

They don't need it. You know it, and I know it.

This bill will ultimately repeal approximately $14 billion in oil subsidies given to big oil companies and, most importantly, invest those funds, because the question has been asked on the other side, will this wind up in a slush fund. They cavalierly talk about that.

Specifically, if you read the bill, these funds will go to clean renewable energy and energy-efficient programs. This is critical. The bill creates the Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve, which will help accelerate the use of clean, domestic renewable energy resources, thereby reducing our dependence on foreign oil. And the case has been made over and over and over again this afternoon.

This is the beginning of real security for our country, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 14¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in that case, I would welcome the opportunity to allow the gentleman from Washington to allocate some more time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) 1 minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, a bill that will finally put our Nation in the correct direction, a new direction towards weaning ourselves off the addiction of oil and gas. This bill is about the future of America.

In the 1960s, President Kennedy challenged our country to dream the unthinkable and to put a man on the Moon. While President Bush has talked about the addiction to foreign oil, the Republican view of the treatment is to continue to pass tax cuts for oil companies, instead of focusing on innovation and new sources of energy.

By this investing in new technology, we have an opportunity for a win-win situation, more energy independence and more jobs for American citizens here in America. Who could be against that?

Please pass this bill. Create a clean energy trust fund and free the resourceful minds of the most resourceful people on Earth today to do what Americans do best, to create and innovate.

We can kick our addiction to foreign oil, and the first step in this is to pass H.R. 6.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished Member of the House, a leader from Tennessee, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we can appropriately dub this the Hold on to Your Wallet Congress. And today, the tax increase that is being passed is one that is being put on the energy that runs our cars and heats our homes; and tomorrow, who knows? But hold on to your wallet, America, because they are coming for it.

Some of the previous speakers have said that they are trying to depict this bill as something that would be repealing subsidies to Big Oil and redirecting money to alternative energy. Both are false. Those are false premises. Even The Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Times don't agree with this bill. They know it is going to raise prices at the pump, punish domestic production, run up the cost of energy on manufactured goods, all of it being done at a time when we are supposed to be weaning off foreign sources of oil. And this bill is going to do exactly the opposite.

There is nothing in the bill that would guarantee that the increased revenues would be spent on alternative energy. While a new reserve is created, it does not have one single enforcement mechanism. In other words, the increased revenues could, in reality, be directed to any Federal discretionary expenditure without penalty, growing the government.

It is the classic bait and switch. It is an energy tax on hardworking Americans with no guarantees for alternative energy.

I will not be a part of the bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 6.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the CLEAN Energy Act. This plan will lead the Nation in a new direction on energy policy.

The United States imports 65 percent of the oil we consume. We spend $800 million every day on foreign oil-producing countries. This threatens our economic stability, our environmental security, and our national security. And today we say, enough.

Today we roll back the Republican-led Congress's giveaways to the oil industry. We stop rewarding the oil companies with taxpayer dollars; and, instead, we start to turn our attention to energy independence in this country.

We will invest the revenues, $14 billion, to put this Nation on the path to energy independence and environmental security. We will reduce our energy consumption by encouraging the development and construction of energy-efficient buildings and consumer appliances and motor vehicles; and, most importantly, we will advance our energy independence by using these revenues to research. We are going to use this money to research and develop and bring to market the alternative sources of energy for a safer, cleaner, cheaper and American-made energy alternatives. We set this country in a new direction.

I wholeheartedly encourage a ''yes'' vote in doing that today on the floor of Congress.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I need some clearance on this. In this trust fund that is created, is clean coal or coal an option as a possibility to use this trust fund?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NUNES. Well, I am trying to get clarification on the language in the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NUNES. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is better addressed to the majority party and the author of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman would better address what he is raising in the debate on the bill.

□ 1400

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I yield the gentleman from California 30 seconds to do that?

Mr. NUNES. I would ask Mr. MCDERMOTT, or the majority party, could you clarify if this trust fund can be used for clean coal technologies, since the United States is known as the Saudi Arabia of coal?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The gentleman raises an interesting possibility, and the legislative process will move forward. There will be bills put into the Congress and this will be discussed.

What we are doing today is creating a fund from which proposals can be funded.

Mr. NUNES. Reclaiming my time. I think the answer is——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon this debate can sound a bit technical to people, so let me put it in very plain English. We are saving $14 billion in United States taxpayer dollars. That is an important change in values in this institution because the last Congress, when they wanted to save money, here is how they did it. They decided we will save $8 billion by going to young adults in this country and saying, you know what, we are going to change the rate of interest on your student loan and you have got to pay more money every month. They decided at one point they will save $3 billion by saying to working class families who struggle to have health care, you have to pay more premiums now to go to the doctor. That is how they saved money in the old Congress.

A lot of issues at stake today, Mr. Speaker, but this is the most important one. There is now a new set of values that runs this institution. We no longer ask the least of us to sacrifice, because guess where we are getting this $14 billion from? From companies who at their best average around $15 billion a year in profit after their liabilities. That is a much more equitable way to do it. That is, in major measure, why this side of the aisle sits in the Speaker's chair today and not our opposition.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I yield myself, Mr. Speaker, 15 seconds simply to point out to the last gentleman that all they are really doing here is moving forward in some leasing policies that are similar to what Congress has passed before, or at least the House has passed before. And beyond that, they are raising taxes, not saving money. That is going to be felt by consumers across the spectrum

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Pennsylvania delegation who has been a strong advocate for new exploration in the United States, the gentleman, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. To those that propose this bill, I want to tell you I support a large fund for renewables. I am for all renewables. But why did you choose to tax American-produced oil and gas and not tax foreign oil and gas? When you tax our production, you will have less of it, when you tax their production, you would have less foreign. You have stacked the deck. It is already cheaper to produce foreign energy than it is American energy. We have locked up so many of our fields, and where in old tired fields the cost of producing has increased, the incentive to go in deep water because it cost so much companies wouldn't go there, and we couldn't even get there.

In 10 years since I have been here, we have increased foreign oil from 46 percent to 66 percent. Why is foreign energy taking over? Ninety percent of the land in this country available for oil production is government land, and this Congress has been locking so much of it up.

I totally agree with a large renewable energy fund, but instead of increasing the cost of producing energy in America, open up new fields. The Outer Continental Shelf is our greatest untouched area. We are the only civilized country in the world that doesn't produce there. Everybody produces there. It makes no sense for us not to be there. We haven't even allowed seismic testing to find out what is there because we might produce it.

Locking up supply by this Congress in the past, by Congress and by those proposing this bill, is why four of the oil companies are making huge profits. When energy usage is increasing more than renewables can increase, you need more oil and gas. And when you need more oil and gas and you lock it up, you give those who have purchased the rights to it all over the world, their $30 oil becomes $60 oil becomes $70 oil, that is where their huge profits are. It is the Congress of the United States that has rewarded Big Oil with increased profits.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from Washington; I would like to ask him a couple of questions.

It is my understanding that this legislation will save the American people billions of dollars. Will those savings be put into a fund?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Yes. The bill before us directs some of the subsidies we currently give to Big Oil into a new fund which is created by this bill called the Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Can you explain what the goal of this fund will be?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The purpose is really this, to accelerate the use of clean domestic renewable energy and to promote energy efficient products and conservation; and furthermore, we want to spur research, development and deployment of clean renewable energy.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I think that is great news for America because it is going to change our energy priorities and bring a new direction for this country. It is especially good for Golden, Colorado and Colorado because we have the preeminent research facility in America in the National Renewable Energy Lab.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to reserve the balance of my time until the end of debate and after the other committees have used their time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, could you tell us the amount of time that we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 5¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, it was just about a year ago that the President of the United States came before this Congress and told the country that America is addicted to oil. He was right then and many of us were pleased to hear him acknowledge that very real fact. However, even as we all acknowledge the seriousness of the energy challenge we face as a Nation, the President and the last Congress failed to actually do something about it. We heard great words, but didn't see good deeds. In fact, rather than invest adequately in renewable energy and energy efficiency, we took the opposite approach. We gave greater breaks in taxes to the oil and gas industry even as prices at the pump went up and profits soared. That policy only served to feed the addiction to oil, not break that addiction. It made us more dependent, not less dependent on oil and gas and the volatile regions of the world that control the greatest reserves.

This is a time to change direction, to set a new course on energy policy, to say to the country: We're not just talking rhetoric. We mean what we say.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been listening to this debate. It is, like all debates, interesting. Yesterday we had a debate, a relatively extended debate, in which Republican after Republican rose and said, This bill does not do enough. In this instance, it does not bring us full energy independence. That is obvious. But person after person got up and said, We're not doing enough for students, we're not doing enough for college aid, and then, lo and behold, the vote was taken and 356 people out of 435 voted for that bill, including 124 Republicans. We are not doing enough in this bill, that is clear, but the journey of a thousand miles, as has been observed, starts with a step.

Another individual got up, and then I will go to my remarks, and talked about the Washington Post editorial. An interesting comment that she made. I don't think she had perhaps read all of the editorial because the editorial said this:

''The good part of the bill revokes tax breaks for oil and gas production in the United States that should never have been granted.''

I believe in the free market system. What is the free market system? If you have a demand for a product and you can get a good price for it, you produce it. That's supply and demand. In point of fact, the price of the product has gone up and up and up. I do not criticize the oil companies for wanting a tax break. We all want tax breaks. What I criticize is the Congress of the United States for not making a judgment on behalf of the American people. That is who I criticize. The actions taken in the ETI bill were wrong.

Mr. Speaker, one of the lessons that most of us learn early on is to study history so that we can avoid making the same mistakes of the past. A generation ago, this Nation faced a series of crises born of an overreliance on foreign oil. Prices spiked and supplies were rationed. It took work, but Congress and the President acted to combat that dependence and ushered in a wave of new technologies, conservation and efficiency improvements that have saved untold billions of dollars and barrels of oil and greatly enhanced the Nation's economic performance and national security.

Unfortunately, in recent years, however, we seem to have forgotten that time period. The economy grew, the price of oil waned and we forgot the lessons of the past and abandoned the progress toward a more fuel efficient existence. Mr. Speaker, crises at home and abroad have changed that, changed it dramatically, and we find ourselves once again increasingly reliant on foreign oil. And drilling for more oil and gas alone is not the solution. Mr. BARTLETT said that earlier today. Oil is a wasting resource. What wasting means is it is going to go away. I have a great-grandchild, unlike some of you who are much younger than I am. She may not use oil. It may not be available for her.

Today, we will pass the last of the bills that we promised the American people we would undertake at the beginning of this Congress. This legislation is but a first down payment on the promise of a new energy future for our country. This bill is not about punishing one sector of industry, nor does this bill represent the totality or even a substantial component of our energy policy, as evidenced by the Rural Caucus's biofuels energy package, Speaker PELOSI's innovation agenda, and the PROGRESS Act, which I, along with 129-plus Members of this body in the last Congress, introduced. However, the CLEAN Act starts to move our Nation in a new direction. It is about the focus of precious taxpayer dollars and the future of our country.

The oil and gas industry is extraordinarily well-established and well-off. I applaud it for being so. It does not need the American taxpayers' help to be successful or to make a dollar. There is not an American who goes to the gas pump that doesn't know that. Even President Bush, a former executive of an oil company, agrees that the industry does not need additional government subsidies when prices are this high. But our future energy resources do need help to get started. Renewable energy, alternative fuels, conservation and efficiency programs are underutilized in our effort to wean our Nation off our dependence on foreign oil.

The money saved by this bill will be spent on our energy future and set aside to, among other things, accelerate the use of clean domestic renewable energy resources and alternative fuels; promote the use of energy efficiency practices and conservation; and increase research, development and deployment of clean renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.

By acting now to take this small but significant step to move toward making America energy independent, we have the opportunity, ladies and gentlemen of this House, to leave future generations a lasting legacy that makes our Nation and our world a better place. The legislation is a good first start in that effort.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in response may I yield myself 15 seconds, simply to point out to the majority leader that he is terribly mistaken if he thinks he is repealing a special tax break. In fact, oil and other energy production was treated the same way under the tax bill that was passed as all other manufacturers, and this differential treatment is one of the reasons why the National Association of Manufacturers so strongly opposes this bill. This does not fulfill any of their commitments on energy any more than the underlying rule fulfills their commitment to an open process.

□ 1415

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, my constituents, like yours, paid over $3 a gallon for gas last year. Isn't that enough? Do they really need to be paying a second time with their tax dollars?

Last year, Big Oil saw higher profits than any industry in the history of the world, yet we are writing them welfare checks. The United States is 65 percent dependent on foreign oil, worse than we have ever been before, sending $800 million a day to the Middle East. This situation creates conflicts of interest in crucial matters of security and diplomacy whereby we, the United States of America, are beholden to nations who do not represent our best interests. Still, we are cutting a welfare check to Big Oil.

When we embrace the wave of the future and dedicate ourselves to developing alternative, renewable, clean more-affordable energy sources, America will create more than a quarter million new jobs, generate $30 billion in new worker wages, and finally stop funding both sides of the war on terror.

Despite all that, we are still using taxpayer dollars to hand a huge welfare check to billionaire oil companies. The CLEAN Energy Act takes the crucial first steps to ending this policy, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had prepared remarks, but I am going to set them aside and submit them for the RECORD, because as I was listening to the debate, I couldn't believe my ears as speaker after speaker on the other side of the aisle came up and attacked this relatively simple piece of legislation, talking about how it doesn't go far enough and it doesn't do this and it doesn't do that, when they have had at least 6 years to actually do something about the energy crisis in this country.

When they had the opportunity to do something, they came up with that god-awful 2005 energy bill, where 93 percent of the tax subsidies went to oil, gas and nuclear, and only 7 percent went to alternative energy sources, so that we could develop these alternative energy sources, harness the Sun, wind, Moon, not the Moon, although maybe if we had enough money, we could try that too, geothermal, all of these possible alternative energy sources. And what did they do? Seven measly percent of the tax subsidies went to that.

I would suggest that we have a golden opportunity to do something, and I

urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a good first step.

Mr. Speaker, in 2005, Congress passed energy legislation intended to promote secure, affordable and reliable energy. This was an important goal, because many of us realized that to keep our Nation safe, we must break our dependence on foreign oil.

Unfortunately, instead of focusing on the promotion of clean, renewable energy sources, the 2005 energy bill gave substantial subsidies to the oil and gas industry. I voted against this bill because it made no sense to give incentives to an industry that was enjoying record profits.

Today, oil and gas companies continue to rake in high profits while Congress fails to offer substantial incentives to alternative energy investors. In the absence of effective federal policy to promote investment in renewables, many states have passed their own incentives.

In my home state of Nevada, the legislature has required that by 2015, 20 percent of power sold to Nevadans come from renewables. Nevadans are already seeing results from this mandate—last June, construction began in Las Vegas on the largest solar power installation in the country built by a public agency, and five other solar projects are planned for southern Nevada.

I am supporting H.R. 6 today because it is a great first step toward securing energy independence. In the last Congress, I introduced a bill to promote renewable energy production, and I reintroduce this bill in the 110th Congress. We are far from being energy independent, but today's bill is a good place to start, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

(Mr. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we listen to the debate that is taking place here on this floor. Some of it is true; some of it is fiction. I think it is very important to understand that $14 billion is going to go into a place that is going to help us to be able to have the kind of energy we need in the future, to be able to invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East.

But I was just on the floor last night talking about something that the American people want even more than what we are doing here in this debate here on the floor, because a lot things are being said here, but they want bipartisanship, and they have had it over the last 2 weeks. And I think the Republican leadership is a little afraid of the fact that their Members are voting on behalf of the American people. So they want to stand in front of the door of the House and say how bad it is.

But when the board lights up here, Members have a choice: do they want to vote on behalf of their constituents and making sure that we have the kind of future here in the United States, or do they want to vote on behalf of the special interests and the status quo for breaks to big oil companies that they didn't even ask for.

I think we are moving in the right direction with this legislation. This is just the beginning of us working together in a bipartisan way, and I look forward to moving in that spirit, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the end of the debate.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, I reserve the balance of my time until the end of debate and after other committees have used their time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House is considering a part of the 100-hours agenda, H.R. 6, the Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act.

This legislation seeks to end the unwarranted tax breaks and subsidies which have been lavished on Big Oil over the last several years, and done so at a time of record prices at the gas pump and record oil industry profits.

Big Oil is hitting the American taxpayer not once, not twice, but three times. They are hitting them at the pump, they are hitting them at the Treasury through the Tax Code, and they are hitting them with royalty holidays put into oil in 1995 and again in 2005.

Meanwhile, our people back home stand in their work boots pumping precious, costly gas into their tanks, while energy lobbyists have scuttled about in Armani suits wanting more.

Indeed, over the last few years we have suffered an unprecedented assault on America's resources and on American taxpayer pockets under the guise of contributing to our energy security. It almost seems like Albert Fall's ghost walks the halls of the Interior Department.

Now, as you remember, Fall was the Secretary of the Interior who embroiled the administration of Warren Harding in the infamous Teapot Dome scandal. Without competitive bidding, Fall leased the Federal oil reserves at Teapot Dome and the Naval oil reserves at Elk Hills in exchange for $404,000 in gifts from the oilmen. In those days, that was a hefty sum of money, but a princely sum back in 1992.

Today, we have a situation at the Interior Department where the OCS oil and gas leasing program is hemorrhaging money as a result of unwarranted royalty relief, royalty underpayments, inadequate audits and potential fraud. The GAO and the Interior Department's Inspector General, Earl Devaney, in particular, have issued scathing reports on these matters.

Last year, in testimony before the House Government Reform Committee hearing on the bureaucratic bungling of oil and gas leases, Devaney went so far as to say: ''Simply stated, short of a crime, anything goes at the highest level of the Department of the Interior.''

This is no small matter. These are public resources. The names of every American are on the deeds to these public lands and waters where these drillings for oil and natural gas take place. Royalties from this production contribute a significant amount to the Treasury, nearly $8 billion in the last fiscal year, and it would be more if it were not for all the mismanagement at the Department of the Interior.

The pending legislation represents the beginning of the exorcism of Albert's Fall's ghost from the Interior Department by dealing with one egregious aspect of the OCS leasing program. I can assure my colleagues that the Natural Resources Committee will follow up with aggressive hearings into other areas of this program in the near future.

The situation that we seek to address in the pending bill, of course, harkens back to the Deep Water Royalty Relief Act of 1995, which Congress passed over the objections of many on this side of the aisle. That act sought to encourage oil companies to drill in the Gulf of Mexico by allowing them to avoid paying royalties on oil and gas production of publicly owned resources.

As many of us warned at the time, this was nothing but an unwarranted giveaway of public resources, paying the companies to do what they would do anyway, drill for oil. To make matters worse, the Interior Department botched the administration of the law. They failed to include provisions in leases issued between 1998 and 1999 to cut off royalty relief when market prices are high. In other words, these leases did not contain any threshold, any threshold, for when royalty relief would kick in. According to GAO, the failure to include price cutoffs for royalty relief in the 1998–99 gulf leases could cost the Treasury up to $10 billion. H.R. 6 would fix these abuses.

The bill would establish thresholds in the 1998–1999 leases for royalty relief. The holders of these royalty-free leases would be required to either agree to negotiate with the Interior Department to pay royalties when market prices reach those thresholds, or pay a new conservation resource fee established in the bill. In addition, H.R. 6 would impose an annual per-acre fee on nonproducing OCS oil and gas leases. According to CBO, these provisions would raise $6.3 billion over 10 years, money that could be used to finance renewable and alternative energy initiatives.

There are two items that I would like to emphasize with respect to these provisions. First, this legislation is not violating any contractual arrangements. The leases in question were issued with a clause that allows the Federal Government to impose new requirements on them in the future, such

as the conservation resource fee being proposed in this bill.

Second, the House is already on record as supporting provisions of this nature. Provisions of this legislation as they relate to the OCS leases have been addressed by amendments offered in the past by MAURICE HINCHEY, ED MARKEY, RON KIND, and RAÚL GRIJALVA over the years. Further, the Jindal-Pombo OCS leasing bill that passed the House last year also included the imposition of a fee on the 1998 and 1999 royalty-free leases. So I would point out that none of the oil companies complained about their contracts being violated at that time.

Finally, H.R. 6 would repeal the extension of the original 1995 royalty relief provision that was contained in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and also reform several other royalty relief and special benefit provisions in that law. Amendments offered in the past by RON KIND and RAÚL GRIJALVA over the last two Congresses to various of our energy legislation attempted to strike these provisions.

So now, as I conclude, Mr. Speaker, it is time to stand up and be counted: to vote for the integrity of America's resources, to vote for the end of corporate welfare, to vote for a new dawn, a new era, in the management of our public energy resources. And that is to vote for H.R. 6.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will join with the distinguished chairman in bringing actions to terminate employees who are incompetent in the Interior Department and bring legal malpractice actions against those firms negotiating for the U.S. Government and creating the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Resources Committee, the distinguished and honorable gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my dear colleagues, just about 100 hours ago you stood in this House and raised your hand and you followed this quote with an ''I do'': ''Do you solemnly swear you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.''

This bill, and I am wearing this red shirt today, is the color of the bill that we are debating, communist red. It is a taking. And regardless of what one says, it will go to court, and it should be decided in court. It should be decided there.

My biggest concern, it is often said the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and this is a great example. The good intentions of this bill are a pursuit of new forms of energy to replace our dependency. We all support that.

But even The Washington Post, which is not my favorite newspaper, says this is a low-wattage bill and it fits the realm of Russia and Putin, and it fits Bolivia and Venezuela. And if there is anything this bill will do, in fact it will increase the competitive edge of foreign oil imported to this country. That is what this bill does.

□ 1430

I ask my colleagues, if the problem is foreign oil, and it is, why increase taxes and make it harder to produce American oil and gas? That makes no sense to me.

I had a motion to recommit and I cannot offer it, but I wanted to take and strike everything after the enacting clause and insert taxes on all foreign oil imported. That would raise your money for renewable resources.

But what we are doing here today is taxing our domestic oil. We are raising dollars supposedly for renewable resources, yet we are still burning fossil fuels.

This is really a San Francisco energy policy, and America is not San Francisco.

My State gets 85 percent of its budget from oil production. I am proud of it and I hope we get more. The pipeline we want to build for gas to deliver the oil to the lower 48 will cost $20 billion, and this, by increasing taxes and taking away the incentives, which this bill does, raises the question of whether we can finance this pipeline, which we all need.

We talk about Joe Blow and all the rest of these people in the smaller income brackets and get the big old oil companies. The reality is if this bill was to become law gas would go to $5 a gallon.

Everybody talks about Big Oil and how much profit they made. These international companies are making that profit overseas shipping the oil to the United States.

If you want to do this right, then let us tax the foreign oil. Let us not tax the American oil. Let us not hurt our little companies, which this bill does. Let us not discourage what I call the frontier areas. Let us help American oil to deliver oil to the American people and quit paying the money to the foreign oil companies, and that is what you are doing.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Alaska, I welcome him as the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee. I am sure it will be a good year ahead. I look forward to working with him.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), a member of the Natural Resources Committee, a gentleman to which I have already referred in my opening remarks and a leader on this issue.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, in 2005, during the debate on the energy bill, I asked my colleagues to strike down provisions that amounted to more corporate welfare for oil companies. At that time the Republican majority voted down that amendment.

Now, as news reports continue to mount regarding the billions of dollars in profit oil and gas companies are reaping we have to look seriously at that policy. Why should the American taxpayer continue to shell out subsidies to oil companies when clearly they need no incentives to drill?

Moreover, why are we still allowing them to drill in our public lands and waters for free because of some mistakes made in the 1990s during the leasing process?

Had the President and his appointees acted when this was discovered, it would have saved taxpayers upwards of $1 billion that has already been lost. Instead, they have deliberately ignored and covered up this problem.

We must send a message that the American taxpayer will no longer be ripped off by Big Oil.

But ending this fiscally ridiculous practice of subsidies for megarich oil companies is not enough. We also need to make a clean break from the past and take a bold step into the 21st century.

Global warming is upon us. We need clean renewable fuel, and we need it now. It will be a tough transition but we have to start right now. We are ready for this challenge. We have the know-how and a highly skilled workforce, and we will create millions of new jobs in the process.

In the strongest way possible, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 6, a hometown American energy bill that helps and protects the American taxpayer.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6, legislation that puts America's independent energy producers at risk and increases America's dependence on foreign oil.

This bill unfairly punishes offshore oil and natural gas companies who signed leases with the Federal Government in 1998 and 1999. These leases, due to a mistake by the Clinton administration, did not set price thresholds for royalty incentives. The bill requires all companies to renegotiate these leases, even though they were fairly signed in the first place.

The companies who entered into these agreements cannot be blamed for the Federal Government's mistakes. The contracts signed by the Federal Government and energy producers are legal and binding, regardless of the mistakes of the Federal Government in drafting them. In addition, a fair version of this provision was included in the Republican Outer Continental Shelf drilling bill that was adopted last year.

We talk about this and I think this is a national security issue. Right now we

should be encouraging domestic production here in the United States of America, and we are not.

We get 60 percent of our oil from foreign sources, and a lot of that oil that we are getting is from areas that we are at conflict with or we have carpet bombed recently. I think it is asinine we are not doing all we can to spur domestic production here in the United States and not penalizing companies for doing such. It is absolutely ridiculous.

Not only are gas prices low right now, in Tulsa where I am from it is below $2 a gallon when I left this past week, but also crude oil prices are as low as they were in 2005. They are going down.

All this legislation will do is increase gasoline prices at the pump to upwards of $5 a barrel. What we need to be working on is a comprehensive energy policy in this country that will actually get prices down by not only spurring domestic production but also working on getting more refining capacity in this country.

We are operating at 100 percent capacity right now. We need to be expanding, building five or so additional refineries in this country. And we can do it in an environmentally sound way.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, who would have ever thought that the Republicans would be defending welfare queens on the floor of the House of Representatives, but they are.

Lee Raymond, just-retired CEO, ExxonMobil, $400 million, part of it in tax subsidies, part of it in royalty forgiveness, and part of it gouging consumers at the pump. But they are standing up here today to defend poor little ole Lee Raymond with his $400 million pension and ExxonMobil, his company, that only made $29.2 billion last year, the largest corporate profit in the history of the world.

They need those subsidies or they will not go out and explore for oil, the Republicans will tell us. Here they are defending welfare queens, subsidies to the most profitable industry in the world. It is sad to see the Republicans come to this.

Now, they laughably say this will lead to higher prices. Oh, higher prices, unlike the price gouging after Katrina where gasoline went over three bucks a gallon in Oregon and we do not even get any supply from the eastern United States? Or the price gouging that goes on day in, day out? The price fixing that goes on day in, day out in this industry? The collusion between the American companies, the foreign companies operating in America, and the OPEC cartel to drive down the supply, to drive up the price, which gives them an excuse to go even higher at the pump?

What about a trade complaint to the WTO? No, the Republican administration does not support that, but George Bush does support two provisions of this bill, saying those are tax breaks that are not necessary to the oil industry. The oil man in the White House says the oil industry does not need this, and the Republicans are down here fighting hard to preserve it, to drain money from the taxpayer, to not take royalties. Unlike any other owner of public resources, the United States would be the only one not to take royalty.

Now, they talked about communism. That would be communism if we did not get a fair return for our taxpayers, if we did not get a fair return for depleting our resources.

Pass this bill and begin to turn back the inordinate influence of Big Oil on this government.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a couple of points up on this in response to the gentleman who was just making the points.

First of all, we talk about the $440 million that the head of Exxon makes. If we divide out the numbers of millions and billions of dollars that Exxon pays out to shareholders and compare it to Tiger Woods, for instance, Tiger Woods made $25,181 a stroke. Shaquille O'Neal made $18,300 per minute that he played. A-Rod made $180,000 per run batted in.

And the people who provide gasoline and oil at the price, $3 for gasoline, you will pay more than $3 for this fingernail polish that comes out to $25,000 per bottle. This bottled water is over $400 per barrel, and it does not require an investment in an operation like this. These offshore platforms are over $1 billion investment, and you are saying that oil is overpriced and we are gouging the American consumers. Next, you should go after bottled water and after fingernail polish because this is $25,000 per barrel.

We need to understand that it takes a lot of investment to put gas in the pumps. It cannot be done. I have heard today that we are going to provide wave energy. Wave energy on our F–16s, I can just imagine it now. The investments to power this Nation are extraordinarily high, and we are not overcompensating the companies that do that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), a gentleman with whom we have worked with on this legislation in good faith and appreciate his leadership and input.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans believe that dependence on foreign oil is a problem and alternative energy sources deserve our support, particularly after 9/11. The recent election season saw such high consumer gas prices and high anxiety about energy security.

But let us look at another industry. Very cold weather in southern California is causing loss of fruits and vegetables, and ranchers in the Midwest are losing cattle because of the cold weather. The farmers and ranchers who still have crops and livestock stand to make a lot of money from the price spikes that we are seeing literally as we stand here on the floor today.

Are we blaming those farmers and ranchers for the high prices? Are we going to cut farm benefits and raise taxes on the farmers? No.

But for some reason when we have cold winters and hot summers and hurricanes in the gulf that raise gas prices, we all get mad at energy suppliers. It is the easy way out to get mad at the industry, since most of our country just uses energy and does not produce it.

We have a budget deficit, and funds for new alternative energy programs are in short supply. So industry is being targeted for this purpose.

I understand why my colleagues are choosing to do this, but this plan carries a significant risk of being counterproductive, especially in the near future.

H.R. 6 exempts the oil and gas industry from a recent manufacturing tax benefit, cuts geological expense to major energy producers and requires new payments on 1998–1999 offshore leases to make up for serious government errors in the original contracts.

These provisions raise $14 billion over 10 years for clean alternative energy programs that Congress will establish through regular order. That is why I support this bill. That $14 billion will be used for alternatives through the regular order of this Congress, through our committee process.

These tax provisions reduce incentives for domestic production and could increase dependence on foreign oil and LNG which hurt national security.

With current high oil prices, we may not miss these incentives as much if prices were low, but the effects could be very real in the long term.

However, the 100 hours energy bill is a compromise within the Democratic Caucus to promote alternative energy. For the first time in my years in Congress, the Democratic leadership included the Members from energy producing States in the process.

The section 199 tax provision is most unfair because it singles out oil and gas as ineligible, as compared to other manufacturing operations.

The main royalty provision is based on the Jindal-Pombo bill that House Republicans overwhelmingly supported a few months ago in June.

I am also very concerned about the effects of the provision on contract certainty in U.S. oil and gas leasing, but for better or worse, there is a consensus among both parties to address this 1998–1999 lease issue.

While this bill is a far cry from my preferred energy policies, the Democratic leadership has been narrow and targeted.

After extensive discussions between our office and other Members' offices

from oil and gas producing States, this bill does not include more punitive measures that seek to alter long-standing oil and gas tax or accounting treatment that could destabilize our Nation's gasoline supply even more.

We do not repeal the refinery tax provision or the deductions for intangible drilling costs. We also do not eliminate LIFO accounting, impose a windfall profits tax, or repeal of natural gas distribution line depreciation.

Mr. Speaker, as a result and the good faith we have had in this 100 hours agenda, I am voting for the bill.

Before I close, I have two messages. First, you cannot hit an industry for $14 billion and go back time and time again.

And my second message is to the oil and gas industry. With the recent November elections, this bill should be a wake-up call to explain energy issues to Democratic Members who may have been ignored in recent years.

We also do not eliminate LIFO accounting, impose a windfall profits tax, or repeal of natural gas distribution line depreciation.

As a result, and as a show of good faith during this critical 100 hours period for our new majority, I am voting for this bill.

Before I close I have two messages, and the first is for the Democratic Caucus—when you hit one industry for $14 billion, you cannot go back for more later and expect enough gasoline in your cars and fuel to heat and cool our homes.

My second message for the oil and gas industry—the recent November election and this bill should be a wake-up call to explain energy issues to Democratic members that they may have ignored in recent years. We are going to need those members to prevent additional legislation of this type.

□ 1445

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, it is evident in the Democrats' energy bill, to gain and achieve energy independence they are not using any coal in this country. And I hope that the majority party from the Resources Committee can answer at some point during this debate why clean coal and coal-to-liquid technology is not included as a possibility to achieve energy independence. That question needs to be answered before the American people on the House floor before this debate ends.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understood the gentleman's question, he is asking why we are not using more clean coal.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. Yes, to get a clarification of your question to me.

Mr. NUNES. The trust fund that you guys are creating in this bill prohibits clean coal and coal-to-liquid technology.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. The gentleman is inaccurate. The fund created would allow for the development of renewable and alternative fuels. And as far as the lack of clean coal technology in the past, it is because Congress in the past energy bills has never gotten serious about clean coal technology. Lip service, yes. Authorizations to go fish, yes. But hard-core appropriation dollars for clean coal technology, no. Thanks to my senior colleague in the other body, yes, we did that, but not through any actions of energy policy acts of this Congress in the past.

And, besides, how can we get anything from coal when we are so addicted to the oil diet? Because we give tax incentives and royalty holidays and other grants to the oil industry without any mention of coal in these pieces of legislation.

I would say to the gentleman from California we have joined in the past in cosponsoring legislation that would help coal liquefication.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And I appreciate it. I know the gentleman is a big supporter of coal. And we did bring to the Rules Committee an amendment that would amend the language in this bill to allow some of this money to go to contract with the Department of Defense so they can move on coal-to-liquid provisions.

You know there are really three avenues to expand coal-to-liquid technology: one is forward contracting for the Department of Defense; one is a tax provision; and the other one is a collar provision that we are working on. And if we could have gotten some provision in this bill, because there is going to be money available to move directly, we have got to get that first coal-to-liquid plant built, then the others will come. And I think that is what our disappointment is.

Mr. RAHALL. I understand the point that the gentleman from California raises, and it is not one with which I disagree. If I might say, in due process, in due time that will be considered by this Congress. I have no question about it. This bill is not a comprehensive energy bill. Nobody is out here touting it as such. That is to be addressed later. This is part of our 6 for '06 agenda; it is to get us started in the right direction, and my agenda on the Natural Resources Committee will go much further than this, not only hearings on our bills and legislation, but extensive oversight over the entire oil and gas leasing program both offshore and onshore.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And if the gentleman would yield, I know you are a big backer of coal, and I do look forward to working with you. This is our window of opportunity to really exploit coal-to-liquid activities, and we are disappointed now. We hope that we can recover later on in this debate.

Mr. RAHALL. I say to the gentleman, please be patient. We didn't get in this mix in 100 hours; we are not going to get out of it in 100 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today we really do begin America's clean revolution in this bill. Every revolution has a beginning. The American Revolution began at Concord; the aerospace revolution began at Kittyhawk; and America's clean energy revolution begins today with this bill. And years from now when we have licked global warming and we have achieved energy independence, we will look back to this day as the first step on the road to clean energy for America.

Today we are going to break the shackles of oil and gas. We are going to free Americans to invent, to innovate, to create the clean technologies we need in energy. This is only common sense.

We pay once at the pump for gasoline already. We shouldn't have to pay again on tax day on April 15 to line the pockets of the oil and gas industry. It is common sense.

Our national resources should be going to the innovators who will lead us in energy in the 21st century, rather than to those who have kept us in serfdom to the oil industry, an industry of the 19th century. Change is afoot starting today.

Now we are going to unleash the talents of the Nanosolar Company in California. It is perfecting thin cell solar cells. We are going to empower the Ocean Power Technology Company that is perfecting wave energy, enough wave energy off the California coast to light the entire State. We will get loan guarantees to the Iogen Corporation, which is going to build the first cellulosic ethanol plant in the Western World in Idaho starting today.

Today we recognize that the solution to our energy challenges is not below our feet in the ground. It is above our shoulders in our brains, and we are going to unleash the intellectual talents of America to see that that happens.

I will be introducing again the New Apollo Energy Project bill, which will marshal our Nation's talents, just as John Kennedy marshaled our national resources in the original Apollo Project. Today is the first step of the new Apollo Energy Project. Tomorrow I will introduce the Plug-In Hybrid Bill, a bill that will hasten the day when our cars are powered on clean energy, clean electricity, and clean biofuels so we can get our energy from Midwestern farmers rather than Middle Eastern sheiks.

These are just two of the many steps on this long road of the clean energy revolution; and there is no silver bullet to our energy challenges, but there is a silver lining, and that is the genius of the American people. Today we are freeing the genius of the American people. It is long overdue.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes on this new energy policy for the Nation that some are calling the Hugo Chavez Competitive Rewards Advantage Program to Mr. SHIMKUS from Illinois.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, again, I enjoyed my comments with my colleague, but I know my colleague from Washington State who just left would not mention coal. My folks from the west coast will not mention the benefits of coal, and we have a lot of work to do. We are going to continue to move it forward, and this was our opportunity to be helpful.

I want to talk about section 199. And I know my colleagues on the other side like to talk about the Big Oil guys, but let's talk about the Little Oil guys, the ones in southern Illinois. In southern Illinois, we produce about 30,000 barrels of crude oil per day amounting to $574 million minus about one-eighth of that to royalty owners. These are small mom and pop operations of marginal wells, you know, those wells that you have to put energy in to get the crude oil out.

Section 199 has three primary purposes: exploration, that is a good thing. Production, that is a good thing. Refining, that is a good thing. Three good things to help address our reliance on imported crude oil from overseas.

Illinois crude oil, being delivered from Illinois soil up to the surface area so that it can meet our fuel needs, the attack on section 199 in this bill to a small mom and pop oil producer in southern Illinois in 2008 will be a $200,000 tax increase. In 2009, it will be a $300,000 tax increase on this small marginal oil producer. This is money that she, a woman-owned business operation, cannot use to expand, employ, provide health care benefits to. This is all money that is going to come out of the bottom line in her ability to expand and find new oil reserves and resources in southern Illinois, and that is why I am going to vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to decrease our reliance on foreign energy—exploiting our coal reserves is one way. I offered and amendment through the rules committee that would move some of the revenue from this tax increase to allow DOD to forward contract and purchase CTL fuels.

But this bill will make it more difficult to recover what oil we have left in Southern Illinois.

In Southern Illinois—we produce around 30,000 barrels of crude per day amounting to $574 million minus about ⅛ of that to royalty owners. These are all small mom and pop operations and marginal wells.

The smaller oil and gas producers in my district rely on Section 199 deduction as it lowers the effective tax rate on manufacturing income that comes from exploration, production and refining.

One small producer in my district, for example, estimates that depending on the timing the Democratic repeal would go into effect, they would lose $200,000 in 2008 and around $300,000 in 2009. Now this is $500,000 that a small oil and gas producer in rural Southern Illinois cannot use to improve the efficiency of their business, buy new equipment, hire new employees or even use to pay health insurance cost of their current employees.

Regular order would have allowed a committee to hear some of these concerns so that adjustments could have been made to eliminate the unintended consequences of this bill—or maybe they aren't unintended.

Amortization of Geological and Geophysical (G&G) expenses, another provision that they are trying to repeal today—was passed in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, because it allows producers to affordably use a technology to examine, without drilling, the best spot to drill for oil or gas—this is also an environmentally friendly practice—without it they would have to revert to drilling all over an area to find an optimal drilling point.

The cost of this Geophysical exploration is around 20 to 30 thousand dollars per square mile of exploration—so simple math shows you that this is a significant investment that is being made by the industry, taking that away will lower production and efficiency, making the U.S. less competitive in the world market.

We need to develop policies that make it easier to produce affordable domestic energy.

And, again, we did that in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that is why expansion is starting to happen today. Expansion with petroleum refineries, with ethanol refineries, with clean coal generation, nuclear generation, expansion of the areas where we can explore for new energy sources.

Here are some numbers: Over 500 million of new ethanol production and nearly 30 new plants; 500 million gallons of new annual ethanol production online; 25 new nuclear reactors planned; 2,000 megawatts of new wind power online; 120 new coal-based facilities in various stages of planning; and 2 million barrels of oil daily that can be replaced by clean, synthetic fuel from coal by 2025.

Raising taxes in this bill will in fact do more harm to the little guys—the guys that are spread across the U.S. diversifying where our domestic petroleum and gas come from. And will not help us reduce our dependence on foreign sources of gas and oil.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Illinois, some of the issues which he just addressed are properly addressed in the Ways and Means Committee or the Ways and Means section of this bill.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Regarding clean coal, we believe clean coal could be part of our energy future, and we need to do research in it to find a way to sequester carbon dioxide so that resource can be used. But in doing so, we can only do it if we have some limitation on carbon dioxide. The FutureGen project will never be built unless we have a limit on carbon dioxide. That is the only way it is going to be built. Democrats stand for research on that. It is part of this bill, it is part of clean energy.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of our Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this week I received an e-mail message from a constituent of mine in Lawrenceville, New Jersey. She said: ''Please help turn the tide by doing not a little but a lot to help solar, wind, hydrogen become the mainstream energy sources and turn oil into the alternative.''

She is right. This legislation which will end the subsidies, renegotiate the leases, and use the revenues to develop sustainable energy technologies is a very good start.

There are any number of things. Take wind energy. The United States does not lead the world in total production of wind energy. We fall behind Spain, Germany, Denmark. It is because these governments have made commitments that we have not. We have lost some technological leads that we have had, and we won't lessen our addiction to foreign oil in the United States without making investment in these sustainable energy sources. Wind is just one example. Generating power from the oceans is another. This bill is not enough, but it is a good start.

I rise today in support of H.R. 6, the Creating Long-term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act or the CLEAN Energy Act. This is an important step for our nation in reducing our dependence on foreign oil and I commend Speaker PELOSI, Chairman RAHALL, and Chairman RANGEL for including this legislation in the first 100 hours of legislative business in the 110th Congress.

We have already heard from our colleagues today about the three major tenets of this bill—ending subsidies for large oil companies, renegotiating leases for oil companies that have avoided paying royalties on leases they signed in 1998 and 1999, and creating the Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve. I would like to take some time to speak about the importance of the Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve.

The new sustainable energy reserve created in this legislation will be funded by repealing the tax breaks that have been provided to the large oil companies, who consistently reap excessive profits at the expense of the American consumer. There is a lot that is funding can be used for. It is my hope that we focus our attention on research and development of sustainable energy sources and invest in the technologies needed to wean ourselves from fossil fuels.

One example of a real investment is the wind industry. It was once the case that the wind industry was based-only in California. Production across the country has increased, and I commend the industry for the progress they have made. There is, of course, still more we can do. The United States does not lead the world in total production of wind energy—we fall behind Spain and Germany. These countries have a greater commitment to wind energy than we. And Denmark has made a turnaround in the past thirty years, moving away from relying solely on oil to relying a great deal on wind power for their electricity. This is because the government in Denmark made a real commitment to investing in this technology. The United States can and should be the leader on wind energy. With the proper investment from the government, it will be.

According to the American Wind Energy Association, 46 of our states have the potential to produce significant wind energy. We must harness this potential across our country and make a real commitment to wind power. We can start by including a long term extension of the production tax credit. We can also adopt a renewable portfolio standard, which over twenty states have already done on their own.

We will not lessen our addiction on foreign oil in the United States without making the investment in alternative energy sources now. Wind energy is not the only solution to our energy needs. Neither is generating power from the ocean. But investing in research and development in a variety of different sustainable energy sources will lead us on our path to energy independence. But having a dedicated renewable energy reserve to fund this research and development is an important step.

Many of my constituents have written to me over the past few years passionately urging us in Congress to reverse our energy policy. Just last Friday, I received an email from a constituent of mine in Lawrenceville, New Jersey. She said "Please help turn the tide by doing not a little, but a lot, to help solar, wind, and hydrogen [power] become the mainstream energy source[s]—and turn oil into the "alternative"." She is right. We must do something drastic to change our energy policy and put our country back on a rational energy path. Making advancements in sustainable energy sources is a major component of where our energy policy should be.

Of course, this bill is not enough. But it is a start, and a very good start. Once we pass this bill, we will be able to consider other alternative energy legislation and I am confident that we will. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask again: Why did we start the new energy independence with taxing domestic production but not taxing foreign oil? We are going to lead us in the wrong direction.

In your anger against Big Oil, I understand that, but you are penalizing everybody. Eighty-two percent of natural gas is produced by independents; 68 percent of oil is produced by independents; 50 percent of refined products is from independents. My little refinery in Warren, Pennsylvania, will get taxed harder because of your new bill. And I have watched them struggle to fund clean diesel; I watched them struggle to fund clean gasoline units, very expensive.

The use of foreign oil under your bill will continue at the same rate of increase, and I predict in 5 years will be 76 percent dependent. I am for all your renewables, I want to fund them all. But if we produce the energy, took the royalties from the new energy that keeps us alive in this country, we could fund them adequately. If we don't open new fields, we will not have a fertilizer industry, a petrochemical industry, a polymers and plastics industry, and we will make bricks and glass in South America.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 8 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New Mexico has 18 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

□ 1500

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to make three quick points. Sadly, this bill will increase our dependency on foreign oil, exactly the wrong public policy. It taxes the production of domestic oil and, therefore, encourages us to buy more foreign oil. The wrong policy.

Second, this bill will increase the cost of gasoline and fuel oil for every American. Make no mistake about it, when you increase the tax, the producers will pass that tax on and our prices are going up.

But I want to make a broader, more important point, and that is to discuss for the American people and for the record how this bill and the preceding five bills were brought to the floor. That procedure is a raw exercise of power, and I would like to ask my Democratic colleagues why they are afraid to allow discussion and dissent.

This bill came to the floor allowing Republicans no amendments. Zero. This bill didn't go through committee. It couldn't be amended in committee and it can't be amended on the floor.

Some people say this is a response to the Contract With America. I would like to make the point that in the Contract With America, we were allowed to set our agenda. You are entitled to set your agenda here. But in the Contract With America, for those bills we allowed Democrats to offer 154 floor amendments. To our Contract With America in 1995, you got to offer 154 amendments. We get to offer zero.

In our Contract With America, in allowing you to offer 154 amendments in addition to the amendments in committee, 48 of the Democrat amendments to the Republican Contract With America were adopted and became a part of the bill. Zero Republican amendments will be adopted because you allow none.

I do not understand and I do not believe that beginning this debate by not allowing the minority to express itself shows any pride. Let the minority speak. What are you afraid of?

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I recognize one of our new Members, Mr. LAMBORN from Colorado, for 1½ minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 would be bad enough if it only increased taxes by $6.5 billion. H.R. 6 would be bad enough if it only drove up the price of domestic energy, hurting working families and empowering Hugo Chavez and OPEC.

But there is a flaw in this bill that goes even deeper and touches on our oath to uphold the United States Constitution. This bill has a takings with no compensation in it which should not be allowed under the United States Constitution.

I thought we had all learned in the aftermath of the Kelo decision that the American people are offended when the government grabs property without just compensation. Yet this bill does exactly that. This bill forces owners of certain oil and gas leases to renegotiate those leases and forces them to forgo all economic benefits from those leases until they do so. This is a clear violation of the fifth amendment.

Under my oath of office, I cannot support H.R. 6. I urge all Members to oppose it for this reason alone, apart from all of the other bad policy that it contains.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize my friend from Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, for 1 minute.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The word "integrity" in this bill has been used several times today. It is offensive in the extreme just because of what my colleague just mentioned. The lead-in sentence to section 202, which is the beginning of this wreck where we take money, confiscate money from otherwise good hardworking individuals for government purposes, says, "The Secretary of Interior shall agree to a request by any lessee," and I can assure you that no lessee that has negotiated in good faith leases is going to request without some sort of a gun held to their head, and that gun is this bill.

Tax rates go up and tax rates go down. Everybody understands that. Every businessman understands that. What these businessmen don't understand is this Congress's attack on the sanctity of contracts. These leases were signed in 1998 and 1999. If mistakes were made by the Federal Government, fine, go find those lawyers and bring them up on malpractice suits. But those leases were signed.

This bill has delay rentals which were not in the original negotiation. This bill takes money away from those folks.

The bottom line for this increase in taxes and these takings is that there will be less money reinvested in oil and gas domestic production. Every reduction in domestic production leads to a demand for foreign crude oil and foreign natural gas. I recommend a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard complaints from across the aisle today alleging that oil and gas leases being addressed right now were negotiated in a culture of corruption.

Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats have evidence that the Clinton administration that negotiated these leases did so

corruptly, it needs to be brought forward. If that evidence is there, the Attorney General can go forward and rescind these leases and get damages. Maybe that is some of the evidence that Sandy Berger was stuffing in his socks to steal away. But if we don't have the evidence, then it is not right to go forward and break contractual words of this country and this Congress.

Once upon a time there was a king who broke his word regularly, like the Democrats are trying to do here, and our forefathers came forth with a document that said when in the course of human events it becomes necessary to dissolve the political bands which have connected one with another, that is what started this country when the king started being so arbitrary and capricious as this.

Now our forefathers tried to protect against that, so they inserted in the Bill of Rights a fifth amendment provision called the takings clause that says you shall not take private property for public use without just compensation.

Now this bill basically says if you don't renegotiate your lease, you can't get any more leases on your existing lease. You can't have economic benefit. That is one of the things. The Penn Central case from 1978 made clear what the test was, and this rises to the level of a regulatory taking.

In this bill, the Democrats are also going to try to change the Tax Code and deprive the oil and gas industry of a deduction that every other industry has. And what it will do is, in effect, prevent domestic drilling, drive us to more foreign oil and send money to our enemies. We should rename the bill the ''Chavez Shelter Bill'' or the ''Terrorist Assistance Bill'' or maybe the ''National Insecurity Bill.''

Gas prices will skyrocket, and if that is what somebody here wants, they will be happy. Look, I am not happy with the deal that the Clinton administration cut. It was not a good deal, but a country cannot go about breaking its word. That is not the right thing to do.

What the majority wants to do is what was done in ''Animal House'' after a freshman pledge's car was wrecked. He got an arm around his shoulders and the words, ''Son, you messed up. You trusted me.'' That's not the way to run a government.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman who just spoke that he voted for the Pombo bill in both committee and on the floor last year, which included the imposition of these new conservation fees.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there are three titles in this bill. First deals with ways and means problems, those problems that have to do with taxes. We can have legitimate discussions on whether to tax or not tax corporations.

The third title deals with the renewable resources. Being from New Mexico, I think we should be exploring and investing in renewable resources. New Mexico is one of the few States that would be self-sufficient in wind and solar. We are making heavy investments in nuclear energy and in biomass, hydrogen, and geothermal.

I am very committed to the section that the Democrats have on title III. The one I have deep reserves about is title II. In that title, page 10 says a lessee shall not be eligible to obtain the economic benefit of any covered lease, or any other lease.

Mr. Speaker, what is occurring here is the piece that is referred to in yesterday's Washington Post editorial where the Democrats are described as being heavy handed. The stability of contracts that would be recognized and welcomed in Russia and Bolivia, I do not think that our friends on the other side of the aisle intended to do this. Therefore, I recommend that we kindly send this back to committee and we could take out these offenses.

Mr. Speaker, the quality of a nation and its government depends on the full faith and credit of that government. This government depends on making promises that are not written to its seniors, to its veterans. Those promises are honored. But it also makes contractual promises, promises where companies are spending billions of dollars based on the contractual agreement that is there. If we are going to find a way out of those foolish mistakes made by the Clinton administration, I agree we need to do it, but we do not need to do it in the way that they did in Venezuela and Bolivia and Russia. We need to go about it in a proper way. If we are going to punish people who did not voluntarily change a contract, we are no better than those countries that nationalize their industries.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in response to the speaker from New Mexico referring to the silly mistakes of the Clinton administration, I remind him that the current administration has been in power for 6 years.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle have been talking a great deal about the so-called Contract With America. But what our experience has shown over the years is that was not a Contract With America but a contract with and for powerful special interests.

They allowed the drug companies, for example, to write a Medicare bill; and they have allowed the oil companies to determine energy policy in our country. That needs to change.

All day long today they have been talking about how they don't like the idea that the oil companies have to pay their fair share of taxes even while they are making record profits and they have charged record prices at the pump and elsewhere for their product. It makes no sense.

The energy policy that they put in place beginning in 1995, and then made even worse in 2005, caused oil prices to increase dramatically because of their affiliation with the energy companies. We need to change that.

What this bill does is it takes bad policy and turns it into good policy. It takes policy that is based upon the interest of special interests, the oil companies, and changes it into policy that is based upon the big interests of the American people.

It takes as much as $14 billion over the course of the next 10 years and uses that money to promote energy conservation, alternative energy, to bring our country to a situation of increasing energy independence.

They have been talking a great deal about how we are going to be importing more oil. Well, the fact of the matter is 60 percent of the oil that we use in our country today is imported from outside of the country.

The product that we have in places such as the Gulf of Mexico is a very valuable product. It is owned by the American people. The value of that product is going to go up over time significantly. You just want to make it easier for the oil companies to take it now at a cheap price. We are against that. Pass H.R. 6.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) for 1 minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, this ill-conceived legislation will halt recent efforts to increase domestic oil and gas production and will further boost our Nation's dependence on foreign oil.

The price we pay for turning a blind eye towards our Nation's energy security is absolutely staggering. Most Americans don't realize the hidden cost of our reliance on foreign oil.

According to the National Defense Council Foundation, the cost to defend America's access to foreign oil supplies rose to nearly $137 billion in 2006.

The majority is pushing through this job-killing legislation that threatens thousands of jobs in my gulf coast district.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you firsthand, we are not talking about minimum wage jobs. Many times over minimum wage.

Furthermore, the creation of an energy slush fund with no specific wording in this legislation about how it is going to be used is fiscally irresponsible. America deserves a comprehensive bill to address our Nation's energy security. H.R. 6 is not close, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), another member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in 2006, our Nation's oil companies made $97 billion in profits, five times the profits they made in 2002. In the last 3 years, their profits per gallon of gasoline

went from 15 cents per gallon of gas that you pumped in your car to 50 cents last year.

□ 1515

So just think of it. Today, when you put your gallon of gas in the car, oil and gas is taking 50 cents a gallon for profits. That is scandalous.

Now, if you want to challenge me, I ask the press to challenge me. And if oil and gas wants to disprove my facts, I ask the oil and gas industry to disprove my facts. Open up your books, oil and gas companies, and disprove what I have to say to you today.

Otherwise, let's pass this bill and give back to the people of this country some of the excess profits these companies have been taking from the American people.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) 2½ minutes.

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, you know, in America, I still believe that a man's word is a man's word. And in America, contract rights are property rights. And the fifth amendment prohibits the government from taking away those property rights without due process and without just compensation.

Under the Democrat energy bill, contract rights are bona fide leases that are taken away. You cannot sell your lease, you cannot transfer your lease, you cannot derive any economic benefit from your lease until you open up your lease renegotiation. This is a complete elimination of value of these valid and binding contracts. The Supreme Court has long held that when this occurs property owners must be compensated.

The Democrat energy bill doesn't recapture the money lost from the Clinton administration's badly written leases, it just opens up the floodgates for takings litigation. This is a trial lawyer's dream bill. Federal takings claims and property disputes are notoriously long. They can take a long time to resolve.

Now, there was a bipartisan resolution and a vote in Congress to fix the lease mess, but last year's language was killed by the other body. It had a fix on the leases that would give back $10 billion to the American taxpayers. The Democrat bill, as written, will hurt offshore investment in drilling by American companies, which in turn does nothing to reduce our U.S. dependence on foreign energy.

We are breaking our word with American companies who hold these leases and who have invested a lot of their money into drilling. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a man's word is a man's word, and a deal is a deal. If our government interferes with lease contracts and changes this deal, who will want to invest in American exploration?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, for too long Big Oil has benefited from weak royalty laws, huge tax breaks, and subsidies. Last year, the five biggest oil companies' profits were $97 billion, nearly five times their profit in 2002. These record profits were bolstered by excessive tax breaks, generous subsidies, and being allowed to drill on public land without reimbursing taxpayers.

In the meantime, Americans are being taken at the gas pump as gas prices rose to over $3 per gallon last summer. Rather than helping oil companies' bottom lines, these tax breaks and special subsidies will be reallocated in H.R. 6 to promote and develop clean and renewable energy to end our Nation's addiction to oil.

Under prior Republican leadership, the oil industry enjoyed years of record profits with minimal oversight, resulting in price manipulation and record gas prices. The American people have chosen a new direction, and under Democratic leadership we will end the tax breaks and the subsidies to Big Oil.

America will begin to end our addiction to foreign oil, improve our environment, and promote our economic and national security through clean and renewable energy. Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 6.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not energy policy, it is industrial policy. The San Francisco wing of the Democrat Party is switching from blaming America first to blaming the American way of life first for all the ills they conjure up.

San Francisco Democrats want to tell the American people they should be running their cars off wind, yet I will tell you that there is only one institution in this Nation that runs off wind and that is the hot air that fuels this institution.

Mr. Speaker, energy is the largest business in the world, not because governments make it so but because 6 billion people demand the freedom and quality of life that its use provides. When America went from horses to cars it was because cars were more efficient and faster than horses, not because government deemed they should be driving in cars. When America went from dirt roads to asphalt it was because asphalt was the more efficient surface that could withstand rain and snow, not because government told people to use it.

Just because we say people should be using wind and solar to power their cars does not mean it is going to occur.

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

Mr. RAHALL. May I have a time check, please, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. And the gentleman from New Mexico?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would observe that it is my intent to reserve the balance of my time until the closing of the entire bill, if that would assist the gentleman in planning his time.

Mr. RAHALL. I am sorry, I have the right to close; is that right?

Mr. PEARCE. I am just going to reserve my 5 minutes of debate time until after the next two committees have gone.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield for unanimous consent only to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 6.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, which works to stop global warming by creating a fund that will support research in renewable energy sources and encourage energy efficiency.

Yesterday, the publishers of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, a group of prominent experts including physicist Lawrence Krauss of Case Western Reserve University, said we are perilously close to destroying the stability of our planet by ignoring the threat of climate change.

Carbon dioxide levels are 27 percent higher now than at any point in 650,000 years, and 2006 registered as the warmest year in recorded history. We can no longer afford to postpone action.

Our need to act now is further enhanced by our Nation's dependence on foreign oil. Currently, we import 60 percent of our oil, and that number will increase to 75 percent in the next four years.

With diminishing domestic oil reserves and growing instability in the Middle East, dependence on imported oil leaves our Nation vulnerable to volatility in foreign nations.

Yet we can reverse our course, and H.R. 6 takes a step toward doing so.

The CLEAN Act will create a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve, which will finance legislation that promotes renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Although 86 percent of America's energy comes from the burning of fossil fuels, a number of alternatives exist that are better for the environment.

Ohio is home to the largest wind turbines east of the Rockies, installed near Bowling Green. These utility-scale turbines produce 1.8 Megawatts of electricity. Honda and Iten Industries are currently studying developing wind farms at their facilities in Ashtabula and Logan counties.

As part of its Sustainability Program, the City of Cleveland has partnered with Green Energy Ohio to study the feasibility of installing wind turbines on Lake Erie.

Ohio is also a leader in biofuels. Most gasoline sold in Ohio contains 10 percent ethanol, and the Ohio Department of Development offers incentives for research in agricultural-based fuels. Ohioans are installing solar panels on their roofs to heat their water, buying hybrid cars to decrease fuel consumption, and building low-impact dams to produce hydropower. The City of Cleveland is building new bike lanes to encourage commuters to leave their cars at home.

Ohioans are committed to using cleaner energy, but doing so is expensive. The reserve

fund established by H.R. 6 would provide the means needed to pursue these environmentally sound strategies.

This reserve will be financed by reinvesting money that used to go to large oil companies through tax breaks, allowing Congress to provide this fund without increasing the deficit.

Critics of H.R. 6 argue this measure will place an undue burden on oil companies, which will lead to higher gas prices. However, by helping reduce our dependence on oil and diversifying the source of energy for Americans, H.R. 6 will lead to increased long-run fuel price stability. Even President Bush has said, ''Energy companies do not need taxpayer funded incentives to explore for oil and gas.''

Other critics argue the threat of global warming has not been proved. Those in denial ignore the opinions of not only the scientific community, but of corporations such as Wal-Mart and General Electric, state and local governments around the country, and the National Academy of Sciences, who all agree that the fight to stop global warming must start now.

H.R. 6 will not single-handedly solve our climate change problems, but it is one part of an elaborate strategy we must undertake in order to ensure that the planet we love will be here for our grandchildren's grandchildren.

Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 6.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, just by way of clarification with the gentleman of New Mexico, my name is the lead sponsor on this bill and I am from the State of West Virginia, not San Francisco. Just to correct any misperceptions there.

Mr. PEARCE. I appreciate that clarification from the gentleman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to a valued member of our Natural Resources Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) 1½ minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. Today, our economy relies on fossil fuels for energy. We must simply change that.

President Bush admits we are addicted to oil, and this addiction is harming our country. The best way to beat this addiction is to stop using so much oil and gas by reducing demand, promoting renewables, and developing alternatives.

Since America is not exactly awash in oil and gas, reducing our dependence upon them would be good not only for our environment but for the economy and our national security as well.

To be honest, though, we have to do more than just talk about the potential that renewables and alternative energy has for this country. We have to put in place more funding for programs to bring these energy sources to market. We have to make changes in energy policy to encourage their use. And that is exactly what H.R. 6 does.

In the debate on the floor today, the minority side has described H.R. 6 as a takings. So let me remind all of us that when the House considered and passed the Jindal-Pombo OCS drilling legislation last June, 2006, no Republican Member challenged the conservation fee as a breach of contract or a taking. In fact, the Committee on Resources report on that legislation, H.R. 4761, states, and I quote, ''this new fee addresses the mistakes made in leases issued in 1998 and 1999 where price triggers for royalties were not included in the lease without violating contractual obligations of the United States.''

Mr. Speaker, Americans want real meaningful solutions to our Nation's energy challenges. Big Oil has received more than its fair share of handouts. It is time we put taxpayer funds to more productive use. Let us pass the CLEAN Energy Act.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to point out that the conservation fee in this bill, contrary to the testimony we are hearing, applies to all leases, according to the language in the bill, and that clarification is a very important distinction.

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

Mr. RAHALL. How much time do I have left now, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a valued member of our Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his great work and for yielding, and I thank Mr. HINCHEY, who has worked with me over the past 2 years to bring to the attention of the American people this issue of the fact that there is drilling going on off the shores of our public country on public lands where there are no royalties being paid, whether it is $30, $40, $50, $60, $70, or $80 a barrel.

Here is what President Bush said about that on April 19, 2005. ''I will tell you, with $55 oil, we don't need the incentives to oil and gas companies to explore,'' Bush said in a speech in April.

So what are we saying? We are saying keep your contracts. You don't have to change the contracts. Keep them. But if you want new contracts on new drilling sites, renegotiate the old contracts or pay a $9 fee. You can keep the sanctity of the old contracts, but you are not entitled to new contracts. Very simple.

Then, after the money is recollected, we are going to create a Renewable Energy Strategic Fund to change and put our country heading in a new direction.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we are considering today represents the important first step in charting a new direction for the nation's energy policy. H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007, repeals the unnecessary and I wasteful tax breaks and royalty-free drilling rights for big oil and gas companies, and instead creates a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve that would invest in clean, renewable energy sources and clean alternative fuels like ethanol, as well as energy efficiency and conservation.

At a time when they are making record profits and American consumers are being tipped upside down at the pump we should not be giving massive subsidies and tax breaks to big oil companies. Even President Bush conceded in an April 19, 2005 Washington Post article, ''I will tell you with $55 oil we don't need incentives to oil and gas companies to explore. * * * There are plenty of incentives.'' Even George Bush admits that at $55 dollars, the price of oil is enough of an incentive for oil companies to drill and they don't need the additional taxpayer subsidies that were created under the Republican Congress. Today, with H.R. 6, we are simply going to repeal the most egregious of those unnecessary incentives and tax breaks to big oil.

In addition, H.R. 6 will put an end to oil companies drilling for free on public land when oil prices are high. The Government Accountability Office has estimated that the American taxpayers stand to lose at least $10 billion from leases issued in the late 90s that do not suspend so-called royalty relief. H.R. 6 would correct this problem by barring oil companies from purchasing new leases unless they had either renegotiated their existing faulty leases or agreed to pay a fee on the production of oil and gas from those leases.

Now, I have heard some Members on the other side of the aisle argue that if we were to pass the royalty relief fixes included in H.R. 6 and take back from big oil the $10 billion or more that rightfully belongs to the American people, it will violate the contracts that they are holding. That it will turn our country into Bolivia or Russia. But let me be clear—we have spoken to the top constitutional lawyers in the country and they all agree that we are on the firmest of constitutional ground.

The contracts that these oil companies are holding allow for the federal government to impose fees like the ones in this bill. Furthermore, the American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service has said time and time again that including a condition in new oil and gas leases to exclude oil companies that have not renegotiated their faulty leases would not abrogate existing contracts or constitute a takings. All H.R. 6 does is give these big oil companies a choice—they can continue producing royalty-free oil no matter how high the price of oil climbs, that's fine, but then they're not going to get any new leases from the Federal Government.

And more than that, this House has already adopted the royalty relief fixes included in H.R. 6 by overwhelming, bipartisan votes. Many of my Republican colleagues voted for both of those provisions. The House adopted the Markey-Hinchey amendment to the Interior appropriations bill to provide an incentive for these companies to renegotiate by suspending their ability to bid on new leases by a vote of 252–165. The House also voted last year to impose a $9 per barrel fee on oil produced from these leases in a bill authored by former Resources Chairman Pombo. That Pombo fee is this bill, and the Markey-Hinchey suspension on bidding for new leases is also there as an alternative. So, this is something that the House has already voted to do two times. Two times, this House has said that we want to put real pressure on all the oil and gas companies holding those 1998–1999 leases to renegotiate.

However, the Bush Administration has consistently opposed our efforts to bring every oil

company holding one of these leases back to the negotiating table and it continues to oppose the provisions in H.R. 6 that would do so. Instead, the Bush Administration has argued that we should allow oil companies to "voluntarily" renegotiate with the Minerals Management Service. However, of the 56 companies holding these leases, only 5 have voluntarily agreed to renegotiate. When billions of taxpayer dollars are at stake, that is simply not an acceptable rate of return. H.R. 6 says that it is time for the oil companies to stop playing Uncle Sam for Uncle Sucker.

According to an Interior Department's Inspector General's report that came out today, senior officials at the Minerals Management Service have known about these faulty leases for nearly three years, yet sat idly by and did absolutely nothing while big oil companies failed to pay nearly $1 billion in royalties that rightfully belonged to the American people. If the allegations in the IG's report are true, top Bush Administration officials have aided and abetted one of the greatest heists in history. We should not now leave those same officials in charge of getting oil companies to "voluntarily" renegotiate those same leases.

Finally today, as part of the first 100 hours, we are starting the comprehensive debate about our nation's energy policy that we should have been having over the last 6 years. Finally today, we are beginning to talk about how we can radically increase the amount of renewable fuels such as ethanol we consume in the country. Finally today, we are beginning to talk on the Floor of the People's House about how to make our appliances or our buildings or our vehicles more energy efficient so that we can reduce our consumption of foreign oil and our emissions of greenhouse gasses.

Adopting H.R. 6 will allow us to begin to move in a new, clean direction on energy and put an end to the free ride that big oil has had under the Bush Administration. This bill is a beginning. It is the beginning of a change in direction, away from subsidizing an industry that doesn't need extra financial incentives, and towards the technologies that do need a helping hand. Today, we have a Strategic Petroleum Reserve that we can tap to help American consumers in the event of another Middle East oil embargo or crisis. But with this bill we create a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve, that we can tap to ensure that America can move towards energy independence.

I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 6.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in introducing this bill.

We are following through with our promise to hold big oil and gas companies accountable to the American people. Now, 6 years ago, when temperatures were spiking around the world, and the effects of global warming were raising alarm bells about the fate of the polar bear, the Vice President was holding secret meetings with energy executives and offering cozy deals and incentives to his Big Oil buddies.

When oil prices spiked, and they spiked after Hurricane Katrina, and oil companies began reporting the highest corporate profits in American history, the President and the Republicans in Congress were eagerly offering their cronies another generous helping of public giveaways. While the American people were emptying their pockets to fill up at the pump, Republicans were lining up to be the first to open our coast to new drilling.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that those days are over. By forcing oil and gas companies to pay their fair share for the natural resources that belong to us, we are recovering more than $14 billion of the taxpayers' money over the next 10 years. That $14 billion represents a real investment in green energy initiatives that will one day allow us to declare energy independence.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and a valued member of our Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I think it is just incredible that the other side of the aisle would argue, at a time when the most competitive and the most stressed oil market in the world, that what you need to develop oil leases offshore is to have government subsidies. At a time when you have national governments and international oil companies scouring the world to lock up resources, almost willing to do business with anybody in the world, doesn't matter if they are a dictator from the right or the left, at a time when countries are out trying to get their hands on these resources, we suggest the only way you can get people to drill in the most secure area of the entire world is to give them a subsidy.

The national security of the United States is the subsidy they get when they drill here. They do not need additional subsidies.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the end of debate after the other committees have used their time.

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). At this time, the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Virginia each control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, thank you. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I am pleased today to rise in support of H.R. 6. Rural America is already leading the way towards reducing our dependence on foreign oil and generating electricity from renewable resources.

To encourage the growth of renewable energy production, the Agriculture Committee will be including an energy title in the farm bill that we will write this year; however, we currently have no baseline money to write that energy title.

The funds created in the energy reserve in H.R. 6 will help us establish farm bill policies that will move us closer to energy independence.

One of my top priorities for renewable energy in the farm bill will be funding for additional research and development on cellulosic ethanol, which I believe is the real key to achieving energy independence.

To begin the transition to cellulosic ethanol, we need to start growing cellulosic feedstocks so that we are ready to get the industry off the ground when the technology and infrastructure are in place to begin producing it.

To make this happen, we are going to propose a new farm bill program that will pay farmers and ranchers to begin growing cellulosic feedstocks, such as switch grass, sweet sorghum, miscanthus and other crops in actual, real-world settings. This will help us identify the best feedstocks that each region of the country can grow and supply to this new cellulosic ethanol industry.

While we are learning how to grow the feedstocks that will fuel the cellulosic ethanol industry, we must also help get the first generation of cellulosic ethanol plants up and running. We hoped that the Department of Energy would issue the loan guarantees to start that process, but the unfinished appropriation process left over from the last Congress, it appears, makes that unlikely. So I am going to work with the other committees of relevance to determine what we need to do to help these first cellulosic ethanol plants to be built and to be operational.

Although I am most interested in finding ways to encourage the move to cellulosic ethanol, we will also be looking for ways to make our current starch ethanol industry more efficient by supporting research on better use of by-products and better corn yields.

As we build on the success of the starch ethanol industry and as a value-added agriculture product, we need to continue to support one of our most important value-added industries in agriculture, our livestock industry. This industry has been one of the greatest value-added success stories in recent years, boosting income in our farming communities. We need to ensure that any renewable fuels policies that we pursue do not damage this important sector.

We must also continue to grow our domestic biodiesel industry, so the Agriculture Committee will continue the CCC Bioenergy program, a farm bill

program that can also provide incentives for the cellulosic ethanol production.

Beyond the renewable fuel production, there are other policies that the Agriculture Committee will support to help our Nation's farmers and ranchers both conserve and produce more energy. For example, in the 2002 farm bill, we included a program to help farmers and ranchers make their operations more energy efficient. That program, known as the Section 9006 Program, also helps agriculture producers install methane digesters or wind turbines on their land to produce renewable energy.

As we continue to consider the future of the energy production in the United States, we need to be sure that we can provide the technical expertise needed to plan and test all kinds of bio-based products, not just fuels, such as shirts made from corn fiber, which are produced in my district, and fast-food containers made from corn starch.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Minnesota has been a leader in renewable energy, recognizing the growing needs for a growing industry. Many of our rural communities are coming alive with the excitement and the new investment that renewable energy has brought. I want to be sure that the rest of the country can benefit from this great experience that we have had in Minnesota.

Rural America stands ready to plant, grow and harvest the future of energy independence for our Nation. I encourage the support of this bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6. Like my colleagues, I believe we should find solutions to address the growing demand for energy, and I look forward to working with my colleague, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. PETERSON, to find new ways for American agriculture to provide increasing sources of domestic energy.

In the Republican-led Congress, I supported an energy bill that was signed into law that actually encouraged domestic energy production and lessened our dependence on foreign oil. Today's legislation, however, seems to dismantle any progress we have made in achieving energy independence.

The Wall Street Journal and The Washington Post, they don't agree with each other very often, they both condemn this legislation. The Wall Street Journal calls it the OPEC Energy Security Act: ''This bill is said to promote America's energy independence, but the biggest winner may be OPEC. Raise taxes on domestic oil producers,'' it said. ''Yes, raise the cost at the gas pump for American consumers. Raise the cost for American farmers who have to buy oil and natural gas to operate their farms. Every American farmer has to do that.''

The Washington Post says: ''This heavy-handed attack on the stability of contracts would be welcomed in Russia, Bolivia or other countries that have been criticized for tearing up revenue-sharing agreements with private energy companies.'' The Wall Street Journal again says: ''So at the same time that the U.S. is trying to persuade Venezuela and other nations to honor property rights, Congress does its own Hugo Chavez imitation.''

Many Members have discussed passionately how America needs to decrease its dependence on foreign oil. In fact, many campaigned on promises to decrease our independence. But here we are in the midst of the Democratic leadership's first 100 hours considering a bill to increase America's dependence on foreign oil. This is dangerous policy for our national and economic security.

This legislation increases fees for domestic energy production and repeals for energy companies only the manufacturing tax deduction which was put in place to encourage domestic manufacturing and jobs from domestic production of goods. The manufacturing tax deduction was extended to all manufacturing to fix the problematic FSC–ETI problem, and was in no way a giveaway to the oil companies.

By singling out one industry alone, we are not righting a wrong. We are persecuting an industry and the people employed in that industry domestically. This is not attacks on foreign production in Venezuela or Iran or Saudi Arabia. This is attacks on American production of energy. Repealing these incentives makes it less economical to produce domestic energy and will compel companies to seek cheaper options abroad.

While energy demands continue to rise, this bill would discourage domestic production, forcing the U.S. to import more foreign oil. While the proponents will tell you only oil companies will pay, the truth is every single one of us will pay the price.

So why are we increasing the price of energy as well as our dependence on foreign oil? Those on the other side think this will help spur research for alternative energy. It is estimated that this bill robs about $14 billion over the next decade from domestic energy production. That is quite a lot of money. But where is the plan outlining how that money will be used? Sadly, there isn't one, thanks to a closed rule, with no amendments offered whatsoever time after time during this process, in contrast with the Contract With America, where we allowed 154 Democratic amendments, 48 of which, by the way, passed and were included as a part of the Contract With America. In this process, that possibility of spelling that out is gone. There is no way to tell people how we can use this for more domestic production for renewable fuels, for example. Sadly, there isn't anything like that.

This bill creates a $14 billion piggy bank or slush fund that we have been told will be used for future alternative energy legislation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this very bad legislation.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6, a piece of legislation that will move us towards energy independence. We are 65 percent dependent upon foreign energy, and we need to take advantage of our own natural resources. And in reference to the prior debate, that includes coal.

The only reason we do not have a coal-to-liquid plant in the United States of America right now has nothing to do with anyone in this Chamber on either side of the aisle, but it has directly to do with the Department of Energy that refuses to follow the letter of the law and enforce a loan guarantee of $100 million. If they would do that, we would have a coal-to-liquid plant right now in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the borough of Gilberton. We need to take advantage of all of our natural resources. And serving as the vice chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I look forward to taking advantage of our agriculture natural resources.

The chairman and ranking member last year, when their roles were reversed, traveled around the country having hearings, trying to see what we need to do in the next farm bill. One thing was heard loud and clear, we need to take advantage of our own natural resources. And in the trip to Minnesota at the chairman's district, when we learned how far ahead the State of Minnesota is in ethanol production and cellulosic research, we understood right then what we need to do in writing this farm bill.

So I rise in support of this legislation to give us the opportunity to do the research, to find the feedstocks to make us energy independent so we can, once and for all, not depend upon foreign energy and be independent and bring the price down.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT).

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 aims to punish Big Oil. In reality, the only people it punishes are the American people.

It is a fact that America is dependent upon foreign sources of oil. Six out of every 10 barrels of oil our Nation consumes come from foreign sources. This means that our Nation's energy security rests in the hands of the leaders of Iran, Venezuela, Algeria, Chad, Angola, Nigeria, and Russia. This state of affairs is unacceptable, and we must do all we can to change it.

The way we change the situation is straightforward, but not easy. We need

to be more efficient with the energy we use to fuel our economy, heat our homes, and run our cars. We need to increase the use of alternative and renewable fuels, like ethanol and soy diesel, wind energy and nuclear power. We need to deploy new technologies that will allow us to make clean and efficient use of our nearly inexhaustible supplies of coal, and we need to look forward to a new age where we can use the power derived from hydrogen-replaced fossil fuels.

I am pleased to say that on every one of these fronts, Congress has already acted. The Energy Policy Act of 2005, the first comprehensive energy bill in decades, provided significant incentives for renewable fuels, including the very successful and renewable fuel standard. It provided significant incentives for new nuclear power plants, energy-efficient buildings, solar and wind power, biomass and geothermal energy. It provides funding for FutureGen and other clean coal projects for research into the use of hydrogen and fuel cells. And it provides loan guarantees for projects employing carbon sequestration, coal gasification and coal-to-liquids technology.

This landmark legislation moved us toward where we will ultimately need to be, a country less dependent on uncertain foreign sources of energy.

I agree with many of my colleagues that we need to do more. We need to ensure that this country can deploy nuclear power plants, that we can provide the power investment climate whereby clean coal-to-liquid plants can be built. And we need to push the deployment of E–85 infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do all these things and more, but we also need a vibrant and effective energy sector in this country. We need to produce and develop our own energy. We need to open ANWR. We need to make more of our offshore resources available for development, and we need additional investment in energy infrastructure. What we do not need, Mr. Speaker, is a tax increase on domestic energy exploration, production and development. We do not need to make American energy less competitive than energy produced overseas.

And make no mistake about it, increasing taxes on our Nation's energy industry means one thing: more reliance on foreign oil and gasoline. I had the honor of being in Soviet Union, Russia, last fall; met with Premier Putin. He spent 2½ hours talking about how Russia was going to combine and provide the energy for all of Europe and America if we wished to buy it.

□ 1545

Incidentally, he wanted our investment dollars, he wanted companies to invest there. Higher taxes means we have less investment here, less exploration here, development of resources here at home, and more development dependence on energy derived from foreign sources.

Mr. Speaker, we need to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 is shortsighted policy. Oil companies in recent years have made huge profits, no doubt about it. I, for one, have argued that they use these profits and re-invest them here in developing new energy projects and building new refineries.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, however, want to punish such investment in America with new taxes. That is wrong, it is shortsighted and it won't work.

As the Wall Street Journal noted, this is an energy bill only OPEC Ministers could love.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with many of my colleagues that we should fix the Clinton Administrations mistake in not putting price thresholds in offshore leases granted to oil companies in 1998 and 1999.

I voted, along with many of you, to correct this mistake. But I do not agree with my Democrat colleagues that we should punish investment in our Nation's energy resources and infrastructure.

Far from punishing Big Oil we are only punishing ourselves. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, for giving me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. When we passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Congress put the interests of Big Oil ahead of enacting a comprehensive energy bill for the American people.

Today we begin to right that wrong by repealing $14 billion in giveaways in tax loopholes to Big Oil. We are also repealing a provision which suspended the royalty fees from oil and gas companies operating in the Gulf of Mexico. We simply cannot let these companies off the hook for reaping record profits without paying their fair share.

We will then invest these funds in clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency and create a Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve which will also promote new energy technologies and improve energy conservation. The 110th Congress presents us with a new opportunity to advance forward-thinking 21st century energy policy. As a matter of national security we must wean ourselves off of foreign oil.

I will be reintroducing the bipartisan Engel/Kingston DRIVE Act, also known as the Fuel Choices for American Security Act. I hope we pass that bill as well.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for the purpose of controlling debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HINCHEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6 for a whole series of reasons. The gentleman addressed Vladimir Putin, who just nationalized $20 billion worth of Shell Oil Company's investment. You get a sense of what we have when you have those countries taking over the private investment.

I, for one, don't object to profits that go into companies like Exxon, Chevron, Shell, companies that take their profits and reinvest them back into research and development and exploration. That is why oil went from $75 a barrel down to $53 a barrel, and the trend is on back down.

This bill sends it the other way. I happen to represent Iowa, and Iowa produced 26 percent of the ethanol in the United States of America. That is number one of the States in the United States. We have a Nation that eclipsed Brazil in ethanol production. We have over $1 billion in private capital investment just in my congressional district for the 2006 construction season for renewable energies.

That tells me that research and development is coming in the private sector. They are producing enzymes in the private sector. They will catch up, and they will take care of the cellulosic ethanol. The government does a poor job of investing those dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. We need a balanced energy policy in this country. This bill hurts agriculture and renewable fuels, small petroleum companies and well as the energy sector. This bill that affects every man, woman and child in America was not even given committee consideration. I guess an iron fisted rule from the Democrats is what we have come to expect.

Mr. Speaker, the liquid hydrocarbon sector supplies more then 99 percent of fuel used by Americans for transportation and operation of businesses. They produce the diesel fuel used by farmers in my district to run their tractors and combines. These are tractors and combines that plant and harvest our food in America. Natural gas is also the major cost in Nitrogen fertilizer farmers in my district use to grow corn. Corn, Mr. Speaker, is the major feedstock for ethanol in this country followed only by natural gas. This bill will hurt America's farmers by making them pay more for fuel to grow food and more for fertilizer to grow more ethanol. One last point, asphalt is made from petroleum. Asphalt is used for roads. Roads are used to transport grain to market and children to school.

I wonder if the Democrats realize they will be putting additional strain on local and State governments, the largest buyers of asphalt, who will then have to raise taxes to cover their cost. To recap, this bill raises operational costs of farming in my district by making fuel and fertilizer more expensive. In addition, farmers will get hit by increased taxes from their local and country governments.

While recovering royalties from the 98–99 lease issue seems like a politically friendly catch phrase, I would like to make two points on this issue. Recently, Russia forced Shell to hand over a $20 billion project. The Democrat plan to force producers to renegotiate their lease royalties or be barred from future leases is blackmail of American oil companies. This blackmail stems from a mistake from a Democrat administration. Maybe the Democrats are taking a page from Putin's energy policy playbook. They make American petroleum companies fear blackmail on two continents.

Have the Democrats given any consideration to what this legislation will do to small business? Large companies are somewhat cushioned against these types of blows. Small independent oil producers are not.

If they are forced into bankruptcy or mergers, all the Democrats have done is to consolidate petroleum production into fewer hands.

Right now, America is importing a large sum of petroleum from unstable countries. By importing this petroleum, America is enriching her enemies. Importing oil is a fact of life right now. Since I have been in Congress, I have been saying that we need to produce more BTU's here in America. Section 345 of the 2005 Energy bill contained incentives for petroleum producers to venture into deep water. In September 2006 Chevron discovered an oil field 270 miles south-west of New Orleans. This field is projected to increase America's proven reserves by 50 percent. I don't know if Chevron took advantage of Section 345 but it sure would make it easier to convince the accountants of the need to head to deep water. H.R. 6 repeals section 345. The test-well that Chevron had to drill to find this new field cost them $100 million.

The Democrats will no doubt point out the revenues reported in the media as justification for this legislation. I'm curious if the Democrats will acknowledge that the media has reported the gross revenue of oil companies. Not the net profits, but the gross receipts.

As a former small business owner, I wish to remind my Democrat colleagues about simple economics about how to calculate how much profit is made. The GROSS revenue are profits before bills are paid. Once the bills are paid, the net revenues of oil companies are very much in line with other industries as stated by Congressman COLE earlier today.

Some of the debt that oil companies pay is to shareholders. With the recent run-up in oil prices, oil companies have been a profitable sector to invest. When Democrat's take a bite out of the oil companies, they are taking a bite out of 401(k) plans, retirement plans and pension funds. Any tax increase on oil companies will hurt retirees and stockholders. Right now over seventeen million people rely on those funds for their retirement security.

I realize that this bill contains a section that will use royalty money for renewable research. Yet, there is no provision that would prevent this account from being raided for other projects. Most of my colleagues know that Iowa is not only a consumer of energy, but a producer of energy. The Fifth District of Iowa is an energy export center, exporting ethanol and biodiesel all across this Nation. Rest assured the American consumer is driving renewable demand. It is also driving research. Ethanol is good to invest in. Ethanol companies realize that more investment means more money. Ethanol companies also realize that more ethanol means more money for investors. In order to maximize ethanol production companies are doing research to increase the yield of ethanol from feedstock. Rural investors raise money for new ethanol plants in days. Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats want research to happen for renewable energy, then clear the way of burdensome regulations.

Mr. Speaker as I conclude, I wish to reiterate, H.R. 6 sounds good, but it will do nothing but drive up energy prices for the American consumer. The American consumer, who drives to work, drives kids to wrestling practice, the independent truck driver driving more miles to make ends meet. It will make it harder for the American consumer living on a fixed income to make ends meet. I ask my colleagues to join with the American consumer and oppose H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize a new member of the House Agriculture Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ELLSWORTH) for 1 minute.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is an argument that has been going on for a long time, when I was a young boy, since the 1970s, talking about reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

I rise today in strong support of this bill for cutting big oil subsidies and investing in our homegrown energy sources.

I have to think of an analogy that this is much like when I was trying to teach my daughter how to ride a bicycle. Had training wheels on a small Stingray. She road like that, and I ran behind her with my hand on the back of the seat. Then at the point she was ready, I let her go. She could ride, and she rode well. I think these companies and these big oil companies are ready to ride on their own.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time we get serious about kicking our dependence on foreign oil, relying on homegrown sources like we grow in Indiana, corn and soybeans. We know how to do it, we know how to grow it. With the technology incentives, we can turn that into the energy we need.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. BARTON of TEXAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to focus, in the small amount of time that I have, on one of the principal components of this particular piece of legislation. That is the apparent attempt to say that some of these leases that were granted in 1997 and 1998 were somehow flawed, and that there were mistakes made and things were covered up and the oil companies tried to renegotiate some of these leases to get a sweetheart deal. Nothing could be further from the truth.

On November 28, 1995, President Clinton signed Public Law 104–58. It was entitled the Outer Continental Shelf Deepwater Royalty Relief Act, Royalty Relief Act. It was the intent of this act to offer royalty relief, royalty suspension in certain tracts in the Gulf of Mexico in order to create an incentive to get the oil companies, both large and small, to actually bid on these leases, to spend money to promote them, develop them and hopefully find some commercial production.

There was no mistake about it. It was the intention of the act to sign some leases that did not have royalty or had a lesser royalty than was commonly in place. Now, remember at this point in time oil was selling for $10 to $15 a barrel, and there was no production, there was no exploration, or very little exploration going on.

Section 303 of that act established a new bidding system that allowed the Secretary of the Interior to offer tracts with royalty suspensions for a period, volume or value that the Secretary so determines. Now, section 304 of that ACT went on and says that all tracts, a-l-l, all tracts that were off within 5 years of the date of enactment in deepwater; that is, water that is at least 200 meters deep, had to be offered under a new bidding system, had to be, not could be, might be, had to be.

This new bidding system had a royalty clause in it, but the royalty clause was based on volume of production and is also based on the depth of the water. The deeper the water was, the less the volume was that you had to produce before you triggered a royalty.

In other words, if you were in the deepest water in the gulf that was leased, you could produce up to 87 million barrels of oil without paying a royalty. That is a lot of oil, 87 million barrels is a lot of oil.

So we, those of us that were in the Congress, in the mid-1990s, passed a Royalty Relief Act, it is in the title. It says, if you will put your hard-earned dollars and go out and bid on these leases, and you win one of those leases, if it is in the deepwater, we are putting in a bidding system, and under this bidding system you may have to pay a royalty based on how much you produce but you won't pay a royalty based on the price.

Now, we only offered these leases for, I think, 2 years, 571 were actually bid on. Of those, about half, I think, were accepted. Of those, we discovered we have current production in 19 of them, 19.

Now, after the fact, we can come back here in 2007, when prices are at $50 a barrel, and say that was a bad deal 12 years ago, we should not have done it. But 12 years ago oil was at $10 a barrel. We had no domestic exploration going on. We passed a specific act of Congress that said give this royalty relief. Today we are, in hindsight, saying take it away. That is wrong, and I oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker, during the 2006 campaign we were promised civility and "playing by the rules, following regular order." Today, like the

rest of the 110th Congress so far, we face the extreme opposite: government by martial law and bumper sticker. Mr. Speaker, your bumper stickers worked in the campaign but they are not governance worthy of the American people and it won't take time for the people to understand the difference.

The last major energy legislation enacted by Congress was the Energy Policy Act of 2005. It was a long and heavy lift. We had countless hours of hearings before the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Committee mark-up seemed to take forever because of the many amendments offered by Members on both sides of the aisle.

And then there was the exhausting conference with the Senate. Many provisions were negotiated in excruciating detail. What did it give us? One of the most important, historic, and consequential pieces of comprehensive legislation in history. It has already directly accounted for several liquefied gas facilities, new nuclear plant announcements, vastly improved electricity transmission reliability, and impressive capital investment in solar, wind, and other renewables.

Did the minority party participation slow things down? You bet it did, but it also improved the product. I am proud of the 70 Democrat votes on final passage but especially of one vote, that of our new chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan. We earned each other's support for the final product.

Today, by contrast, we have a bumper sticker: ''Stick it to Big Oil.'' That's a cute bumper sticker, but, please, Mr. Speaker, don't use it to govern with because you are only hurting the very people who sent us all here.

In 2004 we agreed that the JOBS Act was important for keeping American manufacturing and production here at home in the face of an increasingly competitive global market. Today we're saying, ''all that is still true—let's keep the JOBS Act, except we will carve out one industry for which we don't want American production, American manufacturing, American jobs: the energy industry. No, we'd rather tip the scales so that global companies with American operations in the energy industry will take their jobs and production off shore where they are more welcome: say Nigeria, or Iran, or Venezuela.

Last year virtually all Members recognized the disturbing shortage of U.S. based refining capacity. We had various ideas to address it and virtually every Member of this body voted for one or the other. But driving refineries off shore was on nobody's agenda. Why is it on your's?

Meanwhile, as off-shore energy prices spike as a direct, inevitable result, so do consumer prices for commuters, and soccer moms, and grandmothers struggling to pay home heating.

These prices matter to our constituents in places like Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Texas, and other States.

Mr. Speaker, why must you turn every bumper sticker into more taxes and more spending? Why throw $14 billion into the Department of Energy to produce energy? In its entire history with all its billions, how much electricity, how much transportation fuel has DOE really created?

Let's step back, see this H.R. 6 bumper sticker for what it really is and have the courage to say, ''The bumper sticker was for last year, now it's time to govern and to put the people of America first.'' I urge a ''no'' vote on final passage.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

30 CFR Part 260

RIN 1010–AC14

Royalty Relief for New Leases in Deep Water

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service (MMS), Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to offer Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) tracts in parts of the Gulf of Mexico for lease with suspension of royalties for a volume, value, or period of production. This applies to tracts in water depths of 200 meters or more. This final rule specifies the royalty-suspension terms for lease sales using this bidding system.

DATES: This final rule is effective February 17, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Walter Cruickshank, Chief, Washington Division, Office of Policy and Management Improvement, at (202) 208–3822.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Legislative

On November 28, 1995, President Clinton signed Public Law 104–58, which included the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (''Act''). The Act contains four major provisions concerning new and existing leases. New leases are tracts leased during a sale held after the Act's enactment on November 28, 1995. Existing leases are all other leases.

First, section 302 of the Act clarifies the Secretary's authority in 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3) to reduce royalty rates on existing leases to promote development, increase production, and encourage production of marginal resources on producing or non-producing leases. This provision applies only to leases in the Gulf of Mexico west of 87 degrees, 30 minutes West longitude.

Second, section 302 also provides that ''new production'' from existing leases in deep water (water at least 200 meters deep) qualifies for royalty suspensions if the Secretary determines that the new production would not be economic without royalty relief. The Act defines ''new production'' as production (1) From a lease from which no royalties are due on production, other than test production, before the date of the enactment of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act; or (2) resulting from lease development activities under a Development Operations Coordination Document (DOCD), or supplement thereto that would expand production significantly beyond the level anticipated in the DOCD approved by the Secretary after the date of the Act. The Secretary must determine the appropriate royalty-suspension volume on a case-by-case basis, subject to specified minimums for leases not in production before the date of enactment. This provision also applies only to leases in the Gulf of Mexico west of 87 degrees, 30 minutes West longitude.

Third, section 303 establishes a new bidding system that allows the Secretary to offer tracts with royalty suspensions for a period, volume, or value the Secretary determines.

Fourth, section 304 provides that all tracts offered within 5 years of the date of enactment in deep water (water at least 200 meters deep) in the Gulf of Mexico west of 87 degrees, 30 minutes West longitude, must be offered under the new bidding system. The following minimum volumes of production are not subject to a royalty obligation:

17.5 million barrels of oil equivalent (MMBOE) for leases in 200 to 400 meters of water;

52.5 MMBOE for leases in 400 to 800 meters of water; and

87.5 MMBOE for leases in more than 800 meters.

Regulatory

On February 2, 1996, we published a final rule modifying the regulations governing the bidding systems we use to offer OCS tracts for lease (61 FR 3800). New §260.110(a)(7) implements the new bidding system under section 303 of the Act.

We published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPR) in the FEDERAL REGISTER on February 23, 1996 (61 FR 6958), and informed the public of our intent to develop comprehensive regulations implementing the Act. The ANPR sought comments and recommendations to assist us in that process. In addition, we conducted a public meeting in New Orleans on March 12–13, 1996, about the matters the ANPR addressed.

On March 25, 1996, we published an interim final rule in the FEDERAL REGISTER (61 FR 12022) specifying the royalty-suspension terms under which the Secretary would make tracts available under the bidding system requirements of sections 303 and 304 of the Act. We issued an interim final rule, in part, because we needed royalty relief rules in place before the lease sale held on April 24, 1996. However, in the interim final rule we asked for comments on any of the provisions and stated that we would consider those comments and issue a final rule. This final rule now modifies some of the provisions in the March 25, 1996, interim final rule.

On May 31, 1996, we published another interim final rule in the FEDERAL REGISTER (61 FR 27263) implementing section 302 of the Act. The interim final rule established the terms and conditions under which the Minerals Management Service (MMS) would suspend royalty payments on certain deep water leases issued as a result of a lease sale held before November 28, 1995. (The rule also contained provisions dealing with royalty relief on producing leases under the authority granted the Secretary by the OCS Lands Act.) We again asked for comments that we would consider before issuing a final rule.

Simultaneous with the publication of this rule, we are issuing another final rule (RIN 1010–AC13) to replace the interim final rule implementing section 302 of the Act. The final rule will revise 30 CFR 203 to establish conditions for suspension of royalty payments on certain deep water leases issued as a result of lease sales held before November 28, 1995.

II. Responses to Comments

One respondent—Exxon Exploration Company (Exxon)—submitted comments on the Interim Final Rule for Deep Water Royalty Relief for New Leases, issued March 25, 1996.

Exxon disagreed with our definition of the term ''Field'' (§260.102). Exxon said that our definition could be applied in such a way as to place unrelated and widely separated reservoirs within the same field. Exxon offered an alternative definition that it said provides for the creation of fields based on geology by allowing the inclusion of separate reservoirs in the same field when there is a meaningful geologic relationship between those reservoirs and avoids inclusion of reservoirs when such a relationship does not exist.

Exxon offered this alternative definition:

''Field means an area consisting of a single hydrocarbon reservoir or multiple hydrocarbon reservoirs all grouped on or related to same local geologic feature or stratigraphic trapping condition. There may be two or more reservoirs in a field that are separated vertically by intervening impervious strata. Separate reservoirs would be considered to

constitute separate fields if significant lateral separation exists and/or they are controlled by separate trapping mechanisms. Reservoirs vertically separated by a significant interval of nonproductive strata may be considered as separate fields when their reservoir quality, fluid content, drive mechanisms, and trapping mechanisms are sufficiently different to support such a determination.''

Except for a minor editorial change, we have decided to leave the definition of ''Field'' unchanged from the interim final rule for the following reasons:

The definition in the interim final rule is similar to, or consistent with, standard definitions used in industry and government, including the American Petroleum Institute, the National Petroleum Council, and the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration.

We do not segregate reservoirs vertically since the reservoirs are developed from the same platforms and use the same infrastructure. Affected lessees/operators typically make development decisions based on a primary objective(s) knowing that secondary targets exist which they will pursue subsequently.

Reservoir quality, fluid content, and drive mechanisms are not appropriate determinants for field designations. These factors are reservoir performance/recovery issues. Indeed, such information is rarely available to MMS at the time field determinations are made. We have not considered these factors in our past field designations and their inclusion now would complicate the process significantly and lead to too much subjectivity.

Elements of the alternative definition, e.g., ''a significant interval of nonproductive strata'' and ''significant lateral separation'' would be difficult to define and even more difficult to apply consistently.

We recognize industry's concerns about field designations. This rule establishes, as discussed below, a process whereby lessees may appeal field designations to the Director, MMS.

Other steps include:

The MMS Field Naming Handbook, which explains our methodology for designating fields, is available on the Internet (www.mms.gov). The Gulf of Mexico Region will entertain suggestions for improvements in the methodology.

We will elevate the level at which we make field definition decisions in the Gulf of Mexico Region. The Chief, Reserves Section, Office of Resource Evaluation, will make these determinations after a lease has a well into the field qualified as producible.

As part of the field designation process, affected lessees/operators will have the chance to review and discuss the field designation with Gulf of Mexico Region personnel before MMS makes a final decision.

III. Summary of Modifications to the Interim Final Rule

As discussed below, we have modified the interim final rule to:

Allow for appeals of field designations;

Clarify when the cumulative royalty-suspension volume ends;

Describe how MMS will establish and allocate royalty-suspension volume in fields that have a combination of eligible leases and leases that are granted a royalty-suspension volume under section 302 of the Act; and

Eliminate the reference to a pressure base standard in the provision for the conversion of natural gas to oil equivalency (§260.110(d)(14)). The rule now indicates you must measure that natural gas in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30 CFR 250, subpart L.

1. We have added a new provision (§260.110(d)(2)) establishing that you or any other affected lessees may appeal to the Director the decision designating your lease as part of a field. The Director's decision is a final agency action subject to judicial review.

2. The preamble to the interim final rule indicated that a royalty-suspension volume would continue until the end of the month in which cumulative production from eligible leases in the field reached the royalty-suspension volume for the field. The interim final rule itself did not include this provision. This final rule now includes a provision (§260.110(d)(10)) that a royalty-suspension volume will continue through the end of the month in which cumulative production from leases in the field entitled to share the royalty-suspension volume reaches that volume. The purpose of this provision is to avoid the complications that would occur for royalty payors if the royalty rate changed in the middle of the month.

3. We have modified §260.110(d)(9) and added a new §260.110(d)(10) to describe how MMS will establish and allocate royalty-suspension volumes in fields having a combination of pre-Act and eligible leases. (Pre-Act leases are defined as OCS leases issued as a result of a sale held before November 28, 1995; in a water depth of at least 200 meters; and in the Gulf of Mexico west of 87 degrees, 30 minutes West longitude. See 30 CFR 203.60 through 203.80). The provisions are necessary to account for and ensure consistency with the deep water royalty relief rules for pre-Act leases (§203.60). We published the interim final rule for pre-Act leases on May 31, 1996 (61 FR 27263), after publication of the interim final rule for new leases in deep water on March 25, 1996.

We have added wording in §260.110(d)(9) for cases where an eligible lease is added to a field that includes pre-Act leases granted a royalty-suspension volume under section 302 of the Act. This rule provides that the addition of the eligible lease will not change the field's established royalty-suspension volume. The added lease(s) may share in the suspension volume even if the volume is more than the eligible lease would qualify for based on its water depth.

The new §260.110(d)(10) describes a case where pre-Act leases in a field that includes eligible leases apply for and receive a royalty-suspension volume larger than the suspension volume established for the field by the eligible leases. This rule provides that the eligible leases may share in the larger suspension volume to the extent of their actual production until cumulative production by all lessees equals the royalty-suspension volume.

4. This final rule states that lessees must measure natural gas in accordance with 30 CFR 250, Subpart L. We have eliminated the specific measurement procedures from the interim final rule because a forthcoming final rule will change those procedures.

IV. Administrative Matters

Executive Order (E.O.) 12866

This rule is a significant rule under E.O. 12866 due to novel policy issues arising out of legal mandates. You may obtain a copy of the determination from MMS. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has reviewed this rule.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior (DOI) has determined that the primary impact of this rule, i.e., royalty relief to spur deep water oil and gas development, may have a significant effect on small entities although we can't estimate their number at this time. The number of small entities affected will depend on how many of them acquire leases that meet the statutory and regulatory criteria for royalty relief at lease sales between November 28, 1995, and November 28, 2000.

Exploration and development activities in the deep water areas of the Gulf of Mexico have traditionally been conducted by the major oil companies because of the expertise and financial resources required. ''Small entities'' (classified by the Small Business Administration as oil and gas producers with fewer than 500 employees) are increasingly active on the OCS, including in deep water, and we expect that trend to continue. The only firm to whom we have granted royalty relief so far under section 302 of the Act is a small entity.

In any case, this rule will have positive impacts on OCS oil and gas companies, large or small. Royalty relief in the form of a royalty-suspension volume is automatically established for leases that meet the statutory and regulatory criteria. No applications or special reports are necessary.

The beneficial effect of this relief on companies' financial operations will be substantial. Once we determine that a lease is eligible for a royalty-suspension volume, the value of that relief may range from tens of millions of dollars to over $100 million. The suspensions will allow companies to recover more of their investment costs before paying royalties, which may allow greater opportunity for small companies to operate in deep water.

This rule also will have a very positive impact on small entities. Constructing and equipping the platforms and other infrastructure associated with deep water development are huge projects that involve not only large companies but numerous small businesses nationwide as well. Once the platforms are operational, other small businesses will provide supplies and services.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no reporting and recordkeeping requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Takings Implication Assessment

DOI certifies that this rule does not represent a governmental action capable of interference with constitutionally protected property rights. A Takings Implication Assessment prepared pursuant to E.O. 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights, is not required.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

DOI has determined and certifies according to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, 2 U.S.C. 1502 et seq., that this final rule will not impose a cost of $100 million or more in any given year on State, local, and tribal governments, or the private sector.

E.O. 12988

DOI has certified to OMB that this regulation meets the applicable standards provided in section 3(b)(2) of E.O. 12988.

National Environmental Policy Act

We examined this rulemaking and have determined that this rule does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 260

Continental shelf, Government contracts, Minerals royalties, Oil and gas exploration, Public lands—mineral resources.

Dated: September 22, 1997.

SYLVIA V. BACA,
Assistant Secretary,
Land and Minerals Management.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Minerals Management Service (MMS) amends 30 CFR part 260, as follows:

PART 260—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING

1. The authority citation for part 260 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 43 U.S.C. 1331 and 1337.

2. In §260.102, the definitions for ''Eligible lease'' and ''Field'' are revised to read as follows:

§260.102 Definitions.

* * * * *

Eligible lease means a lease that results from a sale held after November 28, 1995; is located in the Gulf of Mexico in water depths 200 meters or deeper; lies wholly west of 87 degrees, 30 minutes West longitude; and is offered subject to a royalty-suspension volume authorized by statute.

Field means an area consisting of a single reservoir or multiple reservoirs all grouped on, or related to, the same general geological structural feature and/or stratigraphic trapping condition. Two or more reservoirs may be in a field, separated vertically by intervening impervious strata, or laterally by local geologic barriers, or by both.

* * * * *

3. In §260.110, paragraph (d) is revised to read as follows:

§260.110 Bidding systems.

* * * * *

(d) This paragraph explains how the royalty-suspension volumes in section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act, Public Law 104–58, apply to eligible leases. For purposes of this paragraph, any volumes of production that are not royalty bearing under the lease or the regulations in this chapter do not count against royalty-suspension volumes. Also, for the purposes of this paragraph, production includes volumes allocated to a lease under an approved unit agreement.

(1) Your eligible lease may receive a royalty-suspension volume only if your lease is in a field where no current lease produced oil or gas (other than test production) before November 28, 1995. Paragraph (d) of this section applies only to eligible leases in fields that meet this condition.

(2) We will assign your lease to an existing field or designate a new field and will notify you and other affected lessees of that assignment. Within 15 days of that notification, you or any of the other affected lessees may file a written request with the Director, MMS, for reconsideration accompanied by a statement of reasons. The Director will respond in writing either affirming or reversing the assignment decision. The Director's decision is final for the Department and is not subject to appeal to the Interior Board of Land Appeals under 30 CFR part 290 and 43 CFR part 4.

(3) The Final Notice of Sale will specify the water depth for each eligible lease. Our determination of water depth for each lease is final once we issue the lease. The Notice also will specify the royalty-suspension volume applicable to each water depth. The minimum royalty-suspension volumes for fields are:

(i) 17.5 million barrels of oil equivalent (MMBOE) in 200 to 400 meters of water;

(ii) 52.5 MMBOE in 400 to 800 meters of water; and

(iii) 87.5 MMBOE in more than 800 meters of water.

(4) When production (other than test production) first occurs from any of the eligible leases in a field, we will determine what royalty-suspension volume applies to the eligible lease(s) in that field. The determination is based on the royalty-suspension volumes specified in paragraph (d)(3) of this section.

(5) If a new field consists of eligible leases in different water depth categories, the royalty-suspension volume associated with the deepest eligible lease applies.

(6) If your eligible lease is the only eligible lease in a field, you do not owe royalty on the production from your lease up to the applicable royalty-suspension volume.

(7) If a field consists of more than one eligible lease, payment of royalties on the eligible leases' initial production is suspended until their cumulative production equals the field's established royalty-suspension volume. The royalty-suspension volume for each eligible lease is equal to each lease's actual production (or production allocated under an approved unit agreement) until the field's established royalty-suspension volume is reached.

(8) If an eligible lease is added to a field that has an established royalty-suspension volume as the result of an approved application for royalty relief submitted under 30 CFR part 203 or as the result of one or more eligible leases having been assigned previously to the field, the field's royalty-suspension volume will not change even if the added lease is in deeper water. If a royalty-suspension volume has been granted under 30 CFR part 203 that is larger than the minimum specified for that water depth, the added eligible lease may share in the larger suspension volume. The lease may receive a royalty-suspension volume only to the extent of its production before the cumulative production from all leases in the field entitled to share in the suspension volume equals the field's previously established royalty-suspension volume.

(9) If a pre-Act lease(s) receives a royalty-suspension volume under 30 CFR part 203 for a field that already has a royalty-suspension volume due to eligible leases, then the eligible and pre-Act leases will share a single royalty-suspension volume. (Pre-Act leases are OCS leases issued as a result of a sale held before November 28, 1995; in a water depth of at least 200 meters; and in the Gulf of Mexico west of 87 degrees, 30 minutes West longitude. See 30 CFR part 203). The field's royalty-suspension volume will be the larger of the volume for the eligible leases or the volume MMS grants in response to the pre-Act leases' application. The suspension volume for each lease will be its actual production from the field until cumulative production from all leases in the field equals the suspension volume.

(10) A royalty-suspension volume will continue through the end of the month in which cumulative production from leases in a field entitled to share the royalty-suspension volume reaches that volume.

(11) If we reassign a well on an eligible lease to another field, the past production from that well will count toward the royalty-suspension volume, if any, specified for the field to which it is reassigned. The past production will not count toward the royalty suspension volume, if any, for the field from which it was reassigned.

(12) You may receive a royalty-suspension volume only if your entire lease is west of 87 degrees, 30 minutes West longitude. A field that lies on both sides of this meridian will receive a royalty-suspension volume only for those eligible leases lying entirely west of the meridian.

(13) Your lease may obtain more than one royalty-suspension volume. If a new field is discovered on your eligible lease that already benefits from the royalty-suspension volume for another field, production from that new field receives a separate royalty suspension.

(14) You must measure natural gas production subject to the royalty-suspension volume as follows: 5.62 thousand cubic feet of natural gas, measured in accordance with 30 CFR part 250, subpart L, equals one barrel of oil equivalent.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy and Poultry, Mr. BOSWELL of Iowa.

Mr. BOSWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to say a few words about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support it without reservation, in contrast to my colleague from Iowa, another person who spoke a moment or two ago. I really support this. Farmers across Iowa, across the Midwest, across the country, realize that this is an opportunity for us to be more self-sufficient.

I, some 30 years ago, was stationed as a soldier in Portugal when we had the first oil crisis, and I realized that the chaos that took place, that we are in bondage to OPEC. It was really bad then, but now it is even worse. We are up to 65 percent import.

Here is something we can grow out of ground this year. It is the thing to do. It is environmentally sound. We grow it out of the ground this year. We can turn around and grow it next year and have a great step forward and be independent in our energy production.

I hope that everybody will support this bill. It is a good thing all the way around, not just the farmers, it is good for everybody. Support H.R. 6.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a tough vote for some of us here this afternoon. For me, I support greater spending, spending for alternative fuel, so that we can lessen our dependence on foreign oil. For me I am appalled at the ineptness and bungling of the Interior Department's troubled program to collect royalties on oil and gas and public lands in both the Clinton and Bush administrations. It needs to be investigated, and it needs to be remedied.

But other items in this legislation, specifically the repeal of section 199, which will likely drive more refinery production elsewhere overseas, and thus more jobs, is not right.

When JOE BARTON was chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, he was rightly proud of the process. It was open and, indeed, bipartisan. Lots of debate, Democrats and Republicans, and lots of amendments were accepted, Democrats and Republicans, and the proof was in the pudding. We passed a bipartisan bill, energy bill, which included the vote of Mr. DINGELL, the chairman today of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Nobody saw this bill until late last week. No hearings, no markup in subcommittee or full committee, no amendments on the House floor allowed. We know this bill is going to pass, but listening to the debate, I know it could have been a much better bill and one that could have been called bipartisan, and it would pass by a much larger margin than it will this afternoon.

Maybe the margin of the vote could have helped us with the Senate to actually get the bill to the President's desk for his signature, rather than a veto. I urge my Republican colleagues to vote ''no'' so that we can truly pass a bill that will do something for our constituents in our country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tough vote for some of us.

For me, I support greater funding of alternative fuels so we can lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

For me, I'm appalled by the ineptness and bungling of the Interior Department's troubled program to collect royalties on oil and gas on public lands in both the Clinton and Bush Administrations and it needs to be investigated and remedied.

But other items in this legislation—specifically the repeal of Sec. 199 which will likely drive more refinery production elsewhere, and therefore jobs, is not right.

When JOE BARTON was Chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, he was rightly proud of the process. It was open and indeed bi-partisan. Lots of debate (Democrat and Republican) and amendments accepted (Democrat and Republican).

And the proof was in the pudding—we passed on a bi-partisan vote which included the vote of Mr. DINGELL—the new Chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Nobody saw this bill on the Republican side until Friday of last week, no hearings, no markup in subcommittee or full committee and no amendments on the Floor. This bill will pass, but listening to the debate, I know it could have been a much better bill and one that really could be called bi-partisan and pass by a much greater margin than it will today.

And maybe—the margin of that vote would help us, with the Senate, to actually get the bill to the President's desk for signature rather than a veto.

I urge my Republican colleagues to vote "no" so we can truly pass a bill that will do something for our constituents.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a leader on the Agriculture Committee and in the Congress on renewable fuels, the distinguished gentlelady from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of this bill, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007.

It is the capstone of the Democrats 100-hour agenda for America, and it is also a significant step towards fulfilling our commitment to meeting our Nation's growing energy needs with clean, homegrown, renewable sources. This bill will redirect roughly $14 billion of taxpayers's money to help fund important existing renewable energy programs, accelerate the development of new and more aggressive renewable energy initiatives and technologies and promote energy efficiency.

The biofuels industry, though still in its infancy, is already providing much needed income to thousands of family farmers and rural citizens across the Great Plains and across the Midwest. It has proven to be a vital economic lifeline to hundreds of communities.

It is the tip of the iceberg. This bill will provide additional funding to further advance research and development in order to greatly diversify the feedstock used to produce biofuels, including cellulosic ethanol. This will include not only dedicated energy crops, but also crop residue, municipal waste, woody biomass and a whole source of other inexpensive renewable sources.

The benefits that will flow from this bill are broader than just biofuels. It can also promote the development of wind energy in this country. In addition to having considerable corn and biomass resources for the production of biofuels in my home State of South Dakota, we also have been blessed with an abundance of wind.

In fact, the Dakotas have been called the Saudi Arabia of wind energy. For decades wind energy development in this country has been hamstrung by inadequate and erratic Federal support.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact long-term incentives to provide the certainty and the resources to vastly increase the role of wind in our Nation's energy picture. This bill reprioritizes our national energy policy and our future investments in a way that recognizes the unique challenges, but also the undeniable strengths of rural America. We truly have the solution to our national energy crisis growing in and blowing over our fields.

□ 1600

This bill is a strong statement of our commitment to an energy policy that decreases our dependence on foreign oil, benefits the environment, enhances our national security, and revitalizes rural America's economies, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), the chairman of the General Farm Commodities Subcommittee and a leader on renewable fuels on the committee and in the Congress.

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate Speaker PELOSI and the House Democratic leadership for bringing this legislation to the floor for a new direction for America's energy independence. Last Congress, I had the honor of serving with Congresswoman STEPHANIE HERSETH as co-chairs of the Speaker's Rural Working Group. Working with leaders like Chairman COLLIN PETERSON, we identified biofuels as a win-win for America's energy needs.

Over the past few years, as gas prices have steadily risen higher and higher, there has been no significant legislation passed in this body to gain our energy independence. Anyone who has filled up his or her gas tank in the past year knows that gas prices are highly volatile and really too high for the average American.

Yet while Americans are struggling to make ends meet, oil companies are making record profits. As a former small businessman in North Carolina and as a part-time farmer, I believe it is our duty to find alternatives for what can become a dangerous reliance on foreign oil.

And let me be clear, our Nation has the capacity to gain its energy independence. H.R. 6 will promote this by creating a renewable fuel standard requiring that, by 2015, 15 percent of our fuels be renewable. This legislation will also extend and expand tax credits for ethanol and biodiesel. It will extend loan guarantees to farmers to produce renewable energy, and it will increase and expand tax credits to promote the use of flex fuel vehicles.

Today we have the technology to solve our energy crisis growing in our fields. We have the ability to turn soybeans and peanuts, both grown in large amounts, I should say, in my home State of North Carolina, into biodiesel, and the technology to turn sugar cane and corn into ethanol. What we haven't had up to this point is the leadership to develop the infrastructure needed to facilitate the use of these fuels.

This legislation before us today will begin to do just that. I encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 6.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the Chair of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee and a leader on agriculture issues and energy independence.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the need to move our Nation toward energy independence has never been clearer, yet this administration has stood by, leaving consumers struggling to pay their winter heating bills as oil companies continue to enjoy billions in record profits.

With this legislation, we can recover $14 billion in unnecessary oil and gas subsidies and target that money toward where it should have been going all along, into renewable energy sources created right here at home, into alternative fuels grown on our farms and energy-efficiency technologies, creating jobs, protecting our consumers and our economy.

We could generate over 800,000 jobs by 2010, jobs from the Great Plains to the Northeast. In Bethlehem, Connecticut, we have the first biodiesel production plant in New England, in partnership with Maryland and Delaware soybean growers.

By supporting this legislation, we have an opportunity to begin bridging the cultural, economic and social divide growing between rural America and other parts of the country. It starts with investments. It starts with this bill. Let us take control of our energy policy. Let us put our country on the path to energy independence and reenergize our farm economy.

Let's pass this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when we can work across the aisle to do what I have heard so many of the speakers here today talk about doing in terms of encouraging greater production of renewable energy here in the

United States. The committee will look forward to doing that, indeed.

But this legislation doesn't do it. Unfortunately, it doesn't do it because of the very closed rule that we pointed out throughout the Democrats' 100 hours; no openness whatsoever, in contrast to the Contract with America, when Democrats offered 154 amendments. In fact, 48 were adopted.

We could have spelled out in good legislation, if it had been through the committee process and we had held hearings and markups in each of the committees represented here today, to say what we were going to use this money for.

But, instead, what we are asked to do is vote for a tax increase on domestic production of energy, no tax increase on Venezuela and Hugo Chavez, no tax increase on Iran, no tax increase on any Middle Eastern country, no jobs lost over there, but jobs lost in the United States and American consumers paying for it at the gas pump and American farmers and ranchers paying for it with increased energy cost.

Oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been around agriculture all my life, and I have never seen the excitement that is generated by this opportunity, because not only are we going to have economic benefits; we are going to help get this country off oil dependence.

The internal combustion engine and diesel engine were invented to run on alcohol and peanut oil. They went to gasoline because it was cheaper and I guess more available. Well, times have changed and we are going back to the future, and this legislation is going to give us the opportunity and the resources to do that.

So I encourage everybody to support H.R. 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a father of a 5-year-old daughter, I am deeply concerned about the future of our country. I am concerned that our children could be the first generation of Americans that do not have a better quality of life than their parents. I am concerned about the availability of quality jobs for our children. I am concerned that our country's competitive position in the world will continue to deteriorate. And I am concerned that our country will not have access to energy supplies needed to sustain our economy and our growth.

For far too long, our country has relied on foreign sources of oil to meet our energy needs. This dependency is bad for our economic security, it is bad for our national security, it harms our ability to create new quality jobs, and it harms our ability to maintain our competitive position in the world. Ten years from now, I want to look at my daughter and know that I did my part to find a solution.

The bill we are considering today will make a significant down payment for the development of new energy technologies. A stable domestic energy supply is essential to economic well-being and security of our Nation. For years, we have been chipping away at energy policy, increasing production here, a tax incentive there, funding energy R&D when it is convenient, and letting programs languish when it is not.

It is time we think of new ways to approach this problem. Replacing traditional energy sources requires an unprecedented basic research and development technology effort. We must be a world leader, developing new technologies and sustainable energy sources that will maintain our competitive position.

As chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, you have my commitment that our committee will be doing our part. We will be working to use R&D to accelerate the production and use of new biofuels, increase the use of renewable energy, like solar, wind, geothermal, and boost energy efficiency in part by making the Federal Government a model of conservation.

We will not ignore the potential contribution of clean coal, carbon capture and storage technologies and better, cleaner ways to produce oil and gas. And we will not shy away from engaging in a thoughtful dialogue of the role of nuclear power. In these ways, we will help ensure a strong, secure energy future for our children and help manufacturers keep jobs here by ensuring a stable, reliable, and affordable energy supply.

Mr. Speaker, today I will have the privilege of yielding my time to the next generation of leaders in the energy debate. These new members of the Committee on Science and Technology came to Washington to change things and to make a difference. This is their chance. This is their opportunity to leave a legacy that includes the creation of a reasonable, balanced, and effective energy policy for years to come. I am proud I can join with them in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, of course, in opposition to H.R. 6. While I would like to believe that we all have the same goal in creating energy independence for our country, I really regret that this bill before us today would not lead us to that goal. This is really, I am very fearful, just the initial attack or one of the early attacks on an industry that is going to have other attacks this year, that survived the windfall profit tax that passed during the Jimmy Carter years of disaster, as far as energy was concerned.

This energy act is more likely to increase the dependence on foreign oil. By decreasing after-tax revenues for oil and gas companies, including the small independent producers that are considered small businessmen, the effect will be an increase in the cost of energy to consumers and a decrease in domestic exploration and production of oil and natural gas, because companies will have less money available to them for their activities.

This will, of course, require our country to import more oil and natural gas from countries that are not our natural allies. We will be dependent on these countries and to the OPEC group to supply us with the lifeblood of our economy. I just can't in good conscience vote for anything that would have that type of outcome.

I have said all along that this country will fight for energy, and the way to prevent our sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters from having to go overseas to take some oil away from someone or another country is to ensure that we utilize our own natural resources efficiently and effectively.

I am well aware that drilling alone on U.S. soil is not going to quickly solve all of our problems. I know that we also need to expand our usage of renewable energy and increase the efficiency of how we use fossil fuels. This is why I am supportive of the legislation that passed last Congress on a voice vote under suspension of the rules by my colleague from Illinois, Congresswoman BIGGERT. Among other initiatives, her bill supports the development and advancement of renewable energy in areas such as solar, wind, biofuels, coal, and encourages energy efficiency in buildings and technology.

I am fully supportive of seeing these initiatives enacted now. We have unanimous bipartisan support. Why do we need to wait for ''subsequent legislation,'' as is stated in the Rahall bill? Let's not wait any longer to ensure energy independence.

The United States has substantial amounts of oil and natural gas, but our laws prevent our domestic companies from accessing these resources in both onshore and offshore areas. In fact, we are the only country in the world that has limited ourselves like this. If our goal really is energy independence, then we need to increase access to our domestic resources, not increase taxes on one industry.

□ 1615

The point to remember here is that the Tax Code has little to do with the increase in energy prices. So penalizing oil and gas companies by increasing their taxes is not going to solve our energy problem.

Make no mistake, this country will fight for energy, and if we have to we

will send our sons and daughters across the ocean to take energy away from someone when we have plenty right here at home.

Let us help our constituents, not hurt them. Vote against H.R. 6.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) and welcome him back to Congress and to the Science Committee, my friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6. When I was campaigning last year back in Indiana, people found it incredible that while they were paying $3 a gallon for gasoline Congress was giving the oil companies a tax cut. They wanted change because of those kinds of things that Congress was doing.

Well, today, they are going to get their change. Instead of giving tax cuts to oil companies we are going to pour those resources into renewable energy.

My home State of Indiana boasts two premier research universities, Indiana University and Purdue University. Both of these schools have renowned research labs that study a wide range of topics, including alternative energy creation and use.

Indiana has a lot to contribute to the field of alternative energy. My constituents are very involved in biodiesel oil production. It is important to remember this source of alternative energy, as well as ethanol and hydrogen when deciding what types of initiatives to support with the new clean energy fund.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill that will help make the United States truly energy independent.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) on the Science Committee.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to discuss the question here about our dependence on foreign oil.

The leadership in the House of Representatives because of the last election has changed, but the problems that confront our Nation remain the same. The question is how are we going to deal with our dependence on foreign oil, and that is a serious question for many reasons.

Well, there are different ways to approach it, but it is certainly hard for the party of the Democrats that are now in charge to advocate a lot of nuclear because they have a lot of people who do not like that. Very well. And they really do not like burning a lot of fossil fuels because of global warming.

Well, what tool are we going to use? Well, we use our favorite tool, a tax increase. The only trouble with a tax increase, though, is what it is going to do is it is going to make the problem worse because when you increase the taxes on American oil and gas by $10 billion you make it less competitive, and if they are less competitive that means OPEC fills in the gap.

Now, is this just about the problem of $3 gasoline? The answer is no. It is about a lot more than that. When you go over to the Middle East, particularly a human rights trip that I took about a year or two ago to Pakistan, what you find is that there is a very nice country by the name of the Saudis who are funding private education so the little kids in Pakistan can learn. Well, until you find out what they are learning. They are being trained to be radical Islamic terrorists. And who is funding this? Saudi oil money, OPEC oil money.

So this question before us today is not just about SUV owners paying $3 for gasoline. It is a question about where is that money going and the radical Islamists that we are going to fund essentially with this tax increase.

So this is a bill that is trying to deal with a problem that is a serious problem, but a tax increase is not the way to go.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MITCHELL), the former mayor of Tempe, as well as a former member of the Arizona State Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be cosponsor of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act, because it is time for Congress to do more than talk when it comes to investing in clean and renewable energy sources.

During this last election, the American people asked to repeal billions of dollars in indefensible tax giveaways to big oil and invest in new, clean energy technologies that will reduce our dependence on foreign sources of fuel, and this is what we are doing today.

We are keeping our promise to the American people and we are meeting our obligation to our grandchildren and future generations of Americans by improving our national security and protecting our environment.

But there is another important benefit we are talking about today, and this is an important step in growing the American economy and creating good, high paying jobs.

By investing in research and development for solar, wind and other sources of clean energy, we will be tapping the potential of our Nation's most innovative minds and best engineers.

I am particularly excited about investing in solar energy because I believe my State of Arizona can one day be the Middle East of solar energy, and instead of importing energy we can export it around the world.

This bill puts us on the right path.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a three-legged stool if we are going to get to energy independence. It is alternatives fuels, which there is great promise. There is also the expansion of refineries. We knew that early, and if we were going to have a stable supply and cheaper prices, we needed more refining capability in America. And it was domestic production. You need all three so that we do not send more money to Ahmadinejad and Chavez.

Political theater is what we see here today. A bill that did not go through the committee process gives you this.

I agree, giving $400 million to a CEO of which they had no material stake in a company is wrong, but what is worse is giving more money to the very people who are targeting the United States and seek our destruction.

Do not fool yourself. This is where this money is going. You make it more expensive to refine gasoline in the United States, this bill does it, they will buy it offshore. You make it more expensive to produce energy in the United States, they will buy it offshore.

These will be the recipients of these dollars. Let us take this bill back and go do it the right way. We can come together on renewable energy. Michigan State University is doing great work on cellulosic research, so we can get to that next generation of ethanol that burns efficiently in American-made automobiles. But we cannot do it if we are sending money to the very people that seek our destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge that we have a little common sense, we close the curtain to this political theater and we get back to the reality of what our policies will really mean for the future of this country. If you care about your children, stop sending the money to Ahmadinejad and Chavez.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) one of the few Members of this body that really brings real world experience in the renewable energy area.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, the energy policy in this country is neither sustainable nor healthy. Every day we import $800 million worth of oil, and not only does that put our economy at great risk, but some of that money is going to the very people who would harm us.

Our vote today in H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007, will begin moving towards a rational and sustainable energy policy.

After spending more than 20 years climbing wind turbines and developing new energy technology, I can tell you that we have not even begun to realize the potential for jobs creation and sustainability in this industry. We need to be doing much more to expand the use of renewable energy. This bill is a first step to diversify our energy sources.

With H.R. 6 we will end billions of dollars of corporate welfare that we

have doled out to big oil companies currently enjoying record profits.

By investing in new energy technologies, we will also create an entire spectrum of good paying jobs right here in America. In fact, the passage of this bill will produce nearly 1 million jobs, generating close to $30 billion in new wages.

I am pleased that we are doing more than just paying lip service to expanding innovation and clean energy by following through with our responsibility to make the environment livable for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working in a bipartisan way with my colleagues on the Science and Technology Committee to increase innovation and investment in our energy future.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the bill on the floor. Supporters of the bill claim that this will boost our energy independence, promote the use of renewable and alternative energy, but looking at this bill, you really cannot find anything that will help us accomplish those goals.

In fact, there are four provisions in this bill that will make us more, not less, dependent on foreign oil by making it more difficult and more expensive to produce the needed energy here in the United States.

The bill specifically disallows energy companies from receiving the domestic manufacturing tax deduction, thereby making it more expensive for them to do business in the United States and more likely that we will be buying our oil from someone outside this country.

Higher energy taxes will be passed on to the consumers in the form of higher gasoline and in the form of higher home energy prices. Similarly, heavy users of oil and natural gas, such as other manufacturers and agricultural producers, will feel the pinch of these higher prices.

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot help but note the irony that film makers will continue to be eligible for this manufacturing deduction, yet in my district I have not had a single constituent complain about our increasing dependence on foreign film.

The bill before us today would repeal the royalty incentives put in place under last Congress' Energy Policy Act of 2005 to encourage the energy production in hard-to-reach and technologically challenging places such as the ultra deepwater Gulf of Mexico and offshore Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, the Gulf of Mexico delivers more oil and more natural gas to United States markets than any other single source. Since approximately 97 percent of America's coasts are off limits for energy production, energy companies are forced to explore for and produce from increasingly difficult-to-reach places.

The incentives included in the energy bill we passed in August of 2005, which now would be repealed by the Democrats, encouraged production in the Gulf of Mexico that will help the Nation meet the production needs of the future.

It is important to note that unlike the 1998–1999 Clinton leases, under every provision in the energy bill, where royalty relief is granted, the Secretary of the Interior is granted the authority to set those price thresholds, to set those price triggers based upon market price.

Producers would not and do not receive royalty relief through the energy bill of 2005 under today's price climate. These provisions provide energy companies with some price certainty, a price floor that they need, that it is necessary to make to justify the billion dollar investments in America's energy.

The bill creates a new Strategic Energy Efficiency Renewables Reserve but does not specify how those funds would be used. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the increased use of renewable and alternative energy. In fact, Texas has a strong State renewable energy portfolio and is the largest producer of wind energy in the United States, but before we cast our votes today let us be sure what we understand that the bill is for. It is for partisan advantage, not for the good of the American people.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), the successor of the former chairman of the Science Committee.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in proud support today of the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007. My constituents in upstate New York know what it is like to have to pay more than most people in the country for energy. They also know what it is like to have to deal with winters that are more severe, and they know that during those winter months they have to adjust their budget to be able to handle the added expense for fuel costs.

But they also know that prices will continue to rise if something is not done to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and fossil fuels.

□ 1630

However, we must address our long-term energy demands with more than just short-term solutions. We have to face the facts, and the fact is that oil is a finite resource. We ought to be investing in a wide array of clean energy.

The giveaways this legislation will reclaim from oil and gas industry will be placed into a renewable energy account to fund research and development of alternative fuels, providing a much needed new direction to address our Nation's growing energy needs.

It is important to note that we don't pass this legislation today for ourselves, but rather we pass this legislation for our children and our children's children.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HINCHEY). The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Judge POE of Texas, a member of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. POE. I want to thank my friend from Texas for yielding some time.

Mr. Speaker, where I come from in southeast Texas, that area of the State is called the energy capital of the world. We have numerous refineries, petrochemical plants, and hundreds of offshore rigs. Energy byproducts from these areas are shipped all over the country, even to States that won't allow refineries and, heaven forbid, those offshore rigs near their shores.

This is a tax bill, and Economics 101 says when you tax something, you get less of it. Now, we will get less energy because of this bill.

This tax bill will discourage energy independence. It will increase gasoline prices; it will discourage American exploration; it will increase dependence on foreign countries and OPEC; it will cost Americans jobs, especially those in my district. It takes money and invests it in alternative energy.

Investment is a politically correct word for Federal subsidies for special interest groups. Alternative energy is necessary, but this bill doesn't do that, and this bill breaks a contract this government signed. Now we want to legalize contract breaking with oil companies like they do in Bolivia and Venezuela.

So if this bill passes, Americans need to get their checkbooks out because Americans are going to pay more at the pump. Americans always have to pay.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the former State senator from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS), who really has experienced both the private sector and the public sector and will be a great addition to our Science Committee.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled today to speak on this final piece of legislation of our first 100 hours and perhaps the most important piece of legislation, the CLEAN Energy Act.

In the early 1960s, in response to the Russians when they launched Sputnik, President Kennedy decided to send a man to the Moon. And remember his words. He said: ''We choose to go to the Moon. We choose to go to the Moon in this decade, not because it's easy, but because it's hard.'' And we did it and we led in science and math and engineering, and it was greatness for our Nation.

These policies led to a major technological breakthrough that benefited

both our military and our economy; and now America faces a greater challenge than ever. How we respond to this challenge will have lasting effects not just for the American people but for the entire world. We put our national security at risk when we are reliant on unstable regimes, Middle Eastern oil, Latin American oil. We put our economy at risk by not adequately investing in science and math and engineering and technology, and we put our world at risk when we ignore the real threats of global warming.

Ending America's addiction to foreign oil, investing in renewable energy, and achieving clean energy independence is the Apollo mission of our generation. This will not just result in better jobs and the creation of hundreds of thousands of new economic opportunities for our citizens, but a more stable and a more sustainable world. The CLEAN Energy Act is a meaningful first step in our new mission, and I look forward to working with both Republicans and Democrats in achieving this goal.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for 3 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, there is one economic fact that doesn't belong to the Democrats or the Republicans. Facts work that way. And that is, that price in the long run is the cost of production, period. It is true with anything.

What we are doing with this bill, should it pass, is we are increasing the cost of production, specifically, domestic production.

We live in a world where, in 2004, we spent $103 billion buying oil from nondemocratic countries. Now, some of them might be your best friends. Saudi Arabia, for example. Others might be less than your best friends. Of course, I say that tongue in cheek. But Iran, Iraq, Russia, Venezuela, that is who you are buying your oil from today; and you are going to increase the cost of domestic production. It doesn't quite make sense, except for in the context of the last 2 weeks, the context of the transfer of power from Republican to Democrat. We were promised open government; we were promised open rules; we were promised the opportunity to add amendments and to have fair debates. And yet this bill, as has been the case with the five bills before it, did not even have a committee hearing. It is like giving a book report having not read the book.

Sure, it is a power jam, and certainly the majority has the right to jam its power through on the minority. But in this case, wouldn't it have been more helpful to have a committee hearing so we could have gotten rid of what I would call the tuna fish clause?

Now, we know what the tuna fish clause is. Right? That is where we heard over and over again on the minimum wage debate that increasing wages was good for everybody, good for the economy, good for the worker, particularly the poor worker. And then we read this insidious, surreptitious scheme to exempt American Samoa and the tuna worker factories. Sorry, Charlie, but only the best tuna workers are entitled to minimum wage, not the folks on American Samoa.

Now, that is the tuna fish clause. Now, frankly, I think other States ought to have that option, too. We found out there was a tuna fish clause yesterday in the education bill; and that was that the title of the bill was to decrease the student loan interest rate down to 3.4 percent, but the tuna fish clause in it said that it was only applied for 6 months of the bill. How do you go back home and tell people you cut student loan rates in half when you only did it for 6 months? It is a tuna fish clause.

How do you tell the American people that you are going to have open government, and yet your first six bills bypass the committee process? That is the tuna fish clause.

Today the tuna fish clause is that our domestic oil production is low in terms of our consumption, and we are going to be increasing the cost of the production, which will be passed on to the American consumers.

We do need alternative energy. We need it on a bipartisan basis. I would say to the majority, you missed a great opportunity to work on this.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Space and Aviation Committee from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, and I am compelled to respond to some of the criticisms of the Members of the other party about the intent of this legislation.

It is clear that the oil and gas industry is doing quite well. There are a number of tax breaks, tax credits, tax deductions, and encouragements that are already in place. This bill says the short-term benefits that were extended to the oil and gas community are overridden, and that the royalty problems that we have had are going to be revised and solved so that taxpayers get a fair return on their investments. After all, we own these assets as the people of this country.

This starts us finally on the right path by creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve. It says we will set aside $14 billion to invest in clean energy technologies. And as the Chair of the bipartisan Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus, I can tell you that these are crucial technologies not only to protect our environment but to ensure job creation and, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to ensure our national security.

So I want to stand in strong support of this legislation. We ought to pass it. The country is for it, and Democrats and Republicans are for it.

I want to echo the views of many of my colleagues who have talked about the importance of diversifying and balancing our energy portfolio and moving toward a clean energy regime. We all know that energy security and national security go hand in hand, and right now we don't enjoy either. That's why—as part of the 100 Hours agenda—we are passing this important legislation. We need a national effort to address our reliance on foreign energy sources.

I rise in support of H.R. 6. H.R. 6 starts us finally on the right path by creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve. The CLEAN Energy Act would set aside roughly $14,000,000,000 to invest in clean renewable energy resources and alternative fuels, promote new energy technologies, and improve energy efficiency.

As co-chair of the bi-partisan Renewable Energy & Energy Efficiency Caucus, I can tell you that renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies can increase our energy security AND allow us to think anew about our energy future.

This isn't just about doing right by the environment—this is also about creating jobs. The U.S. currently leads the world technology in developing advanced energy technologies. But we won't hold onto the lead for long unless U.S. government policies begin to favor their development more than they do now. With the world market for new energy technologies projected to be in the trillions of dollars in twenty years, we would be foolish to forgo this opportunity.

And it is an opportunity—for new jobs, for rural development, for a cleaner environment, for national security. States and localities have realize this, and with federal action at a standstill, many of them—like my state of Colorado—have already acted on renewable portfolio standards and other forward-looking policies. Now Congress is in a position to follow their lead.

We will use this strategic fund to extend the renewable energy production tax credit to give the market the assurance it needs to respond. We can extend energy efficiency tax incentives for buildings. equipment, and appliances, We can invest in renewable energy and energy efficiency research programs at the Department of Energy, and make sure that the National Renewable Energy Laboratory has enough money and enough staff to do its important work. It is these programs that can drive down costs, make commercialization of new technologies possible, and help retain America's leadership role in these technologies.

The best thing about investing in clean energy is that Americans support it. This Administration supports it. Democrats and Republicans alike support it. It is the right thing to do.

The CLEAN Energy Act sets our priorities straight, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have 30 seconds. We do not need that. I will be glad to yield to Chairman GORDON all 30 of those seconds.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, and I yield myself the balance of my time and his time.

You know, most of my life I have heard of red herrings. Today, I got to hear about a red tuna.

It is amazing to me to think that the opponents of this bill could categorize it as sending money overseas. The fact of the matter is what we are doing is we are going to be developing an energy efficiency, an alternative energy, renewable energy in this country so we don't have to send money overseas. It is just the reverse. And not only are we doing that, we are doing it in an economically responsible way in that we are paying as we go. And that is the reason that we are taking these unneeded tax breaks and using them to help us to develop a new type of energy for this country, new jobs for my children, for your children, and for our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I encourage Democrats and Republicans alike to support this good bill.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I would inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentleman from New Mexico has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker and fellow House Members, let's take a look at what we are doing here today. The Democrats say that they are reducing America's dependence on oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative resources. Both goals, I agree, are admirable.

In the process, they are trying to unravel a very thorny problem of contracts that were badly negotiated by the Clinton administration, contracts that the Clinton administration made no attempt to remedy. But let's look at what is actually occurring.

In title I, we are penalizing American oil and gas companies and rewarding foreign companies by taxing them differently. That is, we are going to favor foreign jobs and foreign oil over domestic jobs and domestic oil.

The second thing we are doing is charging a conservation fee on U.S.-produced oil while protecting foreign oil from this tax. Now, again, this is $9. If I could get the House to focus on the percentages for just a moment.

If $9 is added on top of the $70 charged to a production company that is making $70 a barrel, that is about 12.8 percent. But already the price of oil has fallen to about $52. And if $9 is assessed into a $50-a-barrel revenue stream, then it is 18 percent.

But what happens if the price of oil falls to $30? I would remind my constituents that as little as 3½ years ago the price of oil was actually at $20. And there, you now have a fee on top of the taxes that is 45 percent. A 45 percent fee will begin to move exploration away from this Nation.

In 1999 and 2000, I was in an oil and gas company that did repairs for oil and gas wells. The price of oil fell to $6. At that point, our fee is going to be 150 percent.

This bill is extraordinarily prescriptive in declaring not a percent, but instead a fixed fee. It disadvantaged tremendously the production of oil and gas.

But probably the most serious consequence of this bill is where, on page 10, it describes that ''a lessee shall not be eligible to obtain the economic benefit of any covered lease or any other lease.''

This is the piece of the bill that The Washington Post declares to be heavy handed, the heavy-handed attack on the stability of contracts, a process that would be welcomed in Russia and Bolivia.

In 2005, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez mandated that private oil firms cooperate with new contractual changes. Those firms that did not agree had their assets nationalized.

□ 1645

This bill does not nationalize, but it prohibits firms who do not agree from participating in future contracts. It is a very serious contractual problem.

Bolivia in 2006 threatened to expel oil companies that refused to agree to new government terms on already existing contracts. That is extraordinarily close to what we are doing in this bill. What Bolivia did has caused investors to begin to take their investments out of Bolivia.

In Russia, President Vladimir Putin wants to gain complete control, and so he has begun to renegotiate with companies like Shell, Exxon and BP, who have held valid oil leases in Russia for several years. Mr. Putin had a number of government agencies threaten to pull these leases for a number of suspect reasons. That is exactly the language contained in this bill.

I do not think it is the intent of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to be this heavy handed. This bill would have been presented differently if it had been sent to committee, if it had been debated in committee and if amendments had been allowed. My request is that we vote ''no'' on this bill and we send it back to the committee where we can get a good hearing to take the very troublesome parts of this bill, troublesome parts which The Washington Post describe as heavy handed and the sort of thing that you would expect in Russia and Bolivia.

In this country, we want an environment that causes people to go out and invest. We want people to create jobs and to create a better standard of living. But this bill begins to undermine the full faith and credit of the United States by changing the contractual basis. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY) has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, the portion of this bill under my committee's jurisdiction, the Ways and Means Committee, is somewhat complex; but the effect it would have is simple. These provisions raise taxes on our domestic energy industry. We should not mince words or use semantics; that is what those provisions do. They raise taxes on our home-grown domestic energy industry.

The result of that will be higher prices for gasoline, home heating oil, fewer manufacturing jobs and even more dependence on foreign oil. This legislation is in these respects the exact opposite of the energy policy that the United States needs. Anyone who is serious about energy security should oppose this bill.

There are two tax provisions in the legislation. The first deals with geological and geophysical expenses. These costs, referred to as G&G expenses, are amortized over several years, just like other business expenses. The Democrats' bill would increase the amortization period for costs associated with efforts to find new domestic oil and gas from 5 years to 7 years for the largest American oil companies. That would raise their taxes by about $100 million over 11 years.

But the far larger tax increase is a second provision, and this one is the one that is most unfair. It would eliminate the oil and gas industry, and only the oil and gas industry, from eligibility for the manufacturers' tax incentives, section 199 of the jobs bill. It increases taxes not just on Big Oil but on all oil and gas companies, big and small, that pay corporate taxes. That change will raise the industry's taxes by $7.6 billion over 11 years. This provision would not repeal any special tax break for Big Oil. It won't repeal any subsidy for Big Oil. Instead, it would single out oil and gas businesses for higher taxes than all other manufacturing businesses in the United States.

Worse, it would not place any additional cost on foreign producers of oil and gas. In effect, the legislation would give a new competitive advantage to foreign oil producers and refiners. Why should Congress vote to help Hugo Chavez's regime in Venezuela at the expense of our own domestic energy industry?

The heart of the Democrats' argument seems to be that somehow energy is not an American manufacturing industry. That conclusion is absurd. The United States energy industry employs 1.8 million Americans. These are precisely the sort of high-paying manufacturing jobs that Democrats constantly complain America is losing. The average pay for those workers is $19.34 an hour for workers for oil and gas extraction, $28.41 an hour for refinery workers, and of course they get good benefits in addition to that.

The new Speaker of the House has said, ''Manufacturing jobs are the engines that run the economy. These are

good jobs that give working families high standards of living.'' And I agree with her.

The new majority leader has said, ''Jobs still will be the number one issue next fall, and manufacturing job loss overseas is a subset of that. We're hearing that giant sucking sound that Perot warned about.''

Well, given that prominent Democrats claim to be concerned about the loss of American manufacturing jobs, why are they now leading an effort to drive these jobs overseas?

We should also remember that these jobs are concentrated in the area of the country that was hardest hit by hurricanes Katrina and Rita. I know in my State of Louisiana, good-paying energy industry jobs are a key to our recovery.

In addition, as we saw in the wake of those storms, our domestic refining is already strained to full capacity. The sticker shock many of us faced at the pump after the hurricanes hit was not as a result of a shortage of crude oil, but a shortage of refined gasoline. There are now plans to substantially boost our refining capacity to avoid a repeat of that situation. But repealing section 199 for American oil and gas companies could change that and leave the United States economy even more vulnerable.

We should also remember during this debate that oil companies are not some sort of evil rapacious organization. Indeed, higher taxes on oil companies affect nearly every American with a retirement or pension account because those accounts now hold about 41 percent of the shares in American oil and gas companies.

Both of these new taxes would discourage new exploration for domestic energy resources and weaken our domestic energy industry, and the tax increases will be passed along to consumers. In addition, the effects will ripple throughout our economy, increasing the cost of nearly everything Americans buy and nearly every service they hire.

Increasing the cost of producing oil and gas in America, which this Democratic bill would do, will raise gasoline prices, ship manufacturing jobs overseas, and make America more dependent on foreign oil.

This bill certainly does not constitute a balanced energy policy for this country. What it does constitute is a purely political exercise that should be rejected by this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, as I listened to my colleague from Louisiana, I would think that the end of the Western World as we have known it is about to descend upon us by these rather minor changes we are making in the tax policy of this country, by taking back subsidies to an oil industry that between January and September of 2006 has had $96 billion worth of profit reported.

Now these are minor changes at the most and we know that. This is a down payment on the changes that must go on in this country. We know the American people have spoken on this issue. They are demanding change. That is why they voted the way they did in November. They saw what they got out of the White House and out of the Vice President's office, the records of which are still kept secret so we don't know what agreements were made with the oil companies at the beginning of this administration.

I spoke earlier, and after I spoke I went out of the Chamber and I bumped into some people from the National Wildlife Federation, and they gave me 30,000 signatures of people who want this bill to pass, people who care about the environment. People who care about global warming, people who believe in national security, who believe in economic security, signed this in the last 3 weeks. The American people obviously are way ahead of us.

Detroit didn't know what was going on. The Prius was on the street for 3 years in Tokyo, and they never saw it coming. When the Prius came to the United States, the waiting time was 18 months long. That is what we have to change. We have to change the thinking in this country about whether we are going to be addicted to oil forever or not.

Now global warming is real. The average temperature in the ocean has gone up 1 degree worldwide. In the Northwest, it is up more than 2 degrees. And the changes that means for salmon spawning and for the ecology that goes on are under way. Yesterday's New York Times had a story about the melting of the glaciers in Greenland. There is no question about whether global warming is happening. The question is whether this Congress will respond and lead the way.

Speaker PELOSI when she came in said she was going to do these things and set a new direction for this country. Today we are finishing up 100 hours of efforts in a whole series of areas, this being the toughest, this being the most complicated, the most costly, the one that is going to take us the most time.

We can change the health care system in fairly short order if we want to. We can change college loans in fairly short order if we want to. But changing the way we use energy in this country needs to start today.

No one says this bill is the be-all and end-all of what should happen, but we can see countries that have done it. In Brazil, they have gotten themselves off gasoline. They are using ethanol. We could do that. The Brazilians are not smarter than we are. They just decided as a country they were going to get off their addiction to oil.

The Danes, when we dropped our support for the wind industry, picked up the technology and now at every place you go to see a windmill in this country, it is made in Denmark. Why is that? We started that in 1994 with some amendments supporting the wind industry, and then we let them expire.

Last year, 2005, we suddenly woke up and said, Oh my God, the Danes are ahead of us. We better start again. There is a whole series of things that we should be doing if we are serious about what is going to be our future.

Now, I have hoped that we would have a day like this when we would start to make the change. This is one small step. The Chinese say a journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step. This is the first step.

Mr. RAHALL has done an excellent job, and I want to congratulate the staff of the Ways and Means Committee, and particularly John Buckley whose idea this bill was. He came to me with the idea. It was not my idea. It was John Buckley's and congratulations to John.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6, the "Clean Energy Act of 2007." I agree with Democrats that we need to invest more in renewable energy, including new ways to fuel our cars. But by taxing American companies more for exploring and creating jobs here at home—and letting foreign oil companies off the hook—this bill says foreign oil and foreign jobs are good, American oil and American jobs are bad. That's just crazy.

It's bad energy policy—with big costs. Costs to the consumer at the pump, to the refinery worker in the Gulf, and to the retiree whose pension depends on the strength of American industry.

Don't be fooled—the special tax breaks they say the oil and gas industry gets aren't special at all. In 2004, at a time when manufacturing jobs were heading overseas by the thousands and we were increasingly worried about our foreign dependence on oil, Congress passed a bill that gave a tax incentive to all American manufacturers to get them to invest more here at home—including oil and gas producers.

A year later, Congress passed the Energy Policy Act that the Democrats say provided huge tax breaks to "big oil." But they got that wrong, too. According to the non-partisan Congressional Research Service, this bill imposed a net tax increase of nearly $300 million over the next decade. At the same time, we provided incentives for energy exploration in difficult terrains so that our country could take another step toward weaning ourselves off foreign oil.

And we're seeing an important result from these policies: Jobs. The U.S. energy sector employs more than 1.8 million Americans, with good pay—up to $30 an hour on average, and often with union benefits.

In Texas, energy independence is our economy's life blood. Over 35,000 people work in the oil and gas sector in the Houston area alone, and nearly a quarter of our nation's crude oil is refined along the Texas Gulf Coast. Drilling is at record levels and reserves of natural gas are growing. Production is holding steady. The cost of oil, which is historically volatile, is down. And while Democrats like to take a swat at record oil and gas profits, these same companies are putting those profits back

into infrastructure and technology—often more than twice their profits in a year. Margins are actually much lower.

But the damage inflicted by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita to our exploration and refining capacity in the Gulf unmasked just how vulnerable our energy sector is. Plans are underway to strengthen that capacity—but that progress could be jeopardized if we place an undue tax burden on our refineries. In an area of the country that's still recovering from these disasters, why strip away even more jobs by taxing an industry that is helping supply thousands?

What's even crazier is that House Democrats will now consider American energy workers, including oil rig and refinery workers, as foreign workers for tax purposes—just so they can raise taxes on U.S. companies. Under this bill, farmers, software designers, and even cartoonists are considered manufacturing workers, but Americans who go to work each day to supply energy for this nation are classified as foreign workers. Explain that.

Democrats like to claim that we need this bill to lower gas and oil prices. I'm not sure who came up with that theory, but common sense tells me that if we put a strain on domestic manufacturers, that only serves to give a boost to foreign competition—and a boost to prices.

At a time when some Americans are relying on Hugo Chavez to heat their homes this winter—we need to take a step back and clearly understand the consequences of our actions. Repealing these tax incentives would only serve to stifle domestic production of oil and gas, raise gas prices and home heating costs for Americans, send more jobs overseas, and increase our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

The new House leadership may believe it scores them cheap political points to target Texas energy companies, many of whom employ union workers, but our communities don't think it's so funny. And at a time we need more U.S. energy and less foreign oil, it makes no sense at all.

As I said before, I believe we should invest in the development of renewable energy and alternative fuels to protect our future and our children's future. But short-changing American jobs today isn't the way to do it.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007. This bill takes an important first step towards a new energy future by investing in clean energy resources that will reduce harmful pollution and help break our addiction to foreign oil.

H.R. 6 would reclaim $13 billion in tax breaks and giveaways that the Republican Congress extended to big oil in 2004 and 2005 and ensure that oil companies pay their fair share to drill on public land. It would use that revenue to create a Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve to invest in clean, renewable energy resources and alternative fuels, promote new energy technologies, develop greater efficiency and improve energy conservation.

Over the last several years, Big Oil has raked in record profits while our dependence on foreign oil has climbed ever higher. At the same time, scientists have uncovered new and alarming facts about global warming that demand our urgent attention. While there is broad, bipartisan public support for investing in clean energy technology, the last Congress and the Administration seem to have been more concerned with taking care of their Big Oil buddies than steering us toward a sustainable energy future.

Today, we have an opportunity to chart a new course. H.R. 6 establishes a forward-thinking approach to energy that looks to American innovation to provide renewable energy for our future. Our security, our economy, and indeed, our very existence require nothing less.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, it has been said several times but bears repeating. When you're in a hole, stop digging. Our dependence on oil—foreign and domestic—requires us to stop making the problem worse by giving oil companies billions upon billions of dollars in truly unnecessary subsidies that worsen our dependence. This bill redirects $14 billion away from these subsidies and toward more sustainable energy production.

The transition to a renewable energy economy is not optional. The question is whether we will wait so long to create the transition that we do not make it on our own terms. Europe gets it. They are pouring orders of magnitude more money into research on renewables, positioning their industries to thrive in the future. On the other hand, this Administration has been digging its heels in by throwing billions of taxpayer dollars at an industry that made record profits on the backs of hard working Americans. We have a long way to go to catch up and this bill steers us firmly in that direction. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes''.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation (CLEAN) Energy Act, H.R 6. This critical legislation is an important step in increasing our investment in the development of clean and efficient energy technology that will one day end our dependence on foreign oil.

The oil industry has been reaping record profits while working Americans have faced record high gas prices. Last year, while millions of Americans struggled to afford gasoline at $3 a gallon, the top five oil companies made nearly $97 billion in profit. The hard truth is that at a time of record energy costs and oil profits, families in Connecticut and across the country were getting tapped into twice: once at the pump and once again with their tax dollars going to oil companies in the form of tax breaks and subsidies.

The bill before us today restores some common sense to our federal budget by repealing or minimizing nearly $13 billion in unnecessary tax subsidies given away to the oil and gas industries. It includes a rollback of a tax break for geological and geophysical exploration, a provision that the President himself suggested that Congress eliminate. In addition, it closes a $7.6 billion loophole written into the FSC/ETI international tax bill which allowed oil companies to qualify for a tax provision intended to help domestic manufacturers struggling to sell their products overseas. Finally, the CLEAN Energy Act ensures that oil companies that were awarded the 1998 and 1999 leases for drilling pay their fair share in royalties.

Our dangerous dependence on foreign oil is much more than just an energy issue—it is at its very core a matter of national security, foreign policy, environmental responsibility, economic development and technological advancement. Our dependence on foreign energy has grown to an alarming 65 percent of our total need, and we send $800 million each day to the Middle East and other oil producing countries.

H.R. 6 takes the important step towards ending this dependence by directing receipts to a newly created Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve. This fund will be used to fund future legislation promoting energy efficiency and investing in renewable energy technologies, such as the hydrogen fuel cells developed in Connecticut, which will one day provide us with almost unlimited amounts of energy to run our cars, power our homes and businesses and move us away from a petroleum based energy economy.

Eliminating unneeded tax breaks for the oil industry and investing in new energy sources are just part of the solution to lowering energy prices for hardworking American families. As we move forward in the 110th Congress, we must also work to protect the American people from high energy costs by preventing the manipulation of the oil futures market and ending the practice of price gouging. H.R. 6 is just the start and I look forward to working with my colleagues to address issues.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. Protecting our environment and promoting energy independence are two of the most important jobs I have as a Member of Congress.

I have long advocated repealing some of the tax breaks we give oil companies as ''incentives'' because our current market place provides adequate incentive as is to find additional sources of oil.

I also support using the $14 billion this bill will save in royalty relief to fund a renewable energy and efficient energy trust fund.

The bottom line is we are not resolving our energy needs because we are not conserving. We'll just continue to consume more and waste more, consume more and waste more, and act like it doesn't matter. This legislation is a first step to begin to address our energy needs.

This bill is similar to a provision in my energy legislation, the Energy for Our Future Act, which also repeals extraneous oil and gas company tax breaks. This is just one of the three principal goals the Energy For Our Future Act has for our national energy policy. I also hope Congress works to improve the fuel efficiency of passenger vehicles, provide incentives for the purchase of energy-efficient appliances and promote the growth of renewable energy, all three of which I deal with in my legislation.

In the past we have taken steps to increase our supply with no focus on our need to conserve. I am pleased to see legislation that finally recognizes that we are on a demand course that is simply unsustainable if we do not take control of our over-consumption.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation which commits nearly $14 billion to renewable energy technology and energy conservation and I rise in strong support of it.

Today we are eliminating unneeded subsidies and tax benefits for the largest and most profitable energy companies, and instead, investing the resources in the development and deployment of renewable energy resources and energy efficient technologies and practices.

This investment is critical because the status quo is not sustainable for our country.

We know that:

(1) The burning of fossil fuels is accelerating global climate change.

(2) We have only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves yet we consume 25 percent of the world's annual oil production.

(3) Two billion people on our planet today do not have access to electricity which is a basic necessity of life and economic security. They aspire to the prosperity we enjoy.

(4) Without a change, we will face stiff competition for oil from the developing world. The Department of Energy estimates that China and India will spur a tripling of energy consumption among Asia's developing nations in the next 25 years.

Rather than a series of problems, I see a tremendous opportunity for our nation.

In Silicon Valley in my Congressional District, the entrepreneurs who developed personal computers, the Internet, e-commerce, biotechnology, and nanotechnology are now turning to energy as the next great frontier for innovation and growth.

With the growing global demand for energy, they understand that the U.S. has the opportunity to be the primary exporter of clean energy and clean energy technology.

In the first 9 months of 2006, these entrepreneurs helped fund $600 million of U.S. investment in green technology.

They are investing in bio-fuels, bio-fuel infrastructure, and R&D to make bio-fuel production more efficient.

One company in my district is developing a fuel cell system that will produce clean, onsite electricity for homes and offices while also providing transportation fuel for hydrogen vehicles.

Others are developing technology that will put fuel cells in laptop computers, consumer electronics and automobiles.

They are developing and manufacturing new, more productive solar cells and solar technology.

Some of the largest computer, technology, and Internet firms are working to develop solutions to reduce the power used by large data centers.

In my region, Tesla Motors, now the third-largest American-owned auto maker, has produced a new line of efficient electric sports cars, with more practical and affordable models on the way.

This isn't happening just in Silicon Valley. Wal-Mart is committing $500 million a year to become more energy efficient and reduce its greenhouse gas emissions.

Just as it was important in the creation and commercialization of the Internet, Federal leadership is needed in this endeavor.

With the funding we're setting aside today, we're setting a national priority and providing the impetus for research, development, and deployment of new and emerging renewable energy technologies in the United States.

This is a very positive step toward energy independence and I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation (CLEAN) Act. This bill eliminates $7.7 billion in unnecessary tax breaks for the oil and gas industry, and raises another $6.3 billion for the Federal Treasury from new royalties on oil and gas removed from Federal waters. This $14 billion is a good down payment on future energy policies that can help eliminate our oil addiction and stop global warming.

This bill is a good first step, but I will work with my colleagues to eliminate many of the other unnecessary tax subsidies for the oil and gas industry. Oil companies are enjoying record profits. Every time the price of gas increases, the value of existing tax subsidies increases and they make even more money. At a time of record gas prices and record profits we should not provide tax incentives for exploring, extracting or refining oil and gas.

The best ways to eliminate our dependence on oil and reduce greenhouse gas emissions is to lower demand and reduce emissions from power plants and vehicles. For example, fuel economy standards for passenger cars have not been raised since 1985, and even lower ''light truck'' standards encourage manufacturers to produce gas-guzzling SUVs. I support raising fuel economy standards to at least 33 miles per gallon, which would save 1.1 million barrels of oil a day by 2015 and 2.6 million barrels by 2025. Those who say that we can't do any better than 20-year-old technology might also like to trade their DVDs for VHS tapes, cell phones for pay phones, ipods for boomboxes, and then see just how advanced 1980s technology seems today.

Eliminating tax subsidies will increase revenues, but we must spend those revenues wisely in our quest for clean renewable energy sources. Incentives for clean coal, ethanol and nuclear are not the answer. We must focus our efforts on promoting advancements in wind, hydrogen, solar and thermal power. These renewable sources can provide significant energy output with minimal environmental impact.

I support H.R. 6 and urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for a cleaner America.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6, which will raise the prices at the pumps, discourage domestic energy production, hurt America's working families, and encourage America's dependence on foreign energy.

I'm reminded of the family down the road from me back home in Michigan. They are a family with four kids, both their parents work and are struggling to get by; and if this legislation becomes law every time they fill up their gas tank or heat their house it will be an even greater burden on this family.

I've always said my number one priority while I'm in Congress is to protect the American taxpayer, that's a promise I made and that's a promise that I'll keep. Never voting for a tax increase is the same promise I made and kept during my 16 years in the Michigan House.

This is the first tax increase vote in 13 years and it didn't take the new majority more than 2 weeks to bring it to the floor to punish the American worker.

This legislation doesn't just force taxpayers to throw more money to the government, it also has our government tearing up already negotiated private contracts with the government at the same time we're trying to convince Russia, Venezuela and other countries to abide by the rule of law and respect its citizen's property rights.

Bottom line, this bill will increase our reliance on foreign oil, decrease our competitiveness and raise the prices at the pumps and the energy bills of working families. I urge my colleagues to vote no on increasing our dependence on foreign oil and yes on lower taxes, less regulation and respect to the rule of law.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. In the first 100 hours of this new Congress, the time finally has come to end the royalty rip-off, which has lined the pockets of Big Oil at the expense of the American taxpayers for entirely too long. For years, I have been working to ensure that Americans get what is owed to them from oil and gas companies through my work on the Government Reform Committee, scathing reports from the Government Accountability Office, and offering amendments here on the House floor. I am thrilled that we finally have the opportunity to give this issue the full attention it deserves.

It is indisputable that the American taxpayers are losing billions of dollars in royalties due to them by the oil and gas companies who are taking valuable resources out of Federal lands. The GAO estimates that because price thresholds were not included in deepwater leases from 1998 and 1999, the government has already lost up to $2 billion in royalties and could lose as much as $10 billion over the life of the leases.

H.R. 6 addresses the problem by requiring current offshore fuel producers with royalty-free leases to either agree to pay royalties when fuel prices reach certain thresholds or agree to pay a new ''conservation of resource fee.'' It would also close loopholes and end giveaways for Big Oil in the tax code and in the 2005 Energy Bill.

Together these savings would generate $14 billion to create a Created Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. The majority of the American public support investing in alternative energy sources to end our addiction to oil, and even President Bush promised to invest in clean renewable fuels and cutting-edge technologies in his 2006 State of the Union Address. This clean energy fund will be used to pay for upcoming legislation to encourage people to use clean domestic renewable energy resources already in existence, promote use of energy-efficient products and practices, and increase research and development of new cutting-edge technologies.

Today, we must take the opportunity to show the American people that we are with them, not with Big Oil. H.R. 6 is an important first step towards a smart energy policy and a clean energy future, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation before the House, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007.

It's time for Congress to face the facts and begin to break our nation's dangerous addiction to oil. The industry tax breaks and royalty holidays that we seek to eliminate today no doubt serve the interests of the big oil companies, but they do not serve the interests of our nation's long-term energy security, or, for that matter, the interests of taxpayers, consumers and the environment.

We import more than 60 percent of the oil we consume every day in this country. We are increasingly dependent on oil imports from volatile regions of the world and from countries that are not necessarily our friends. If we do nothing, our dependence on imported oil will only grow. Some will say that the answer

is to provide more subsidies and tax breaks to encourage oil drilling in the United States. Well, we've tried that, and it hasn't worked. We're more dependent on foreign oil than ever. All the industry subsidies in the world won't change the fact that the U.S. has just 3 percent of the global oil reserves. We can't drill our way out of this problem.

Rather than continue business as usual, today we are beginning to chart a new course to energy security. The legislation before the House repeals $13 billion in egregious tax subsidies and royalty holidays that have been given to the oil companies in recent years. Instead, we will invest these funds in clean, renewable energy that is made here in the United States, including solar, wind, biomass, and biofuels. We will also invest in new energy technologies and develop policies to stimulate investment and deployment of energy efficient products and services. Investing in alternative fuels and new energy technologies is also an investment in jobs here in America.

I want to make it clear that this legislation eliminates only the most egregious energy industry subsidies. First of all, we target the flawed deepwater oil and gas leases that were awarded in 1998 and 1999. Contrary to longstanding practice, these leases did not provide for royalty payments—no matter how high oil prices rise. In this legislation, we require that these leases be renegotiated. The American people deserve a fair royalty for publicly-owned resources.

I also want to respond to some of the statements made today by opponents of this legislation. Some have suggested that our legislation unfairly singles out the oil and gas industry by repealing their ability to take advantage of a tax provision intended to encourage domestic manufacturing. This is not the case. Many of my colleagues will recall that several years ago our trading partners in the European Union successfully challenged a tax benefit that the Federal Government provided to U.S. exporters. Let's be clear that the oil and gas industry did not qualify for the old FSC–ETI tax benefit, and neither did any number of other U.S. industries, including financial services, hospitals, and real estate, to name only a few. When Congress repealed the FSC–ETI in 2004, we provided a replacement benefit to U.S. exporters in the form of tax benefit for domestic manufacturers. But for some reason, this manufacturing tax break was extended to include the oil and gas industry, even though they were never eligible for the old FSC–ETI benefit. If there is a problem with unfairly singling out an industry, it is not in the bill before the House today. The problem lies in the loophole in the 2004 bill that singled out the oil and gas industry to receive a domestic manufacturing benefit that was not justified.

I hope this clears up this matter and that all my colleagues will join me in voting for this important legislation.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, today Democrats will bring forward the final piece of legislation in the Six for 06 for America, the Clean Energy Act of 2007. This bill is vital in assuring the American taxpayers that the government will close loopholes and end giveaways in the tax code for major oil companies.

In my work as Ranking Member on the Government Reform Subcommittee on Energy and Resources in the 109th Congress, I worked closely with my colleague DARRELL ISSA in investigating the overlooked but serious problems with the oil and gas royalty programs. The mismanagement of several of these leases potentially could cost America's taxpayers nearly twenty billion in royalties over the next 25 years because of errors in drafting the leases.

Had the leases been negotiated properly, it is estimated that the government would have collected an additional $700 million in royalties in 2005 alone. Do the math. These funds would allow one American family to fill their Dodge Caravan minivan over 12 million times, even with the high gas prices we are facing now.

Madam Speaker, our citizens should not pay for bureaucratic mistakes nor should they suffer the consequences of this administration not holding these companies accountable. H.R. 6 will be a start to fixing this and many other examples of government mismanagement in the energy sector.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to promote energy legislation that will lead to positive outcomes for the economy and the environment while protecting taxpayers and consumers. H.R. 6 does this and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6. Over the last 24 years, America's dependence on foreign oil has more than tripled. We currently import about 65 percent of our oil, a new record high. At the same time, the Federal Government has been providing tax incentives that have only exacerbated our oil dependence problem.

It's time that we pass this bill and repeal the subsidies created in the 2005 Energy Bill. These government giveaways could be much better used by investing in research and development of clean, renewable energy sources.

Madam Speaker, in my home State of New Jersey, we consume 11.1 million gallons of gasoline per day! That ranks 11th in the Nation. With such high consumption in New Jersey and across our country, we need to start thinking about the future and turn to alternative energy sources. Americans need more choices at the pump.

This legislation will not solve our energy dependence problems overnight, but we have to start somewhere. This legislation gives us a good starting point. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 6.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Clean Energy Act of 2007, H.R. 6.

This bill, like all of the bills brought to the floor by the Democratic leadership under the Six for '06 package has the same effect, to try to level the proverbial playing field so that every American family has a fighting chance.

This bill takes a huge step in the right direction by repealing $14 billion in subsidies given to Big Oil companies and paid for by American taxpayers. It also addresses a future that we know is coming—a future where fossil fuels will be in far less plentiful supply—and sets the stage for investing those profits in clean, renewable and alternative energy technologies and sources.

This bill closes tax loopholes for oil companies, rolls back tax breaks for geological and geophysical expenditures and repeals five royalty relief provisions from the 2005 Republican energy bill. In fact, this bill will require companies that have been reaping billions in profits and providing record golden parachute packages to departing CEOs while the average American family has seen an overall decline in income, to pay royalties in order to qualify for new federal leases for drilling.

The goal of this bill is energy independence for our country that will allow our foreign policy decisions to be based more on what's good for our citizens and not just what's good for our gas tanks.

I applaud the Democratic leadership for bringing this legislation to the floor and I applaud this Congress for successfully passing six critical pieces of legislation that affect the everyday lives of all Americans.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, affordable and reliable energy is an important component of continued economic growth. It heats and cools our homes, facilitates the means of production, and fuels our transportation system. However, politics, not sound energy policy is driving the legislation before us today.

The tax provisions targeted for repeal in H.R. 6 are designed to encourage new capital investment in U.S. energy projects, and they are fulfilling this goal. Their repeal will discourage new domestic oil and gas production and refinery capacity, threaten American jobs, and make it less economic to produce domestic energy resources—thereby increasing our dependence on imported crude oil and refined fuel products. A recent economic analysis by PricewaterhouseCoopers confirms:

''Higher taxes on the U.S. activities of the oil and natural gas industry, as would result under H.R. 6, would be expected to reduce U.S. exploration, production, and refining activities and increase U.S. dependence on foreign oil. This outcome is in sharp contrast to long-term energy goals for a Nation less reliant on imported energy sources.''

These results run directly counter to sound energy policy goals and, by diminishing energy supplies, would strike a blow to U.S. energy consumers.

Provisions in the bill affecting the deep water royalty relief program will set back the significant gains in oil and gas production that are attributable to the program and discourage new domestic production. This program has been one of the most successful policy stimulants for U.S. oil and natural gas exploration and production. It has contributed to a nearly 400 percent increase in natural gas production and more than 100 new discoveries.

The real impact of actions taken in this bill will be felt by our Nation's manufacturers and every day consumers of energy. The higher energy taxes will be passed on to consumers in the form of higher gasoline and home energy prices. Similarly, heavy users of oil and natural gas, such as manufacturers and their customers, will feel the pinch of these higher prices and the effects of higher gas prices will ripple throughout the economy.

This legislation would give an unfair competitive advantage to foreign energy firms by placing tax increases squarely on the shoulders of domestic energy producers. This will encourage domestic energy companies, which employ 1.8 million Americans to move those jobs overseas.

America's energy future is too important to risk a rush to judgment, and H.R. 6 represents a significant step backward for our Nation's energy security. Imposing new costs, whether in the form of taxes or fees is contrary to the goal of providing stable and affordable energy supplies for American consumers.

America's energy consumers deserve a sound energy policy that will not hit them with unnecessarily increased energy costs. This legislation is a poor substitute for a real energy policy. I urge my colleagues to reject this punitive energy legislation and to decrease our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to H.R. 6. This bill is fatally flawed, both because of the provisions that it contains and also the process that brought it to the floor.

Simply put: Congress performs best when the process of Authorization, Appropriation, and Oversight is followed through the regular order.

This bill seeks to both Authorize and Appropriate at the same time by short-cutting the authority of the Budget Committee and directing spending.

In addition, this new language was brought to the floor without the benefit of review by any Committees, and even before the Resources Committee has been organized.

Finally, this bill seeks to create a slush fund for spending on non-specific programs with no enforcement mechanism to ensure that funds are spent appropriately.

We are not talking about an insignificant amount; rather, CBO estimates that these provisions will raise $14 billion dollars in federal revenue—$14 billion that should be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction, if raised at all.

Beyond the argument of oil and gas tax incentives, sanctity of contracts, or renewable resources, I simply cannot support a bill that displays such a disregard for the legislative process and handle taxpayer dollars with such irresponsibility.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise in support of H.R. 6, which will help our Nation take a major step toward energy independence.

We must recognize that we cannot dig or drill our way out of our energy crisis and must move away from our reliance on oil and gas. Our nation deserves a comprehensive energy policy that guarantees access to affordable power, encourages energy conservation efforts, and pursues increased use of environmentally responsible and renewable sources of energy. H.R. 6 moves us in exactly that direction. It will close expensive loopholes and end giveaways to oil and gas companies and invest those dollars in clean and renewable sources of energy here in the United States.

I have strongly supported efforts to develop and adopt new sources of energy, not only for the important environmental benefits they create, but also for their positive impact on our economy and national security. Just as our Nation worked together to put a man on the moon, we must now unite behind an energy policy that enhances national security, creates American jobs, and protects our environment. We must harness Americans' ingenuity and creativity to make the United States a world leader in new energy technology and move our nation toward energy independence.

Many of my colleagues have talked for a long time about how we need to end our addiction to foreign sources of energy. Today we finally have an opportunity to follow through on our promises by voting for H.R. 6.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6, which will begin to right our country's course on energy policy, steering us away from costly subsidies for the oil and gas industries that are both unnecessary and unwanted. Instead, this bill will allow our government to invest in its own industries, which produce clean, efficient energy that will improve our environment, produce jobs, and increase our national security.

Madam Speaker, I cannot say why, during a time of record profits by oil and gas companies, this industry was targeted for tax relief in 2004 and 2005. I honestly cannot say why the majority of this congress thought it was a good idea to give away billions of taxpayer dollars in this way. What I do know, is that I am not alone in wondering why.

Our own President, whose personal ties to the oil industry are well known, has said numerous times that industry does not need these subsidies. Just last year, he was quoted in the Washington Post saying:

> Record oil prices and large cash flows also mean that Congress has got to understand that these energy companies don't need unnecessary tax breaks like the write-offs of certain geological and geophysical expenditures, or the use of taxpayers' money to subsidize energy companies' research into deep water drilling. I'm looking forward to Congress to take about $2 billion of these tax breaks out of the budget over a 10-year period of time. Cash flows are up. Taxpayers don't need to be paying for certain of these expenses on behalf of the energy companies.

President Bush was saying these things even before we passed the energy bill. In 2005 he said, "With oil at more than $50 a barrel, by the way, energy companies do not need taxpayer funded incentives to explore for oil and gas."

Even the President, from the oil State of Texas, understands that our country needs to move in a new direction on energy policy. In his State of the Union address last year, he said, "America is addicted to oil, which is often imported from unstable parts of the world. The best way to break this addiction is through technology."

Madam Speaker, H.R. 6 will repeal the unnecessary giveaways to the energy industry by reducing the tax deductions for exploration that were included in the 2005 energy bill, and eliminating a tax break the industry never should have had. This is expected to raise $6.6 billion over 10 years, which will be set aside in a new strategic energy efficiency and renewables reserve to go toward research and development of newer, cleaner alternatives.

It is time for us to invest in the midwest, not the Middle East. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, the real issue here is about moving this Nation in the direction of energy independence.

It's true that this bill is about increasing royalties for oil extracted from land owned by the American people.

Lease agreements from 1998 and 1999 mistakenly did not include the proper royalty language.

As a result, the American people lost out on an estimated $865 million in royalties.

With this legislation, Congress has an opportunity, and a responsibility, to correct this mistake.

We also have an opportunity to roll back unnecessary subsidies and tax breaks for oil companies.

But the bill is not about sticking it to the oil industry as some critics have claimed. It is about creating an important funding mechanism for our Nation's energy future.

Throughout history, America has been an innovator in technology.

Benjamin Franklin's experiments with electricity paved the way toward harnessing its capabilities.

The Wright Brothers flew the first airplane.

America was the first to put a man on the moon.

Now is the time for America to become a leader in another field: renewable energy.

The funding generated from this bill will allow us to significantly increase our Nation's investment in renewable energy.

As a Nation, we have become more and more dependent on oil. We simply cannot maintain our current rate of oil consumption.

Madam Speaker, let's not wait until we hit rock bottom before making significant progress toward energy independence.

When it comes to renewable energy, we must go forward with the dedication and commitment that put America first in flight and put a man on the moon.

Let's show the American people that this Congress will set this Nation on the path toward clean, renewable energy.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6, Creating Long-Term Energy Alternative for the Nation, also known as the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007.

This bill closes up the tax loopholes that have enabled energy companies to reap huge profits in recent years, as the prices of oil and gas have risen exponentially.

It also rolls back a 2005 Energy Bill tax break for geological and geophysical expenditures, and it repeals provisions that have enabled energy companies to duck out on paying taxes on these profits.

One provision that especially appeals to me is the creation of a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve.

The Reserve will be used to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and it would accelerate the use of alternative fuel sources and renewable energy. In addition, it will encourage energy-efficiency and conservation of our resources. The provision will also ultimately fund research to produce better renewable energy technologies.

The House Science Committee, of which I am a member, has had hearings and markups on renewable energy research strategies, and it is clear that we should push harder toward renewable energy.

Energy research and development are the keys to lessening our dependence on foreign oil and to lessening our dependence on fossil fuels. The federal government should continue to support energy research and also provide incentives to encourage the American public and businesses to buy hybrid cars and support renewable fuels.

We must take the lead in supporting energy policies that are good for the environment and help reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased we're discussing the growing problem of America's dependence on foreign sources of oil and gas, and the high prices that consumers are paying here at home. In the 109th Congress we made great strides in promoting energy independence through tax incentives for oil and gas exploration, improvement of outdated infrastructure and added research into renewable resources.

But while the goal of "energy security" is a good one, I am concerned that today's bill moves us away from that objective. I frequently hear from constituents concerned about our growing dependence on foreign supplies. And rightly so—when we experienced the first "energy crisis," foreign countries provided one, third of our energy needs. Thirty years later, that reliance has nearly doubled.

H.R. 6 does not address this problem. Quite the opposite: Through increasing taxes, the legislation makes it more costly for U.S. firms to develop domestic supplies. This means our over-dependence on foreign supplies will increase even more. The policies we have already put in place are working: American production of natural gas is up 407 percent, and deep water oil production is up 386 percent. And billions of dollars that would otherwise go to hostile nations have been invested in renewable energy developed from open-loop biomass, geothermal and other resources.

Madam Speaker, my constituents want a forward-thinking energy strategy that seeks new ways to meet our needs. Everyone agrees we should pursue "energy independence." H.R. 6 moves us farther from this goal.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 66, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MCCRERY

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MCCRERY. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCrery moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 6) to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Rules with instructions that each Committee report the same back to the House after the Committee holds hearings on, and considers, the bill.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, the substance of this motion to recommit is basically to say, look, these matters are complex. My good friend on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCDERMOTT, said that himself just a few minutes ago. And because of that complexity and because of the complexity of the issues, not only the tax issues in this legislation but the energy issues as well, this bill deserves regular order. It deserves to go through the relevant committees with full hearings, full ability of both the majority and the minority to offer amendments in committee, and then have some sort of rule on the floor which allows for different opinions to be voted on as either amendments or substitutes as the process goes forward.

As we all know by now, in this 100-hour exercise, which I think still has plenty of time left in it, frankly, we could even go back now and within the 100 hours have committee hearings and dispense with this bill in the regular order, and that is what this motion to recommit will do.

It simply says this is not a rejection of the bill, it is not a rejection of the substance of the bill, it is merely saying let's take this important piece of legislation through regular order, let's allow Members of this House the full rights of Members to talk about a bill, hear expert witnesses, delve into the particulars of the legislation, offer amendments, try to make it better, and then, finally, bring it to the floor for a vote.

The way that this bill has been rushed through, without regular process, without opportunity for amendment, or even a substitute, makes a mockery of the legislative process and certainly, I think, shortchanges the important subjects covered in this legislation.

I have talked about the tax consequences of the provisions in the bill which increase taxes on only one sector of American manufacturing, oil and gas. Again, it is not taking back a subsidy to oil and gas, it is not taking back a special tax break for oil and gas, it is singling out oil and gas for harsher treatment under the Tax Code than any other economic sector in this country. That is punishing oil and gas. That is punitive.

And that is not what this Congress should be engaged in, in my view. We should try to give a level playing field to all sectors of the American economy, give them all the same opportunities to succeed, to return value to its shareholders, to all those millions of pensioners that have pieces of shares of stock in these American oil and gas companies. They shouldn't be punished by this Congress.

We should be striking a balance between the need for, as my good friend from Washington says, new alternative and renewable sources of energy for the future, but also recognize the immediate needs of this country and for the foreseeable future, the 20 or 30 years the experts say we are going to be reliant on fossil fuels. So we ought to have a balanced approach. We ought to encourage, not discourage exploration and development of fossil fuels in this country, and also encourage research and development of new renewable sources of energy.

Unfortunately, the process that we have gone through on this bill didn't give us the opportunity to do that. This motion to recommit would give us that opportunity, and I urge its passage.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, in response to the declaration of the gentleman from Louisiana that this is a tax increase on the oil and gas industry, this bill is not a tax increase, I say to my colleagues. What we are doing is repealing subsidies, repealing royalties, and asking the oil and gas industry to pay their fair share. There is no tax increase whatsoever in this bill.

The meat and potatoes of this legislation, H.R. 6, came through our Natural Resources Committee. It was drafted by our committee in consultation with the leadership. This committee is the same committee chaired in a previous Congress by our former colleague, Chairman Richard Pombo. Much of the legislation in this bill, H.R. 6, has been debated, has had hearings held therein, and has even been voted upon by the House of Representatives in the previous Congress.

So I would suggest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to go back and look at those votes that were held in a previous Congress in order to be consistent today.

For example, the new conservation fee of $9 per barrel that is set up in this bill if the companies choose to pay no royalties. That was set up in the Jindal-Pombo bill of the last session of Congress and supported by a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Reference has been made to these notorious leases of 1998 and 1999, where the American taxpayers got socked the most; that these were instituted and allowed to take place under the Clinton administration. True, President Clinton was President of the United States at that time. But I would also remind my colleagues who make this charge that in 2000 we elected President George Bush as President of the United States, and the last time I looked at the calendar, this is 2007. Six years with no action by the current Department of the Interior to correct these abuses. And, I might say, until December 31 of this year, Republicans controlled the Congress as well, yet no action was taken.

So what we are doing here is an attempt to correct mistakes, correct bungling by the Department of the Interior, mismanagement, whatever word you want to call it, on these 1998–1999 leases where there were no royalties collected, where the price of oil has certainly gone above the threshold that was established in the 1995 Deep Royalty Relief Act, again passed by a Republican Congress, and which was overlooked in the implementation and collection on these 1998–1999 leases.

To those who charge that we are breaching contracts today, there is ample precedent and reservation of power in the U.S. to impose fees for the conservation of resources both in the

statute in the Outer Continental Lands Act, and reserved specifically in the leases that are issued in the Gulf of Mexico. Again, these leases issued in 1998 and 1999 are royalty free regardless of market, and that is when we impose this conservation fee passed by the Republican Congress in the past but failed to be enacted into law. So we have set ample precedent here.

As I conclude, let me say that I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in a bipartisan fashion, as we have voted before on this legislation, to pass H.R. 6 for the sake of the American taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I urge people to vote down this motion to recommit. Mr. MCCRERY sat in the other day when we had a forum in the Ways and Means Committee and we discussed this bill. We went over it fairly carefully with experts from two sources at least. And, clearly, we are making very modest changes. That was clear from the testimony we had, that these were modest changes to the law.

When we make the bigger changes, which we will have to do to give us a real source of money for this, and decide how we are going to allocate it in the most effective way for the country, there will be full hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, and I look forward to having your participation. You have been a real wonderful change in the Ways and Means Committee for us, and we are looking forward to working with you on the Tax Code to make this truly the first step, the first teeny step, and then we are going to make a lot of other big steps.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 6, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 62.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Cooper
Johnson, Sam
Lucas
McHenry
Norwood

□ 1733

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. TERRY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BLUNT. Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I do intend to request a recorded vote. However, I first want to make a point of order that the Chair just failed to properly announce the result of the question of passage by the requisite three-fifths pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule XXI, which requires a three-fifths vote to increase tax rates.

Section 102 of H.R. 6 proposes to deny a deduction under section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for an income attributable to domestic production of oil, natural gas or primary products thereof.

Section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for up to a 9 percent deduction in the amount of corporate income that is taxable under section 11(b) of the Code.

As described in the joint statement of managers accompanying H.R. 4520, which created section 199, when enacted section 199 effectively created a lower percentage rate of tax and therefore reduced the amount of tax proposed by such section. Once fully phased in in 2010, section 199 reduces the tax rate under section 11(b) by 3 points.

Section 102 of the pending bill proposes to disallow this deduction for certain taxpayers, thus imposing a new, higher percentage of tax, and thereby increasing the amount of tax imposed on a taxpayer under section 11(b).

The Joint Committee on Taxation has indicated that section 102 will increase tax receipts by $7.6 billion between 2007 and 2017.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, since this bill increases taxes, and since that tax burden will ultimately be passed on to every American consumer who owns or operates an automobile, I insist on my point of order and demand that H.R. 6 not be considered as passed unless agreed to by three-fifths of those Members present and voting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, to hear the Speaker's answer to the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on this point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. McCRERY. Madam Speaker, I ask to be heard on the point of order.

This bill should require a three-fifths majority for passage. Madam Speaker, it is important to point out that section 199(d)(6), the subject in this bill, incorporates by reference section 55 of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 55 is specifically identified as a provision subject to the point of order found in clause 5(b) of House rule XXI. By amending section 199, the bill is increasing the applicable rate under section 55 as applied to oil and gas manufacturers.

Recognizing the connection between section 199 and section 55 is critical to the interpretation of House rule XXI. All of the sections identified in House rule XXI deal with the imposition of taxes, and those sections, in turn, are referenced throughout the Internal Revenue Code.

For example, Internal Revenue Code section 2(a)(1) defines the term ''surviving spouse'' for purposes of section 1 as a person whose spouse died up to 2 years before the current tax year. Amending section 2 of the Code to change the definition of a spouse to someone who died only 1 year ago would have the direct effect of increasing the tax rate on widows that is set by section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

By way of further example, one computation method for farm income is found in section 1301 of the Internal Revenue Code. That section of the Code also explicitly references section 1. By changing the methods for computing farm income in section 1301, you can directly raise the tax rate of a farmer that is set by section 1.

Madam Speaker, here comes the denouement. Madam Speaker, certainly the intent of rule XXI is for the House to clear a higher hurdle, a three-fifths majority, before it increases taxes on farmers or widows. That intent would be just as relevant in this case where a bill effectively raises the tax rate on some American manufacturers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does anyone else seek recognition on this point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, these guys passed $14 billion in tax breaks to Big Oil. Now is not the time to redo it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The requirement in clause 5(b) of rule XXI for a three-fifths vote on certain tax measures comprises three elements.

The first element is that the measure amends one of the subsections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that are cited in the rule. The second element is that the measure does so by imposing a new percentage as a rate of tax. The third element is that in doing so the measure increases the amount of tax imposed by any of those cited subsections of the Code.

The Chair is unable to find a provision in the bill that fulfills even the first element of the requirement.

A bill that does not meet any one of the three elements required by clause 5(b) of rule XXI does not carry a Federal income tax rate increase within the meaning of the rule.

Accordingly, the Chair holds that a majority vote is sufficient to pass H.R. 6, and the Chair properly announced the result of the voice vote on passage.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall suspend.

The question is, shall the decision of this Chair stand as the judgment of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. MCDERMOTT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I move to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

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

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 6, if ordered, and on the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 62, if arising without further debate.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—230

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Cooper
Johnson, Sam
Lucas
McHenry
Norwood
Peterson (MN)

□ 1759

Mr. KING of New York changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 163, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—264

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—163

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Jindal
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Cooper
Johnson, Sam
Lucas
McHenry
Norwood

□ 1809

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

CONGRATULATING THE GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY LAKERS FOR WINNING THE 2006 NCAA DIVISION II FOOTBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 62.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 62, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows: