United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2008 No. 92

House of Representatives

The House met at 9:30 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

''Open my eyes, Lord, that I may see the wonders of Your law.''

The longest of the Psalms, Psalm 119, studies many facets of law so that people down through the ages would be fascinated by the full impact of the law's meaning.

The law's deepest impression, however, comes when Your law is taken to heart. Law then becomes the pulsating rhythm that unites people in every step of every day. Law transforms the source of breathing in freedom and exhaling corruption.

Your law, O Lord, brings fulfillment to the individual and salvation to society.

Bless and guide the lawmakers of this Chamber and of this land now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIRES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HOUSE DEMOCRATS RESTORE FISCAL SANITY TO D.C. BY PASSING BUDGET THAT IS BALANCED BY 2012

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

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, this week the House will vote on a final budget conference agreement that charts a new way forward for our country. It is the first budget agreement reached in an election year since the Clinton administration and restores fiscal sanity to a process that has been out of control since President Bush came to Washington in 2001. Unlike past Republican budgets, our budget returns to surplus in 2012.

The new budget makes investments in energy, education, and infrastructure, while also providing tax relief to middle class families. The agreement does not include any new tax increases. In fact, it does support significant tax relief for middle class families, including extension of marriage penalty tax relief, the child tax credit, and the continuation of the 10 percent tax bracket. It also includes an additional year of the alternative minimum tax relief.

The budget also ensures that veterans get the quality health care they need and protects our homeland. It also rejects cuts proposed by the President to important first responder programs like the COPS program.

Madam Speaker, this budget deserves strong bipartisan support.

PROTECT AMERICAN FAMILIES FROM MEXICAN DRUG GANGS

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times reports that our Mexican allies are now engaged in a life-or-death struggle against massive drug cartels. These cartels assassinated the Mexican FBI Director and now threaten the President's life. President Calderon has asked us for help, and for the safety and security of American families, we must.

If you see a red star on this map, it means that our Drug Enforcement Agency says that a Mexican drug gang is operating in your congressional district. If you see a green star, like in Las Vegas, Chicago, San Francisco, it means the DEA knows that the drug gangs have a command-and-control center in your congressional district.

Last month the gangs of Mexico topped their murder of hundreds of Mexican police officers with a new practice: beheading people and leaving their heads in coolers. It would be naive to think that such violence remains just south of our border.

That's why Congress should fully fund the Merida Law Enforcement Initiative.

DEMOCRATS HAVE A STRONG RECORD OF TRYING TO LOWER OUR NATION'S GAS PRICES

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, the record price of gasoline is pinching the wallets of every American. It seems every day the price hits another record. Since day one this Democratic House has been committed to lowering prices at the pump and adopting a smarter energy future.

Thanks to a Democratic Congress, President Bush finally agreed to temporarily suspend sending oil to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, a move that will instantly lower gas prices by about a quarter when it goes into effect by the end of this month.

Thanks to this Democratic Congress, the Federal Trade Commission recently agreed to implement the market

Printed on recycled paper.

manipulation authority that it was given in an energy law that we passed last year. This agreement should ensure that the U.S. petroleum market is free from price and supply manipulation.

Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration would have never acted on these two issues had it not been for the persistence of this Democratic Congress. We will continue to pressure the administration and congressional Republicans to join us in lowering gas prices.

THE TIDE IS TURNING: AMERICANS SUPPORT INCREASING OUR DOMESTIC ENERGY SUPPLY

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, gas is over $4 a gallon and people are upset. According to a May 20 Gallup poll, 57 percent of Americans support drilling in U.S. coastal and wilderness areas that are now off-limits. The tide is turning. Americans know we can solve this problem of high gas prices.

Just this week the Sioux City Journal reported the results of what they called the ''most important election in the county's history.'' By a solid 58–42 percent, the voters of Union County approved a zoning ordinance that will keep alive the county's chances of landing the Nation's first oil refinery in 32 years. They know we need to increase our energy supply, and that's why I introduced the Refinery Streamlined Permitting Act, H.R. 2471, a bill that would require agencies to give high priority to refinery applications that would result in greater capacity, a cleaner-burning fuel, and a reduction in refinery's pollution output.

Mr. Speaker, Americans need substantive solutions to secure our Nation's energy future. Let's join together in our efforts to open up the coasts, the wilderness areas, and drill for more oil to increase our domestic supply and bring down the price of gasoline.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS OPPOSE OUR EFFORTS TO LOWER RECORD HIGH GAS PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the American people do continue to face record high gas prices, and this Democratic Congress has acted and will continue to act on legislation, commonsense legislation, that will reduce the price at the pump. Only now we need to get the support of President Bush and our friends on the Republican side of the aisle who seem content on pursuing the same failed policies that got us here in the first place.

Over the last couple of months, this House has passed 9 bills that would lower gas prices. While we received a little bit of bipartisan support, the majority of our friends on the Republican side have opposed those 8 bills.

House Republicans said ''no'' to legislation that would enable the Justice Department to take legal action against foreign nations manipulating the price of oil. House Republicans said ''no'' to legislation that would give the Federal Trade Commission the authority to investigate and punish those who are artificially inflating the price of gas.

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the Republican side of the aisle need to realize that saying ''no'' is not an energy policy.

THE PRICE OF GASOLINE: CONGRESS MUST TAKE ACTION TO LOWER GAS PRICES

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, traveling through my district in west and middle Tennessee this past week, gasoline and the price at the pump are what everybody is talking about. Busy moms in Tennessee are now spending about $240 to fill the minivan up every month. That's about $100 more than it was when the Democrats took control of the gavels in both the Senate and the House.

Well, the Congress must stop talking and they must take action so that we can solve this problem.

Government has been and continues to be a roadblock when it comes to lowering gas prices. Republicans want to incentivize efficiency and innovation. We want to incentivize and promote production of American energy resources for an American solution to this problem. We want to incentivize ingenuity. We are innovators. We can solve this problem when we put our best minds to it.

And there are some concrete steps that we could and should take now, things that we have supported, like repealing and delaying the ethanol mandates; taking advantage of our natural resources, western shale, ANWR.

Mr. Speaker, families are calling out for relief. Let's take action.

□ 0945

DEMOCRATS TAKE ACTION ON RECORD HIGH GAS PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, as the price of gasoline continues to hit record prices almost every week, congressional Democrats continue to pass legislation to help us reduce our dependence on foreign oil and lower prices at the pump. Unfortunately, the only solution President Bush and congressional Republicans come up with is more drilling. They ignore the fact that drilling in the U.S. has recently exploded. Since 2000, the number of wells that have been drilled in this country has increased by about 66 percent, while the price at the pump for the consumer has more than doubled.

President Bush and congressional Republicans also continue to push drilling in the Arctic Refuge. Again, they ignore experts who say that opening the refuge for drilling would produce only about 6-months' worth of oil and it wouldn't be available for another 10 years. How is that a strategy for lower prices today?

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats know that American families are feeling squeezed every time they head to the gas station. That is why we continue to pass legislation that should help ease the pain at the pump. It would be nice if the President would support these efforts.

BAD POLICY HAS BANNED DRILLING OFFSHORE

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

Ms. FALLIN. If I told you that a loaf of bread was $4, and there was plenty of wheat growing right here, but you said I could not harvest it, then I would be right to call you illogical. If I told you that you could bake more bread with a new oven, except that your rules say we can't build it, then I'd be right to say that your rules are hurting consumers. If I told you I needed to keep my bakery profits to expand my production, and you tax them away to ''punish'' me for market forces beyond my control, then you would be the one to blame for the rising bread prices.

Sounds silly, doesn't it? Unfortunately, this pretty much sums up our current energy policies. Just substitute gas for bread.

Bad policy has banned drilling offshore in Alaska where there are huge oil reserves. Bad policy has curtailed refinery construction. Bad policy taxes productivity, reduces the capital needed for new production, and the same basic rules of economics apply to bread and energy. When bad policies block production, you have shortages, and prices go up and people get hurt.

PASS THE NEW GI BILL

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, how we treat those who serve this country abroad in our Armed Forces says a lot about this Nation. The greatest gift that we can give to those men and women who are returning to the United States from Iraq and Afghanistan and the fields of battle is an education with the passage of the new GI Bill. When I went to Iraq last year, the troops said this version of the

same thing to myself and the five others that traveled there. They said, Don't forget about us when we come back home.

With the passage of the new GI Bill, we can make good on that promise that we all made to those troops on our visits there. I hope that Senator MCCAIN and many of our friends here in this hall who have not supported this new GI Bill, who have not supported extending benefits to the troops as they return, to give them an education for a lifetime, will remember that you can't just go there and tell them that you support them, you have to come to this floor and to the floor down the hall and do it.

NEW EMPLOYEE VERIFICATION ACT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this year I introduced the New Employee Verification Act, H.R. 5515, that prevents unauthorized employment. It will replace the expiring pilot program, E-Verify, that is run by the Department of Homeland Security.

The Department of Homeland Security has no business keeping tabs on work records of law-abiding American citizens. I strongly reject the Orwellian premise that a government agency tasked with catching terrorists should also maintain a huge database on the work history of every single American. Our bipartisan bill ensures that U.S. citizens go through Social Security to confirm their legal right to work, and noncitizens go through the Department of Homeland Security.

I urge you to cosponsor H.R. 5515, to create a new work authorization system that will help reduce illegal immigration, preserve the rights and privacy of law-abiding citizens, and protect Social Security.

HOUSE DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO WORK TO PASS LEGISLATION THAT WILL MAKE REAL DIFFERENCE

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, over the last month this Democratic Congress has passed important legislation that will help our economy, our veterans, and millions of middle class families. But our efforts are being opposed by a Bush White House that refuses to work with us to solve our Nation's most pressing problems.

We can't turn around our economy without addressing the escalating housing crisis. Last month, we passed a comprehensive package that addresses the crisis directly, helps stabilize the housing market, and makes a real difference for families at risk for losing their homes.

To help jump-start our economy and help reduce prices at the gas pump, we passed legislation that extends vital tax relief to millions of families, strengthens investment opportunities for American businesses, and encourages the production and use of renewable energy. To help veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we passed a new GI Bill that restores promised 4-year scholarships so they can go to college after they complete their military service.

Mr. Speaker, we are passing legislation here in the House that can make a real difference for all Americans.

PROTECT AMERICA TODAY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it has been 109 days since the Protect America Act expired and our intelligence community's ability to track our enemies was degraded. Foreign surveillance is an important part of our Nation's defense in the global war on terrorism. We need to make sure it's up-to-date and equipped with tools our military and intelligence community say are vital to doing the job.

When the Protect America Act expired, a bipartisan group of Senators passed a bill that enjoys vocal support from House Republicans and Democrats, 25 State attorneys general, including South Carolina's own Henry McMaster, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Unfortunately, none of that seems to matter to the majority leadership, who has tried to downplay the importance of this bill and has failed to bring it to the House floor for consideration. We must not tie the hands of our intelligence services while they are doing all they can to protect American families.

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

PROUD TO BE A DEMOCRAT

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

Mr. COHEN. This past week has seen the end of the Democratic primary. I think it will end on Saturday. Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to be a Democrat and witness this historic election. When our country was founded, African Americans were slaves, and even after slavery ended in 1865, Jim Crow laws and others passed by this Congress and States didn't allow African Americans full privileges until about the 1960s. Women weren't allowed to vote in this country until an amendment was passed in 1920, passed by my State of Tennessee, the final State, the Perfect 36.

To see a great candidate who happens to be an African American and a great candidate who's a woman wage a tremendous campaign for the Democratic nomination shows how far this country has come toward truly forming a more perfect union. I am more proud than ever to be a Democrat, to be a Member of this House of Representatives.

As I look back on the anniversary of the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, I know that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans and we will see it move to victory in November, and a new generation of thought.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WORK OF CHIEF DEPUTY U.S. MARSHAL MICHAEL BLEVINS

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. I rise in recognition of the success and achievements in the career of Chief Deputy U.S. Marshal Mike Blevins. Mike has served the U.S. Marshal Service since 1979. His duties have taken him all across the country, with long terms in Arkansas and Texas. Since 1989, he has been the Chief Deputy of the Western District of Arkansas. During that time, he also served as the Acting Marshal for more than 2 years.

Since he has been in Arkansas, he has helped supervise numerous programs that have resulted in a record number of fugitive arrests. His hard work has earned him several awards, including the United States Marshal Service Distinguished Service Award in 2006.

I have had the privilege to work with Mike on many different projects; most recently, a successful effort to make Fort Smith, Arkansas, the home of the National U.S. Marshals Museum.

His dedication, persistence, and leadership are all admirable qualities. I appreciate his friendship and example. I am honored to have had the opportunity to have worked with such a great man, and thank him for his service to our country.

DEMOCRATS TAKE ACTION ON RECORD HIGH GAS PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, from day one, this Democratic Congress has been fighting to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, bring down record gas prices, and launch a cleaner and smarter energy program. We have passed legislation to suspend the filling of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve later this month through the end of this year. After initially opposing this legislation, the President signed it into law last month.

We passed legislation that gives the U.S. the authority to prosecute anticompetitive conduct committed by the

international cartels, like OPEC, that restricts supply and drives up prices. The House also passed the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act of 2008, which allows us to retain and create hundreds of thousands of new ''green'' energy jobs and invest in the renewable energies of the future.

Today, experts estimate biofuel blends are keeping gas prices about 15 percent lower than they would otherwise be right now. With gas prices continuing to skyrocket in my home State of New Jersey and across the Nation, House Democrats will continue to explore ways to provide relief to consumers at the gas pump.

SUE MOTHER NATURE?

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, there are alarming events that keep occurring regarding crude oil spills that seem to go unnoticed by the environmentalists and the media. Off the gulf coast, and even off the sacred west coast of California, crude oil spills have become so noticeable that scientists can see the sources from satellites. Can you believe it? The culprit should be sued and brought to court because that is what the environmentalists do to save us from the nasty crude oil. The offender is Mother Nature.

You see, Mr. Speaker, thousands of metric tons a year of crude oil naturally seep to the surface in the Gulf of Mexico and off the west coast. Mother Nature is the cause of most offshore crude oil spills, and this must be stopped. Why don't we just remove all that crude oil that is seeping from beneath the ocean? That will eliminate oil from coming to the surface. The way to do that is to drill offshore, take out all that oil from underneath the ocean, and stop Mother Nature from polluting.

Congress needs to remove the silly offshore drilling restrictions to give us more supply. That will help bring down the price of gasoline, stop pollution, and we can teach Mother Nature a lesson or two.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING THE STANLEY CUP CHAMPION DETROIT RED WINGS

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. I rise today to congratulate the Detroit Hockey Red Wings. The Detroit Red Wings, the 2008 National Hockey League champions for the Stanley Cup. We are most proud of you. To the coaches, the players, the Ilitch family, thank you for a wonderful, exciting season.

The Detroit Red Wings, the Stanley Cup champions for 2008. You have brought joy and cheer and adventure to all of us. Good luck to you. Enjoy your time off. And have another wonderful season as we march to the 2009 Stanley Cup.

Congratulations, Red Wings.

UNLOCK AMERICA'S ENERGY RESOURCES

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

Mr. STEARNS. A new Gallup Poll shows that 57 percent of Americans agree with House Republicans and favor more energy exploration in the United States. America needs fewer restrictions on domestic sources of oil. The U.S. remains the only oil-producing nation that has placed a substantial amount of its energy potential off limits. This includes just 100th of 1 percent of Alaska's 20-million Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This small portion of ANWR is believed to contain 10 billion barrels of oil, or more, an amount equivalent to 15 years of imports from Saudi Arabia or 30 years of imports from Hugo Chavez. The Congressional Research Service estimates that at $1.25 a barrel, ANWR would deliver $192 billion in corporate income tax and royalty revenue to the Federal Government.

Even more oil is located in other restricted areas throughout the United States, and still more, Mr. Speaker, in the 85 percent of America's Outer Continental Shelf, that is currently off-limits.

We need to favor more exploration.

□ 1000

CELEBRATING NATIONAL OCEANS WEEK BY ADDRESSING THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome those from all over the United States who are here this week celebrating National Oceans Week. They are here to celebrate a week that, frankly, we have no national ocean policy about, and that is why I want to speak to you today about the need to have this Congress enact laws that will make the ocean policy like clean air and clean water policy, perhaps addressing some of those problems that other speakers have talked about today.

America's waters are managed by 140 different laws that spread across 20 different agencies. I have introduced a bill, Oceans 21, with strong bipartisan support. It is moving through Congress, and I urge my colleagues to join their constituents in helping Congress address this national policy.

A New York Times editorial last week told Congress that they must give ocean issues greater priority, in part by reorganizing the way the Federal Government deals with them. America's waters are managed by too many laws and too many different government agencies, and they recommend the adoption of our bill.

So join us in thinking about the oceans. If they are not well, neither will be the planet.

BEGGING CONGRESS TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE EVER-INCREASING COST OF GASOLINE

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Congress, no, to beg Congress to do something about the ever-increasing cost of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are struggling every day with this ever-growing burden. Just Sunday, as my husband was filling up with gas, a young couple begged him for money so that they could get home.

This very day there is indeed drilling activity off of our country's coast. Not by our U.S. companies. That would be illegal. Instead, the Chinese are drilling off the coast of Florida with their new energy partner, Cuba. This Congress has failed to act time and time again. Our oil resources along our coastlines and in Alaska remain untapped in the name of environmentalism.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are more than willing to do their part for the environment, but without their ability to earn a paycheck, there is little they can do, except to suffer like that young couple was on Sunday.

We have all suffered enough. Please, Mr. Speaker, let us act. Let us act wisely. Let us act prudently. Let us drill, and let us drill now.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5540, CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK CONTINUING AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1233 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1233

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5540) to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the

amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Bishop of Utah or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI), shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 5540 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of House Resolution 1233 is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1233 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 5540, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act. The resolution provides 1 hour of debate, controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources, and makes in order all amendments submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by congratulating my freshman class colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for his leadership on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay. Mr. SARBANES has worked diligently and tirelessly in a bipartisan fashion to transcend partisan politics and ensure the Chesapeake Bay remains a vibrant recreational and economic network for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the legislation which it provides for consideration of will continue the important restoration and conservation of the Chesapeake Bay watershed by permanently authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

The Chesapeake Bay is our Nation's largest estuary. Many people often think of the Bay only as Maryland and Virginia, but the Bay's watershed covers 64,000 square miles in five States and the District of Columbia. In fact, the watershed's most northern part, or what we in upstate New York would call the starting point, extends into a significant portion of my congressional district and actually starts in Cooperstown, New York.

As a result of its size and location, the Chesapeake Bay has played a role in the development of American history, from early settlement and commerce to military battles and transportation development, as well as recreational uses. It truly is worthy of preservation, both for its natural beauty and the impact on our Nation's cultural evolution.

First established in 1998, the Chesapeake Bay Network is a comprehensive protection program for the Bay. The programs authorized serve to identify, conserve, restore and interpret the natural, historical, cultural and recreational resources within the watershed. These programs can also educate local communities on the significant sites in their region and how their community impacts the overall health of the Bay. The law requires the National Park Service to award grants to State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations with a full matching requirement for such projects.

The resulting network is a system of over 150 parks, museums, historic communities, scenic roadways, watertrails and water access points located within the vast Chesapeake Bay watershed. Each of these sites tells a piece of a vast Chesapeake story while providing Federal support for the preservation and improvement of these sites, to enhance both the historical and recreational experience. The network is overseen by the National Park Service, but the Park Service only manages about 10 of the network's sites. Other gateways are managed by local, State and nongovernmental organizations.

The Chesapeake Bay Network has always been a bipartisan program. The legislation that created it in 1998 passed the House on suspension by voice vote and was agreed to by unanimous consent in the Senate and signed into law by President Clinton. In 2002, a clean 5-year reauthorization received similar unanimous support in Congress and was signed into law by President Bush.

The White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation headed by the Department of the Interior has called the network a success story. The legislation this rule provides for consideration of will permanently extend the authorization for this bipartisan program. It is worth noting that the National Park Service has also recommended permanent reauthorization of the network.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill and to continue to support the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is currently spending 1 hour debating what rules will be used to consider the underlying Chesapeake Bay Watertrails bill. This is legislation that has passed the House in prior years with little or no dissent and without controversy. So the question must be asked, Mr. Speaker, why are the Democrat leaders going through all of this trouble of having the House consider this bill under this special rule? Why is the House going to spend 2 hours today discussing a bill that could have been handled in just 20 minutes under suspension and ultimately passed by an overwhelming number of votes in this House? And why, if the House is going to such lengths and dedicating 2 hours to consider watertrails on the Chesapeake Bay, are Members being blocked from a true, meaningful debate on the issue?

This rule allows only one amendment to be offered, and that amendment would simply limit the extension of this existing Chesapeake Bay law for another 5 years, instead of extending it forever as the bill is currently written. If we are going to go through all the trouble of bringing this noncontroversial bill to the floor, why don't we have a real debate that allows every Member who has an amendment or an idea to improve this legislation to come to the House floor and have it discussed and voted on?

When the Democrat leaders took control of the Congress after the 2006 election, they promised the American people that they would run the House in a more open and honest manner. But ever since they made that promise, Democrat leaders have been doing just exactly the opposite. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that this Democrat Congress actually has the worst record, Mr. Speaker, the worst record on openness in the history of our country. In the past year-and-a-half, they have only allowed one bill, one bill, to come to the House floor and be debated under an open rule. As we see today on this Chesapeake Bay bill, they are even shutting down debate on even the most noncontroversial pieces of legislation.

Now, I might point out also that the Democrat leaders today convened the House early. Normally when you get to work early it is either because you have a lot to do or you want to go home early. Let's consider that the only two things the House is scheduled to do today is to spend 2 hours debating watertrails and the Chesapeake Bay and one hour of debate on a final budget that was supposed to have been done, Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, and it is a budget that raises taxes by the largest amount in American history. At any rate, that is just 3 hours of time.

So why did we convene early? What are we going to do the rest of the day? It seems pretty clear that the House didn't get to work early today because they had so much to do, but rather it

is, I believe, so the House can leave early and go home.

Mr. Speaker, I have another idea, and that is that this House get serious about the rising price of gasoline in our country.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no against the previous question when they bring that up at the end of the debate to allow the House to debate ''an amendment to a bill which the proponents assert if enacted would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline.''

Mr. Speaker, I first proposed this action on a similar previous question rule back on April 23. In the 44 days since, this liberal Congress has done nothing to address rising gas prices. According to information gathered by the AAA, the citizens of Washington State, my home State, who buy gas are paying the highest reported price for gasoline that has ever been paid in that State. It is at $4.19 per gallon.

Speaker PELOSI promised the American people that Democrats had ''a commonsense plan to bring down skyrocketing gas prices.'' Speaker PELOSI also said that the Democrats have ''real solutions'' that would ''lower the price at the pump.'' Despite this promise of a plan and lower prices, since Democrats took control of the Congress, they have put forward no plan and prices have gone up, up and up to record levels.

□ 1015

And Democrats have blocked every try after try by Republicans to allow the House to debate, just simply to debate legislation to lower the price of gasoline. The only bill that Democrats have brought to the floor and passed was to file lawsuits against OPEC countries in the Middle East and to try to get them to produce more oil and to reduce prices. That is all, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats may believe that suing Middle Eastern countries and raising taxes is a plan to lower gas prices here in America, but common sense says that is just wrong. It is Republicans that have a plan to produce American made gas and energy and it is the Democrats who are standing in the way of these solutions.

Prices go up when demand goes up, and around the world the demand for oil and gas is going way up. Our country can either continue to sit here and be at the mercy of overseas Nations for our energy needs, or we as Americans can start taking matters into our own hands and start accessing the millions of barrels of known reserves right here within the United States. Our Nation's energy reserves have been put off-limits, and Democrats continue to block even exploring the possibility of producing more energy here in America.

With record gas prices at gas stations across the country, Americans can't afford to continue to rely on other countries in volatile parts of the world to sell us the gas and oil that we need. We need to produce this energy ourselves, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so this House can debate the serious issue of rising gas prices confronting Americans in our country and so we can start producing, producing, Mr. Speaker, American-made gasoline.

If the House is going to spend 2 hours debating authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Watertrails law for 5 years or not, we certainly I think, Mr. Speaker, can afford to dedicate some time to considering ways to reduce the rising price of gasoline.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my friend from Washington for his comments and just point out, Mr. Speaker, that on the one hand my colleague from Washington says that we are not allowing anyone to make any amendments, that we have closed the rule, and yet we have allowed every amendment in the Rules Committee that was offered including the one amendment from the gentleman from Utah. And then he criticizes in saying that we allow debate for 2 hours on this bill. You can't have it both ways. We have allowed debate on this bill, we have allowed for people to bring their amendments if that is what they choose to do and have an open Congress just the way we talked about.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

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

In the Hudson Valley, in my district, gas prices have reached crisis levels where commuting is a daily part of life and small businesses need to move their products. The record-setting spikes in gas prices have been a drain on family budgets and our entire economy.

There is, unfortunately, no silver bullet solution to our gas and oil challenge, but I am proud that Congress has taken aggressive action to provide desperately needed relief. We have passed a once in a generation increase in fuel economy standards, pushed for more development of cellulosic biofuels, and continue to advance legislation that would provide tax incentives for people to purchase fuel incentive vehicles and help us break the grip of OPEC on our economy.

The need for relief is real and urgent, and we have also taken steps to provide near-term assistance. The House has passed a bill to beef up the Department of Justice's ability to pursue antitrust action in the oil sector, and we have also passed legislation that requires the President to stop taking oil off the market to put in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, so that more supply is available on the market to lower prices. That was 70,000 barrels of oil a day that was being taken off the market that we passed in a bipartisan way. I am sure my friends across the aisle remember voting with us on that bill.

When market relief does arrive, however, we need to make sure that the individual American driver benefits, not just the oil companies. There is the old proverbial question about whether a tree falling in the woods with no one to hear it actually makes a sound. I don't know about that, but I do know a drop in oil prices that doesn't cut prices at the pump is the same as no price drop at all.

Unfortunately, that is what we have been seeing. Over the past week, the price of crude oil has actually dropped by several dollars per barrel, offering the hope that the edge would be taken off the record high gas prices we have been facing. One look at the local price figures at your gas station is enough to know it has not happened.

On April 1, the price of crude oil was just over $100 per barrel and kept soaring, reaching $135 per barrel during trading on May 22. Over the same period of time, the national average price of gasoline rose from just under $3.29 to just over $3.83 a gallon. In New York, prices increased by over 60 cents from just over $3.40 to almost $4.02 a gallon.

Despite the fact that as of 2 days ago crude prices had dropped below $123 a barrel, retail gasoline prices are still at record levels. Nationwide, the average price of regular gasoline stayed at $3.98, and in New York the average price remained at the astronomical level of $4.17 per gallon. These represent increases of about 15 cents per gallon at the pump during the same period in which crude oil prices were declining.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALL of New York. Apparently, the old adage that what goes up must come down does not apply for the oil companies. That is a cause of great concern, and I have asked the Federal Trade Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to investigate this disconnection between the price of oil on the world market and the price of refined product at the pump.

Drivers are expected to share, in fact are forced to share, in the pain of oil and gas increases immediately, and they should have the expectation that they will also share in the relief just as quickly when the world oil price comes down. In a market this complex, it is imperative for the government to be an active protector of consumer rights and take swift measures to ensure that conditions are not exploited to the detriment of working families. By doing so, I believe we can make sure that any drop in crude prices will also mean real relief at the pump.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague from Washington State for yielding.

The question today is about the rule dealing with the Chesapeake Bay. Well, this is a piece of legislation that is not

controversial. The House can deal with this measure very quickly and move on. Instead, the Democrat leadership has chosen a very cumbersome process that locks out amendments, that locks out new ideas dealing with the Chesapeake Bay, and takes up a significant amount of time in the people's House.

What we should be spending our time on, however, in this House of Representatives is not a piece of noncontroversial legislation which will take up over 2 hours of our day. Instead, we should devote this time to bringing down the cost and the price of gasoline at the pumps. That is what the American people want. That is what my constituents in Western North Carolina are demanding, that we take action on high gas prices.

We have a need and necessity for oil in this country. It is not something that I sought, but this is a life I was born into. We have had our economy powered by oil for about the last 100 years. It is just a fact. I think there will be a day when we can move to some other type of power to move our automobiles and trucks and planes. I am hopeful for that day. That day will happen and I will be fighting for policies to bring it about. But until that time comes, we must have sources of American energy, and we must be energy independent in America. We can't be beholden to the Saudi royal family for our price at the pumps; but, unfortunately, we are.

And why is that? Well, it is because of a significant number of policies that this Congress has put in place, very cumbersome regulations that we need to streamline when we come to the issue of building new refineries. And let's face it, we need new refineries to get diesel and unleaded fuel to the pumps. That also equals jobs. Unfortunately, in this country we have to import refined products. That means we have outsourced jobs. That means we have also sent our wealth overseas to these Nations that are refining product.

But beyond refineries which we must build, we also have to increase domestic production, American energy sources. And we have got significant American energy resources. The known reserves that we have in this country of oil will power 60 million automobiles for 60 years. Now, that is not a long-term solution, but it is certainly good for the next 60 years while we are building alternatives and different types of power sources.

So we also need that American energy production, whether it is oil, natural gas, coal. We have more coal in this United States, enough power source out of that coal than Saudi Arabia has. Actually, we have three times the amount of coal in this country as Saudi Arabia has oil. So these are not perfect solutions, but they will work in the short term.

But why are we at this state? Why are we at this place where we are paying almost $4 at the pump?

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHENRY. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. You mean to tell me that the American middle class is continuing to suffer with record high gas prices, prices that have nearly doubled since the Democrat regime took over Congress, and we are still not dealing with it today? Is that what I am hearing from the gentleman?

Mr. MCHENRY. This is what I am talking about, and I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia asking. The reason we have high gas prices is because there is inaction by Democrat leadership. They don't want new refineries. They don't want American energy production. They want to simply conserve our way into energy independence. That is not possible. The American people know it is not possible, and I ask the Democrat leadership to yield to common sense and ask us to create more American energy so we can be energy independent.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that my colleague from North Carolina talks about inaction. And he would have the American people believe that inaction means not drilling. They are two distinctly different things. Just simply because I don't advocate drilling doesn't mean that I am not for alternative energy. We cannot drill our way to energy independence. It just doesn't make sense.

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MCHENRY. What pieces of legislation have been brought up this Congress to increase American energy production? Name one.

Mr. ARCURI. Reclaiming my time, it is not about drilling. That is what some people in this House want to talk about. It is not. It is about developing alternative energy. In my district, we are developing cellulosic ethanol. In my district, we are developing geothermal power. We are heating schools, we are heating buildings, we are heating offices with geothermal. It is about developing alternative energy. It is not about drilling, drilling, drilling. Because in the end, what is going to happen is in 10 years or in 15 years we are going to defer this problem to our children. It is not something that we should just dump on their laps by just moving the problem to them.

We can drill today, we can drill tomorrow. And then in 10 years and in 15 years our children and our grandchildren will have to deal with this. It is time to deal with it today. Mr. Speaker, it is time to deal with it today and to deal with it now, not to defer it to our children. That is not what a good parent does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Before I yield to the gentleman from California, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) to respond.

Mr. MCHENRY. I appreciate the gentleman from Washington yielding me time so I can answer the gentleman's question.

I think this is a very interesting argument, alternatives. Well, so far in our power resources in the United States, 1 percent of our current power is produced by the types of things the gentleman is talking about. They are very expensive currently. The technology is very expensive.

So the gentleman is saying we can take that 1 percent, and let's say we can double it in the next 10 years, which is an ambitious proposal that some on your side have advocated and actually I am for. That takes us to 2 percent of American energy production.

What we need while we are doing that is actually reasonable solutions, and that means increasing supply.

□ 1030

The American people understand basic economics, unlike some on the other side of the aisle. They understand basic economics, that it is supply and demand that control price.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend from New York, I don't have any geothermal cars in my district. Perhaps the gentleman does in New York.

For me to answer the folks back home that are saying what are we going to do about gas prices with well, we're studying geothermal, frankly, it just doesn't cut it.

You know, I remember the week before we got out for Memorial break, that we had 55, 55, count them, 55 suspensions in 2 days. I can't recall all of them, but when I had a tele-town hall this last Sunday in my district, I had 4,200 people on the line, and not one of them asked a question about one of those 55 suspension bills.

What did they ask about? They asked about what are you in Congress going to do, not just about gas prices, but about increasing energy production in this country?

So I come back here this week anticipating legislation that perhaps will deal with those kinds of issues. And what do we have?

The first 2 days, we had 22 suspensions; supporting National Men's Health Week, a worthy cause, but not a single person asked me about that. But almost everybody asked me about gas prices.

We recognized the State of Minnesota's 150th anniversary, a worthy goal. But not a single person asked me about that. Not one of the 4,200 people asked me about that. But many of them asked me about gas.

We supported the goals and ideals of Arbor Day Foundation and the National Arbor Day, a nice thing to do,

but not a single person asked me about National Arbor Day. Many asked me about gasoline prices.

We designated a post office to be named after someone in Portland, Oregon. We designated another post office to be named after someone in San Gabriel, California, again a nice thing to do, but not a single person of the 4,200 that were on my tele-town hall asked me about that. But they did ask me about gas prices.

We had the Federal Food Donation Act of 2008, not a bad idea, but not a single person asked me about that. But they asked me about gas prices.

We had the Senior Executive Service Diversity Assurance Act on the floor that we talked about and passed, but no one asked me about that back home. They all asked me about gas prices.

We had the Telework Improvements Act of 2008. No one asked me about that, but they asked me about gas prices.

We voted on the Federal Agency Data Protection Act this week. Not a single person asked about that. But almost everybody asked about gas prices.

We had the Government Accountability Office Act of 2008. No one asked me about that, but they asked me about the accountability of this Congress in not doing a single thing for more energy production.

We had a bill authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. That's like mother and apple pie. But no one asked me about the Soap Box Derby in Greater Washington. They all asked me about their cars which don't run downhill by gravity, but they do run on gasoline. And they said, what is Congress going to do about that?

We authorized the use of the Capitol Grounds for a celebration of the 100th anniversary of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. Now, I'm sure that's a wonderful sorority, but not a single person of the 4,200 that were on my tele-town hall asked me about that sorority. But most of them asked about gasoline prices.

We had the James Ashley and Thomas Ashley United States Courthouse Designation Act. And I remember Tom Ashley, a good man. But nobody asked me about him on my tele-town hall. But they almost all asked about gas prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for an additional minute. I would need about 4 minutes to go through all the other suspensions we got through this week, this week, that is legislative time that we have spent on this floor, those without rules.

Now we're going to have a rule on this bill, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act, probably a worthy act. But, believe me, I know it may surprise the gentleman from New York, but not a single person in my district asked me about that. But they asked about gas prices.

And perhaps the reason why the gentleman from New York is loath to talk about this is that on every single vote we have had over the last number of years on increased oil production, 91 percent of the Republicans have voted for increased American energy production, American energy production, and over 85 percent of the Democrats have voted against it.

What has resulted from that? A stalemate in which the American people are held hostage because we will not allow, yes, drilling. I know that's a dirty word over there. Drilling. That's usually how you bring oil up out of the ground.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Usually you have to drill to bring the oil out of the ground because that's where it is. It may be a dirty word in the gentleman's district, but frankly, you have to drill before you refine, before you have it available so that you can increase supply so that people can have their prices go down so they can drive to work and drive to recreational facilities, not in thermoenergy, geothermal cars, but actually in cars with gasoline, which is what happens in my district. Perhaps the gentleman from New York's district is different.

Maybe we should take some attention from the concerns of the American people and do something about gas prices here.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank the gentleman for the history lesson and for the lesson on what drilling means. I really appreciate that. I know we don't have a lot of domestic oil in New York, but I appreciate having him tell me what drilling means.

But when people in my district talk to me about what are we doing about gas, and we get those very same questions, I tell them that we have done some things. We have passed the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension Consumer Protection Act. I tell them we've passed the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act. I tell them we've passed the OPEC and big oil companies accountability bill. I tell them we've passed the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. I tell them we've passed the Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Tax Act. I tell them we've passed the Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act. I tell them we've passed the No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act. I tell them we've passed the Energy Market Manipulation Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, America is tired of the same old rhetoric. They want new solutions. When I talk about geothermal projects that we have in our district, when I talk about cellulosic ethanol plants, when I talk about wood pellet plants, that is new strategies. Those are new philosophies. Those are the kind of strategies that we need in this country for real, long-term change in direction, the kind of direction that will make it easier for our children and our grandchildren to live and to function and not to be dependent on foreign oil.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it's so interesting listening to this debate this morning. And I think that the gentleman was rattling off some bills that they have passed. The problem is they're all talk and no action. They don't do anything to get the price down at the pump; don't actually accomplish the goal of producing any more oil.

What the American people want to see is not right now a debate on a bill which could go through on a voice vote, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. What they want is for us to take the time to address the price at the pump and the cost of energy.

My constituents in Tennessee ask me every week, what did you all do to address the price at the pump? They know that we, as Americans, are the greatest innovators that there are. American ingenuity can solve all sorts of problems. They know that we have the resources on American soil to address this issue. They also know that we need a short-term, a mid-range and a long-term strategy.

Now, to my colleagues, I will say no is not an energy strategy, and no is not an energy policy. No is a roadblock to a sustainable, predictable energy source.

Now, we can go in and look at what was happening with the price of a barrel of oil, and we're using about 21 million barrels of oil in America today to get the 420 million gallons of gasoline that you are pumping when you go to fill up your car.

Now, when the Democrats took the gavels in the House and in the Senate, and they're the ones that are setting the legislative agenda, they are the ones that are saying no to getting this price down, they are the ones who are making decisions that continue to drive it up. $123.85 a barrel. That's where it was yesterday. That is where it was.

What has caused this to happen?

Mr. Speaker, I would say it is because of the history of action. When you look at ANWR exploration, House Republicans have supported this 91 percent of the time. House Democrats have opposed it 86 percent of the time.

Coal-to-liquid. There's another innovative source. 97 percent of the Republicans have supported it. 78 percent of the Democrats have opposed it.

Oil shale exploration. House Republicans have supported it 90 percent of the time. House Democrats have opposed this American solution to American resources and American energy 86 percent of the time.

The Outer Continental Shelf. We know that Cuba is letting China drill 50 miles off our shores. What are we doing with the Outer Continental Shelf? 81 percent of the time House Republicans support that. Democrats oppose that 83 percent of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentlewoman 30 additional seconds.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. Rhetoric is what the Democrats have given us on the issue of the price at the pump, on the issue of home heating oil.

The American people want answers and they want solutions. And what they are getting from the Democrat leadership is prices that are going up and up and up and up, in my district, from $2.20 a gallon to $3.99. $3.99. That is what Democrat leadership of this body has given you.

Mr. ARCURI. I'll reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire of my friend from New York if he has any further speakers.

Mr. ARCURI. We have no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and wanted to point out that yesterday we passed Soap Box Derby Appreciation Day. And I guess that's fitting because that must be the Democrat idea to conserve oil and look for alternatives, because at the rate gas prices are going, we will all be driving soap box cars that are powered by feet.

Look at the gas prices. When the Pelosi regime took over the House of Representatives, gas prices were $2.33 a gallon. Now, they promised to reduce those prices; yet a funny thing happened on the way to the pump. It is now about $4 a gallon. Well, I guess if that's indicative of the promises that the Democrats keep and the way they deliver it, maybe it's right that yet again today we are ignoring any serious legislation that would address gas prices.

You know, it's interesting. It's been over 10 years since President Clinton vetoed drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve. Now, I want to put this in perspective for you. Remember, Alaska is twice as big as Texas. The reserve area is the size of South Carolina. The potential exploration area is about 2,000 acres.

Now, a word picture would be that if the Arctic wildlife reserve was a basketball court, the proposed exploration area is a business card. And yet, the radical extremists in the liberal community are afraid to drill there.

I just got back from a bipartisan trip to the Middle East. We met with oil ministries from Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. And you know what they said?

How dare you Americans come to the Middle East and demand that we reduce oil and gas prices when you won't even drill on your own lands.

□ 1045

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. You have the audacity to come to us and tell us to drill more and yet you won't even unlock your own lands. What kind of hypocrisy is that? Instead, you know what the Democrats do? They make it easier to sue OPEC. Well, that sounds good, but the reality is what they told us is, Hey, the higher the cost of doing business in America is the less willing we are to do business there. And guess what? China and India are willing to buy our product as is. You increase the price of doing business in America, China and India will step in that void. Keep that in mind.

One more day the Democrats are ignoring high gas prices.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I find the testimony from the gentleman from New York interesting. He mentioned pellet stoves, one of the new future heat. 800,000 Americans now heat their homes with a pellet stove. There's 30 or 40 pellet mills sprung up around the country but with no government incentive.

Now, we ought to be incentivizing people to be able to heat their homes with woody biomass. Woody biomass has been the fastest growing energy but without government incentives. We need to be incentivizing that.

He also mentioned cellulosic ethanol, which is from woody biomass or garbage or sweetgrass. That's in the laboratory. We're all for that. But it's in the laboratory. There is no refinery producing that kind of energy today at any scale at all. In fact, we have not yet designed the first refinery. It's future.

The only thing in all of the bills he mentioned that produced energy was we stopped using 70,000 barrels a day in the Strategic Reserve, and that's when we use 21 million barrels a day for the country, we save 70,000. That's the only production that's been passed.

As we look to my left, we have a chart that shows offshore locked up. Oil and gas out there proficient. Lots of it. Locked up. Well, if we want to clean up the Chesapeake Bay, there's a way to do that. The NEED Act, H.R. 2784, my bill does that by producing offshore, putting a part of the royalties. We have 32 billion for carbon capture, 32 billion for renewable energy, 100 billion for the treasury, 150 billion for producing States, 20 billion for the Chesapeake Bay.

Now, these are at old gas prices. This is gas. Natural gas was $12.50 when I left my office. Last year at this time it was $6.50. That's the gas we were putting in the ground for next winter. Americans are going to get whacked this winter because we're putting gas at almost twice the value in the ground for winter storage than we did last year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Folks, if we're serious about cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay, we can get affordable energy for America by producing offshore. Every country in the world produces here. We're the only country that doesn't, and we can have $20 billion, which is exactly what the Chesapeake Bay people need to clean up the Chesapeake Bay, and we can have affordable natural gas and oil for America.

Folks, we need to have supply.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this is not an either/or match. This is not either alternatives or crude oil and natural gas. This is both. The issue is how do we transition from where we are today to where we all want to get to, and how do we afford that transition.

If you simply cut off crude oil as part of that solution today, then you're going to have exactly what we've got: rising gasoline prices, soaring electricity prices, natural gas prices are going to go up, home heating costs are going to go up. And in an ironic twist of fate, the commonsense plan to lower gasoline prices includes being allowed to sue OPEC to increase their production. I'm anxiously awaiting reaction in the OPEC countries to allow OPEC citizens to sue America to force America to produce her own energy.

This is not either/or. It is both.

Let's turn down the rhetoric and begin to work toward both a current short-term solution as well as a long-term solution all of us embrace.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of my friend

from New York if he's the last speaker still.

Mr. ARCURI. I have no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat leaders today have put a noncontroversial Chesapeake Bay watertrails bill on the House floor, but what is first and foremost on the minds of Americans is gas prices, as we have talked about today. And it's also a huge concern in the Chesapeake Bay communities.

I venture to guess the citizens and families living around the Chesapeake Bay don't wake up in the morning worried about watertrails but they do worry in the Chesapeake Bay and the Chesapeake basin about the price of gasoline.

I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, several news releases here talking about the price of gasoline. This is from WJZ, a local Maryland station. And it says here, ''Watermen Feeling Pain At the Pump.'' It talks about the beautiful weather, but it also says that the price of gas is doubling and the price of seafood is going down, and that's a bad combination.

Here is another one: ''Gas prices force business owners to clamp down.'' And there's talk about a gentleman who has to spend $4,000 a month on gasoline.

And here is another one regarding the Chesapeake Bay community. It says, ''Gas prices fuel dip in fishing.''

[From WJZ—a local Maryland station, May 30, 2008]

WATERMEN FEELING PAIN AT THE PUMP

(By Alex DeMetrick)

The weather is beautiful on the Chesapeake Bay. But things are downright ugly at fuel docks.

Alex DeMetrich reports gas prices are soaring and that's having an impact on those who depend upon boats and the bay to make a living.

Naming a work boat the ''Last Penny'' may have been a stab at humor once, but it's striking a little too close to reality at fuel docks around the bay. Diesel is at $4.50 a gallon and climbing.

''The gas is doubling and the price of seafood is going down,'' said Waterman Bucky Murphy.

Working the water takes constant moving. But with crabs spotty and fuel high, watermen are trying to conserve.

''They're hurting us bad. Its almost double in the past year, so it's taking a right good bite out of us.'' said waterman Wendell Lednun.

Joe Spurry buys crabs on Tilghman Island, but his truck might carry them as far away as New York.

Right now, crabs are selling for around $90 a bushel dockside. By the time they get to a seafood market in Baltimore, they could cost around $200 a bushel.

[From the Capital, May 13, 2008]

GAS PRICES FORCE BUSINESS OWNERS TO CLAMP DOWN

(By Adriane Watson)

Tom Campbell is spending $4,000 per month on gasoline.

The gas budget for Mr. Campbell's business Short Hop Moving Inc., an Annapolis-based moving company, increased $2,500 since the price of fuel reached an uncomfortable high. The company has since taken a financial hit because of the spike in gas prices.

''In the past year, we cut our business literally in half,'' he said.

Skyrocketing gas prices forced Mr. Campbell to reduce his fleet from seven moving trucks to three, and to close a satellite office in Laurel.

The small-business owner said he can no longer give his employees company credit cards to use at the pumps. Instead he fills up the trucks himself each morning to monitor what he's spending on gas, which is inching toward $4 per gallon.

Gasoline prices have shattered previous records, reaching an average high of $3.72 per gallon in Maryland yesterday, said Ragina Avarella of the AAA Mid-Atlantic division.

Mr. Campbell said the strain of gas prices has extended beyond his business and into his personal life, as well. His daughter now walks to visit friends, and he and his wife cut down on driving by using only one of their vehicles, he said.

''It's changing everything,'' he said. ''It's changing the way we do business completely.''

The pain at the pump isn't limited to transportation with tires. Elevated prices are causing some charter fishing captains to want to jump overboard. Alex Schlegel, owner of Hartge Yacht Yard in Galesville, said he is selling gas for about $4.20 per gallon at his fuel dock and has noticed fewer small powerboats on the water.

Capt. Joe Richardson, of Dancer Sportfishing Charters, said he is trying to spend as little time at the pump as possible, and that means changing the way he does business. He said he isn't able to take his charters out as far into the Chesapeake Bay as he did previously as a means of conserving gas.

''You have to change your game plan; you have to raise your prices, and you're afraid to price yourself out of the game,'' he said.

Mr. Richardson said he noticed people calling to make price comparisons more this year than ever before.

''We might just end up sitting at the dock if the prices get too high,'' he said, explaining that bookings for his charter boat are already down from last year.

Capt. T.J. Johnson, owner of Tracy Lynn Charters out of Edgewater, said he has tried to stay at the same price for years. But this year, that's proven difficult as he was forced to raise rates by $25 for this fishing season because of fuel costs.

He said he fears raising rates too much will put him out of business.

''If you go up too much, you're gonna be sitting at home every day and not doing any charters at all,'' he said. ''It makes it tough.''

To conserve gas and save money, Mr. Johnson said he has taken advantage of fishing areas closer to his Edgewater dock, but will have to double the distance he travels from 5 miles to 10 or 15 miles later in the season.

''I can't just take them out for sucker laps,'' he said.

Mr. Johnson said that before fuel cost went through the roof he ran between 85 and 90 charters a year. Last year, that number fell to 60 charters, and this year he said he has only taken about 10 trips out, half as many as this time last year.

Even regular clients are reducing their bookings already this season, he said.

Otis Elevator Co., a national elevator, escalator and moving walkway manufacturer, booked about 38 charter trips with Mr. Johnson last year. This year, Mr. Johnson said the company has cut back to 25 dates from now through October.

Though he couldn't name a specific reason why the company, among other regular clients, has reduced their charter trips, Mr. Johnson said he suspects it is combination of the sluggish economy and higher transportation costs that have people spending less across-the-board.

And the lack of business has affected how he and his wife use fuel at home, he said.

Mr. Johnson, who maintains the family vehicles himself, said he tries to keep oil changes up-to-date and has begun filling his tires with more air, sacrificing a smoother ride for better gas mileage.

''I'm just gonna try to ride it out and do what I can. I ain't got much choice,'' he said. ''I'm doing a lot of things now that I never had to do 20 years ago.''

For others, it's business somewhat as usual.

Sandi Latham owns Sandi's Flower Shop on King George Street and offers delivery services to her clients. So far, she said, she has ''absorbed the loss'' in hopes that the cost of gas will begin to drop.

Ms. Latham has taken the hit from all sides since the cost of her trash removal and delivery from wholesalers has spiked to make up for the increases at the pump.

She hasn't increased her own delivery rates, which she said are now hovering at about $10 for local deliveries. Ms. Latham receives her wholesale flower deliveries from companies in Baltimore and Washington, D.C., that charge from $9 to $12.50 to deliver flowers to the downtown florist. While she said those prices are ''very reasonable'' for the distance of the trip, the rate increases are becoming too much for her to absorb.

Ms. Latham said she fears raising delivery rates greater than $10 because she feels her customers will find anything higher ''frustrating.'' But she said most people are willing to pay for the convenience of delivery. Still, she wants to wait out the competition.

''You hate to be the first guy that raises their rate,'' she said. ''But you also hope your customers will come to you for your product.''

In the meantime, she said she is reviewing her own costs and considering mark-ups across-the-board for flower sales to make up for the steady increase in gasoline prices.

''It's bearing down on me and I've tried not to raise it, but I'm just going to not have a choice,'' she said.

[From the Capital, June 1, 2008]

OUTDOORS: GAS PRICES FUEL DIP IN FISHING; CHARTER OPERATIONS, BAIT SHOPS FEELING ECONOMIC PINCH

(By Bill Burton)

It's the economy, stupid.

So said Clinton aid James Carville in that future president's first and winning campaign against George H. W. Bush. It turned out he was right. Bottom line: It is the economy.

Anglers who don't daydream of skippering a charterboat or guiding once they retire are as scarce as drivers of big SUVs pleased with their fuel mileage. But, believe me, these days their pipe dreams would be nightmares. That is if they got any sleep at all. And no psychiatrist would be needed to interpret their dreams.

It's the economy, stupid.

This time around, Izaak Waltons can't blame fisheries administrators, regulations, publicity about blemished rockfish or the shortage of fish available. Repercussions from the escalating price of fuel are felt everywhere, sportsfishing is no exception. Neither is the business of chartering, headboating or commercial fishing.

The same applies to businesses associated with fishing; one big tackle shop proprietor told me the other day, ''I've got four people and myself working right now—and not a single customer in the shop. Haven't seen one in 10 minutes.''

On weekdays, charter fishermen tell me they've never seen so few chartercraft on the Chesapeake; even worse is the number of private boats they encounter. If they see a dozen recreational boats during a trip that's a lot. Meanwhile, the fish appear to be staging for a good summer season.

The black drum, a few of which were caught earlier in Tangier Sound down Crisfield way, are now moving in at the Stone Rock off Tilghman Island; some fishermen are using white perch to catch stripers via live-lining, and the Norfolk spot arrival is picking up despite the bay's chillier waters. As soon as the bay gets a few degrees warmer the perch will leave the tributaries—and at the ocean, the big bluefish, tuna and sharks are already moving in.

Sorry, the same can't be said for fishermen, recreational or charter. No matter how they fish, they all share the same woe; the cost of fuel. A gallon of diesel can cost more than $5. A charter skipper can hike his price 25 bucks and what's he got?

He's got five more gallons of fuel, that's all he's got. And that won't take him far in a big charterboat. That's what Capt. Ed Darwin runs out of Mill Creek, Annapolis. His Becky-D purrs on gasoline, which is a bit less costly than diesel, so after considering the overall economy, he decided on only a $25 increase—and already finds fuel costs are outpacing him.

''I raised my price $40 and the way fuel is rising, I already lose $20 every day,'' said Bruce Scheible of Scheible's Fishing Center at Ridge in St. Mary's County. ''No way can I get over the hump in fuel costs—not only that we've got good fishing, but less customers. Fortunately we've got bluefish (2- to 3-pounders) in the Potomac along with rockfish and with hardheads moving in—and that can save us money. We don't have to run all the way down the Potomac to the bay then to the fishing grounds below there. We have charters, but certainly not near as many as usual.

Fred Donovan, dockmaster at the Rod 'n Reel Docks, Chesapeake Beach, played a hunch. He didn't raise prices at one of the biggest fishing centers on the bay figuring it would give him a competitive edge and it worked in the always popular trophy season when everyone wanted to go. Now the dollar figures whirl by so fast on fuel pumps, soon his regular customers who haven't already booked their dates can expect a letter informing them prices are going up $50. He will honor lower agreed prices made in early bookings.

Fred's got a few other problems. Much of his clientele come from long distances, Pennsylvania and Virginia or further away, and it's getting so they now have to figure into expenses the driving costs to Chesapeake Bay. And, what to do about headboat prices? The big fuel thirsty headboat Lady Hooker has started headboat service out of the Rod 'n Reel with varying success (cool bay waters have slowed perch'n) and it's no longer financially feasible to sail with less than 15 customers aboard at $55 a head plus the dozen bloodworms each angler gets with the ticket.

Some trips have already been canceled like the one on the day I called when only 11 fishermen showed. The Lady Hooker sails at 8 a.m. and returns to the docks at 3 p.m., no more night trips. Perch, spot and hardheads are the usual catches with blues and stripers other possibilities. One has to be careful about raising headboat prices; headboaters are more cost conscious than charter fishermen. Fred advises anglers to call ahead at 800–233–2080 to inquire of the likelihood of sailing on a given weekday.

The economy isn't good, so they don't want to raise prices for fear losing customers, yet if they don't they can lose money by running. And like the rest of us, they have no idea how high fuel costs will peak. There has to be a limit, but where? Fuel prices impact every aspect of sportsfishing as they do everything else.

Others who cater to the fishermen are also in a bind. Rick Warren of Warren's Bait Box, Glen Burnie, is concerned about his business. His customers no longer shop; ''they know what they want when they come in—and that's what they buy, they don't look around to shop for anything else. Rising fuel costs, whether in vehicles to get them to fishing areas, fuel for boats to fish from and higher headboats or charterboat fees have them strapped for cash, there's little to spare,'' said Rick.

''Higher end and more profitable tackle items like the better rods and reels aren't selling like they used to,'' said Charlie Ebersberger, proprietor of Anglers Sports Center just off of Route 50. ''Fishermen check prices carefully, they've become more cost conscious and now look for lower-end and mid-priced merchandise to save money for fuel-associated costs. I hope it changes when the fishing gets hot—and they still just have to go regardless of cost.''

Capt. Stu Burgoon Sr., who with his son Stu Jr. fish a few charterboats out of Happy Harbor in Deale, have started to fish for black drum at the Stone Rock before or after they get their rockfish have made some changes in gears to their boats to increase fuel efficiency, but the longer run for drum is still costly. Once the expected live-lining at the False Channel gets hot in a few weeks, it will be a long run out of Deale to load up on stripers.

Capt. George Prenant, past president of the Maryland Charterboat Association who skippers the Stormy Petrel out of Happy Harbor, says the charter skipper who gets four or five bookings a week is quite lucky.

''Customers have become 'somewhat' timid,'' said George who endured the Kepone scare, Tropical Storm Agnes that muddied waters for weeks on end and other economic woes in his long career. ''Trophy season was good, but now that they've (customers) have got cabin fever out of their system, who knows what lies ahead. We'll just have to wait and see.''

Most who board charterboats these days can expect to pay about $500 for a half-day trip, $700 to $750 for a full day—and that's at the moment. If fuel prices keep rising (lately they've been rising a few cents a day), expect to pay more. The prudent fisherman will book now at a given price and hope there are no additional surcharges for fuel as there well might be.

Meanwhile, more than a few marinas and fishing centers have vacant slips as some have decided not to use their boats this year. Some will fish selectively and charter—get a gang together—to save on bottom-line expenses. One yacht club always filled has 14 vacant slips. The expected run of bluefish aplenty could help a bit, blues spread out everywhere, which should mean shorter runs and small boats to catch fish, but 'most everyone demands rockfish. Close by perch, hardheads and spot are other alternatives.

No matter how one looks at it, fishing is going to cost much more this year—and at a time when the outlook is for great catching. Everything depends on priorities. Though dyed-in-the-wool Izaak Waltons place fishing high on their priorities, there's a limit. The vehicles they drive to work also need fuel in their tanks. A budget can be stretched only so much—and everything costs more because to transportation charges.

If you think things are bad in the bay, how would you like to be an offshore charter skipper trying to book parties for billfish and tuna in the distant bluewater canyons. The cost of fuel alone can be $1,000 to $2,000 depending on size of boat and canyon targeted what with diesel prices for many charterboats already above five bucks a gallon for those obliged to buy their fuel at the docks they fish from. If you have to ask the price for a charter you can't afford to go.

Mr. Speaker, it is really time for the House to debate ideas for lowering gas prices. I'm going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and I will move to amend the rule to allow that any amendment be made in order on the underlying bill that would have the effect of lowering the national average price of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted in the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge again my colleagues to defeat the previous question so this House can get serious about rising gas prices and so we can start producing American-made energy and gasoline.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is a person in America today that hasn't been affected either personally or through their business by the high cost of energy, by the high cost of gas. You know, we all go to the gas pumps. Just last weekend when I was home, I was pumping the gas, and you could see the look on people's faces as they watched the amount and as they went inside to pay the bill. And we all know, whether you're in New York or whether you're in the State of Washington or whether you're in Texas, no matter where you are here in this country, we all know and experience the same thing.

However, the strategy of finger-pointing and blaming just will not get this country to where we need to be. We talk about here whose fault it is. We constantly have people pointing the finger. The fact of the matter is in 2002 when this President took over in the White House, the price of oil was $25 a barrel. Today it's nearly $130 a barrel. The cost of gas per gallon has tripled.

We could point the finger. We could blame. We could do a lot of things. The fact of the matter is we cannot drill our way to energy independence. And people here would have you think that there is no drilling and there is no exploration going on in this country. Right now in my State, in fact, in my district, in the southern part of New York State, the northern part of Pennsylvania, there are huge amounts of exploration going on for natural gas.

Huge natural gas fields there. They are looking for gas. They are searching for gas. They are finding it in this country. It is going on. The American people will have all of the energy that they need.

However, if we are going to get to where we need to be as a country, we cannot depend on a finite resource. We can't depend on gas and oil. It will be gone. It will eventually deplete, and our children will be right where we are now paying double, triple, quadruple what we are paying now for energy.

It is time to look toward alternative energy, and that's what we advocate; Not stopping drilling. No one wants to see us stop drilling or stop exploration. Just to be practical in terms of how we develop our alternative energy in the next step that we take.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to bring us back here to the discussion, just for a moment, of the real reason that we're here today, and that is the reauthorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. I think it's sad that this bill seems to have been trivialized today because this is a very important bill. This means a great deal to many people that live in the States that the Chesapeake Bay watershed is in but more importantly to this country.

It is such an important part of our history and a critical part of our future. This is a program that did not have even a single Member of Congress oppose its creation or its subsequent reauthorization. Over a decade that the program has existed, it has been heralded as a success by the administration and Congress alike.

The program was unanimously reauthorized by Congress 5 years ago. The legislation this rule provides for consideration would now permanently extend the authorization for this bipartisan program. And the National Park Service has recommended this permanent reauthorization of the network. Everyone agrees that the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network is a good program. That's had a positive impact on the preservation and recreation within the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we on the Rules Committee have made every amendment on this legislation submitted by the Republican minority for consideration. This will allow for both a full debate and a vote on every item of legislation with which the Republican minority has issue.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1233 and the underlying bill, H.R. 5540—Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act. I believe this is a fair rule that provides ample time for debate on this important matter and also makes in order the only amendment that was submitted to the Rules Committee on this bill.

But I also want to take this opportunity to set the record straight on the claims made on energy policy during this debate by the other side of the aisle. I would like to submit for the RECORD the following statement released by Speaker PELOSI talking about the significant action taken by this Congress to address the energy concerns of our Nation and also about the recordbreaking profits of oil companies in these times of rising fuel prices.

OIL COMPANIES REAP BILLIONS IN ROYALTY RELIEF

Americans are paying record high prices at the pump and the price of oil continues to skyrocket. But thanks to energy policies put forward by President Bush and the previous Republican-led Congresses, oil companies are making tens of billions of dollars in record profits. According to news reports, a new draft report from the Government Accountability Office estimates oil companies will avoid paying roughly $53 billion in royalty payments to taxpayers for deep water drilling contracts on public lands in the Gulf of Mexico. These contracts were awarded between 1996 and 2000 after the Republican-led Congress passed the ''Deep Water Royalty Relief Act'' in 1995.

$17.82: Price of barrel of oil in 1995 [EIA, Historical Tables, 11/8/95].

$124.33: Price of barrel of oil yesterday [6/3/08].

598%: Percent increase from 1995 to today.

$1.07: Gallon of regular unleaded gasoline in 1995 [EIA Historical Tables, 11/8/95].

$3.98: Gallon of regular unleaded gasoline today [AAA, 6/4/08].

272%: Percent increase from 1995 to today.

$123.3 billion: Oil Company profits, 2007.

$36.9 billion: Oil Company profits—1st Quarter this year.

For years, Democrats in Congress have fought to roll back some of the royalty relief given to Big Oil companies, while Republicans have blocked these efforts. In the first 100 hours of the New Direction Congress, the House passed H.R. 6 to require oil companies, which have not paid royalties for deepwater drilling contracts in the Gulf region 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. That provision was also included in the House version of the Energy Independence bill but did not make it into the final House-Senate passed package due to Republican opposition.

This ''holiday'' from paying royalties was supposed to end when the price of oil reached about $40 a barrel. Instead, the Bush Administration has continued to provide royalty-free oil from public lands, as the price of oil has now risen to over three times the intended trigger.

The New Direction Congress is committed to bringing real relief to hardworking Americans struggling with high gas prices and putting the needs of families before the interests of the oil companies. Below is a list of action the Democratic-led Congress has taken so far:

PASSED THIS SPRING

Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Protection Act—Congress has enacted legislation to suspend the fill of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, starting June 30th and through the end of the year, as long as the price of crude oil remains above $75 per barrel. This is a critical first step for hardworking families, businesses and the economy, which in the past has brought gas prices down. The President, who was previously opposed, suspended shipments and signed the bill because of overwhelming bipartisan support in Congress.

Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act—This legislation will extend and expand tax incentives for renewable energy, retain and create hundreds of thousands of green jobs, spur American innovation and business investment, and cut taxes for millions of Americans. These provisions are critical to creating and preserving hundreds of thousands of good-paying green collar American jobs. A recent study showed that allowing the renewable energy incentives to expire would lead to about 116,000 jobs being lost in the wind and solar industries alone through the end of 2009.

The OPEC and Big Oil Companies Accountability Bill—This bill will combat record gas prices by authorizing lawsuits against oil cartel members for oil price fixing, and creating a an Antitrust Task Force to crack down on oil companies engaged in anticompetitive behavior or market manipulation. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill.

OTHER RECENT ACTION

Energy Independence and Security Act in 2007—Historic energy legislation with provisions to combat oil market manipulation, increase fuel efficiency to 35 miles per gallon in 2020—the first congressional increase in more than three decades, and promote the use of more affordable American biofuels. The initial version of this bill included a provision to rollback the royal relief given to Big Oil companies for deepwater drilling contracts in the Gulf region. Unfortunately, this provision did not make it into the final House-Senate passed package. Signed into law on December 19, 2007. Under new requirements in the Energy Independence Law and pressure from Congress, the FTC announced in May it would begin the rulemaking process to implement-the market manipulation provision.

Reduces our dependence on foreign oil—cutting our consumption of oil by 2.9 million gallons per year in 2030—more than what we currently import from all Persian Gulf countries combined.

Lowers energy costs for consumers with oil prices projected to decline from more than $100 per barrel to $57 per barrel in 2016 (in 2006 dollars) in part due to the new energy law.

The new fuel standard for cars and trucks will save American families $700 to $1,000 per year at the pump.

Reduces global warming emissions by 2030 by up to 24 percent of what the U.S. needs to do to help save the planet.

Building, appliance, and lighting efficiency standards will save consumers $400 billion through 2030.

Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Tax Act—This legislation would end unnecessary subsidies to Big Oil companies, invest in clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency, and help reduce global warming. The bill includes provisions that will generate hundreds of thousands of green jobs including an estimated 70,000 solar energy jobs, more than 20,000 biodiesel jobs, and protect an additional 75,000 wind industry jobs. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill

Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act—This bill will provide immediate relief to consumers by giving the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) the authority to investigate and punish those who artificially inflate the price of energy. It will ensure the Federal Government has the tools it needs to adequately respond to energy emergencies and prohibit price gouging—with a priority on refineries and big oil companies. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill.

No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels (NOPEC) Act—Legislation to enable the Department of Justice to take legal action against foreign nations for participating in

oil cartels that drive up oil prices globally and in the United States. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill.

Energy Market Manipulation Prevention—The new Farm Bill increases Commodity Futures Trading Commission oversight authority to detect and prevent manipulation of energy prices. President Bush vetoed this bill, but the Congress has overridden that veto.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1233 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution or the operation of the previous question, it shall be in order to consider any amendment to the bill which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline. Such amendments shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. For purposes of compliance with clause 9(a)(3) of rule XXI, a statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the proponent of such amendment prior to its consideration shall have the same effect as a statement actually printed.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Mr. ARCURI. 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. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, given the stated concerns of borrowing by the majority, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that pursuant to rule XXVIII of the Rules of the House, upon adoption of the conference report on the budget by both the House and the Senate, the Clerk of the House will be instructed to prepare a joint resolution adjusting the public debt limit; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, further inquiry.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, am I further correct that by operation of rule XXVIII, upon adoption of this conference report by both the House and the Senate, this joint resolution adjusting the debt limit will be considered as passed by the House and transmitted to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will there be a separate vote in the House on passing this joint resolution adjusting the debt limit upwards?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not by operation of rule XXVIII.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by operation of this rule, will the vote by which the conference report is passed by the House be considered the vote on passage of the joint resolution adjusting the debt limit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 70, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1214, I call up the conference report on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1214, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 20, 2008, at page H4217.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to that rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, every year the Budget Committee has one all-important task, and that's to outline a budget for Congress to follow. Today, we do just that as we pass the conference agreement on the budget for fiscal 2009. The Senate passed the conference agreement just yesterday.

Passing a budget is never an easy task. This, in fact, will be the first time in 8 years that Congress has passed a concurrent budget resolution in an election year. Our conference agreement charts a new course. It returns the budget to balance reaching a surplus of $22 billion in the year 2012 and staying in surplus through 2013. Our budget adheres to pay-as-you-go

because we believe in it. It embraces middle-income tax cuts and holds nondefense domestic discretionary spending to an increase of about 1 percent over inflation.

□ 1100

Our budget begins by undoing the damages done by the President's budget to services that people depend upon.

Take Medicare and Medicaid, for example, pillars of medical care for millions of Americans. The President would cut Medicare by $479 billion over the next 10 years and Medicaid by $94 billion. We reject those cuts. We restore Medicare and Medicaid to current services, and we accommodate adding up to $50 billion more for the Children's Health Insurance Program, fully offset, to reach the millions of children who are eligible but not yet enrolled in CHIP.

The President proposes $18 billion in cuts over 5 years in new fees on military retirees and veterans, actually increases in fees of $18 billion. We reject those fees and add $3.7 billion above current services to the veterans' health care system.

The President even digs into education, cutting Function 500, education, training, employment and social services, not only next year but over the next 5 years by $32.7 billion. We reject the President's cuts in education and, in particular, his elimination of 47 educational programs. Instead, we make significant increases for education every year over the next 5 years.

Our budget supports not just investments in education as such, but in research and development and science and innovation, through NIH and NSF and other entities, providing substantially more than the President requested.

Finally, since strong countries are made up of strong communities, we believe that law enforcement grants and community development grants and transportation grants are part of the Federal role. We, therefore, reverse the President's deep cuts in the community development and social services block grants and in LIHEAP and law enforcement, and our budget invests in the Nation's infrastructure.

Because this budget upholds all of these priorities, it has drawn support from dozens of nonpartisan groups, from the AARP to the American Legion to the American Hospital Association. All of them and many more have sent us letters of support, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

We face in this country not just this budget deficit, not just a trade deficit, but an energy deficit that is on the minds of us all. Read the President's budget, however, and you will find little that's new about skyrocketing energy costs, renewable energy, clean fuel technology, conservation, and efficiency. What you will find are heavy hits on LIHEAP, the one program that helps families weather the high price of fuel oil, heat their homes in winter and cool them in summer. Our budget restores LIHEAP to a level that's $3 billion above the President's budget. And for funding development of alternative fuels, renewable energies, and other energy initiatives, our budget provides $7.7 billion.

As I mentioned, this conference agreement extends tax cuts to help middle-income families caught in the current slump. For example, we protect 20 million middle-income households from being hit by the alternative minimum tax, 20 million Americans for whom it was never intended. We accommodate the extension of the middle-income tax cuts, the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and the 10 percent individual income tax bracket.

Our colleagues on the other side will claim, however, that this budget raises taxes. Let me say emphatically, this budget does not raise taxes. But don't take my word for it. Here's what outside experts say.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget: ''The conference agreement does not raise taxes.''

The Hamilton Project of the Brookings Institution: ''The budget would not raise taxes.''

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: ''This year's budget does not include a tax increase.''

There is one other criticism our colleagues across the aisle may make but cannot sustain as to this conference agreement. In terms of national security, we provide the same dollars as the President's base budget requested, except that we call for better stewardship and better priorities, such as nonproliferation, supporting nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and materials, maybe the most menacing threat facing us.

If anything, our conference agreement protects the homeland and internal security more than the President's budget because we reverse his cuts in local law enforcement and firefighters and the Coast Guard and the first responders. Most important of all, we do everything that I have cited within the context of a balanced budget.

When President Bush took office in 2001 the budget was in surplus by $236 billion. His economists looked out over 10 years and saw nothing but surpluses, $5.6 trillion in all. President Bush told the country we could have it all, guns, butter and tax cuts, too, and never mind the deficit. Now, almost 8 years later, we see the disastrous consequences. Under the fiscal policies of this administration, the Bush administration, our national debt has mushroomed, increased from $5.7 trillion in 2001 to $10 trillion in 2009.

Since the Republicans controlled the House, the Senate and the White House during much of this time, they cannot escape responsibility for these abysmal fiscal results.

Faced with these grim facts, what does the President's budget propose for 2009? More of the same. He is still in effect saying that we can have the guns and the butter and the tax cuts, too, and that deficits don't really matter because foreign investors will keeping buying our Treasury bonds.

In contrast, the budget before us is a step in the right direction. It may not be the grand or final solution, but this budget moves us in the right direction, enforcing fiscal responsibility, though not to the exclusion of other values that we hold dear.

I urge support for this conference agreement by all Members of the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First off, I want to start by congratulating Chairman SPRATT. I mentioned this last time, but I think it is worth repeating. It is never easy to bring a budget conference report to bear, particularly in an election year, and Congress has had a pretty splotchy, spotty track record on this lately, and the chairman deserves accolades for keeping this process going, keeping this process alive.

We've had problems with the farm bill, and this bill being on the floor today is real proof of the skill and determination by the Budget chairman, and so I want to give him the compliment he deserves for bringing this to the floor.

It's important that we have a budget process. It's important that we recognize the need to budget in this institution, and doing this today recognizes that. But at the same time, Congress actually should budget, and I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that this budget is really nothing more than the congressional baseline with about a quarter of a trillion dollars slopped on top of it for the Appropriations Committee.

And so what is the opportunity we have here today if we were actually really budgeting? I think there's three things that we ought to be doing in this budget in this Congress.

One, let's have solid growth in our economy, and let's make sure we put ourselves in the position to lead in the international marketplace by having an economic policy that puts America ahead, in the lead and in a position to win in this era of global competition.

Number two, we need to reform our health and retirement security programs so we can fulfill the mission of our health and retirement security programs in this country. The government is making promises to people right now in health and retirement security that it knows it can't keep. We all know this here. We know, Republicans, Democrats, that our government is making promises to a generation of Americans and another generation of Americans that we know are unsustainable. So we need to come up with a plan to make good on that promise, which right now is not being fulfilled.

And number three, while we do that, we have got to lift this burden of debt

on the next generation. We, with this budget, are going faster down the pathway of sending a crushing burden of debt and taxes on the next generation. Both parties are to blame for this. So I'm not simply saying that all of the sudden now the Democrats are running Congress it's all bad. Both parties have been responsible for not addressing these problems. But now that my friends on the other side of the aisle are in the majority, this is their opportunity. This is their chance and opportunity to actually address this problem and take it head-on. And what are they doing? Nothing about it.

Here's the problem, Mr. Speaker. Not only does this budget propose to do nothing to address these issues, it makes them worse. Because by doing nothing, we're going deeper into debt.

Under this budget, what this budget proposes we do for 5 years, by doing nothing to address the two biggest problems we have, the two biggest programs we have, the two biggest unfulfilled promises we have, namely, Medicare and Social Security, this budget proposes to go $14 trillion deeper in debt to just those two programs alone; by doing nothing for 1 year according to the trustees of Medicare and Social Security, $2 trillion deeper into debt. This budget, $14 trillion increase.

But here's also what this budget does propose. What it does propose is the largest tax increase in American history, $683 billion over the next 5 years. That equals about $2,000 in per year tax increase on the average American family, and there's no effort to cut wasteful spending in government whatsoever.

We've heard about the Bridge to Nowhere. We've heard about the $50 million rain forest museum. We heard about the bill passed 2 weeks ago to give $250 million for one earmark from a Senator from the other side of the Rotunda for one company. We're earmarking ourselves to oblivion in this Congress, and this bill does nothing to curtail that. This bill basically assumes that there's no waste in the Federal Government, that every taxpayer dollar is being spent well and wisely and with full accounting and full transparency, and because of that, this ought to give the government even more money to spend on top of the baseline.

This bill will push the appropriations above the $1 trillion mark in the next coming year. That's an increase of $80 billion, an increase of 9 percent over last year. This bill, as a consequence of giving this 9 percent increase in discretionary spending, will lead to the largest annual increase in the debt in our Nation's history.

And so for all the talk of fiscal conservatism, for all the talk of fiscal responsibility we're going to hear in the next hour, this bill right here we're debating, right here, largest increase in debt in our Nation's history, exceeding the $1 trillion mark in government agency spending.

And this bill does absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing, to address the upcoming entitlement crisis. As I mentioned, this bill adds to the entitlement crisis. It increases the entitlement liability in this country by 37 percent, $14 trillion increase in unfulfilled promises and contingent liability, a 37 percent increase.

Now, given the fact that this bill does nothing to address the long-run problems in this country, what about the short-run? What about the problems in the short-run? This bill does nothing to propose any new energy policy whatsoever.

We have $4 gasoline, and this is where it really hits close to home. This is where I really have a personal problem with the fact that we're doing this bill. You know, just 2 days ago in my hometown of Janesville, Wisconsin, General Motors just announced they're shutting down the factory there, the factory that has produced the Yukon, the Tahoe and the Suburban. And the reason they're shutting down the factory at the end of this model year is because of $4 gas. It costs a hundred bucks to fill up a Suburban, and people aren't buying them. Thirty percent decline in sales just this year alone, and people are scratching their heads and wondering how did this happen, how did this come to be, why do we have $4 gas.

Well, here's the problem, Mr. Speaker, we're 60 percent dependent on foreign oil, and you know what's so galling about that is the fact that we have about seven times the amount of oil under our ground in this country than Saudi Arabia has under theirs. Yet it's all off-limits.

We have got 16 billion barrels of oil up in ANWR that are off-limits by Congress. We've got 86 billion barrels of oil in the Outer Continental Shelf off-limits by Congress. We have 2 trillion barrels of oil in the Intermountain Region in this country, all off-limits by Congress.

We know how to drill in a very safe and environmentally sound way. And what's more galling from that is the Congressional Research Service is now telling us, just passing the ANWR legislation, the smallest of these three fields I just mentioned, would get us about $191 billion in revenue to the Federal Government over the next 10 years.

Imagine what we could do with that. Imagine the deficit reduction that could occur as a consequence of that. Imagine the hydrogen, the fuel cells, the research that we could do to actually invest in a Manhattan Project to get us off of oil itself. But unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle are not doing anything.

So while I'm happy we have a budget resolution on the floor, I'm very dispirited and very disappointed in its content. Largest tax increase in American history. Absolutely nothing to confront the entitlement crisis in this country, a 37 percent increase in this liability. Largest increase in national debt in the American history. And nothing to address the long-term and nothing to address the short-term by making us less dependent on foreign oil.

I find it interesting that our friends on the other side of the aisle are so critical of our foreign policy as being too unilateral; yet what we're simply saying to other countries is we're going to drill for oil in your country and buy that from you and not explore it in our own country. A little bit of a hypocritical stance, I would argue.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to the gentleman from Texas.

Let me just make clear, this budget moves us to balance in 2012. And the fact of the matter is, the plain history of the matter is that when the Republicans took the White House in 2001, the budget the year before was $236 billion in surplus. By the year 2004, they had made that surplus advantage to where we had a deficit of $412 billion, a swing of $648 billion on their watch. They controlled the House, they controlled the Senate, they controlled the White House; and they've added $4 trillion to the national debt.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution provides ''unwavering support for our Nation's sick and disabled veterans, as well as all of the men and women who have so honorably served this country.'' Those are not my words. They are the words of the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, and the Paralyzed Veterans of America in a letter sent May 20 to Budget Chairman SPRATT.

After years of veterans' budgets that barely, if at all, kept pace with inflation, leaving America's heroes with inadequate health care and benefits, it is now a new day, a better day for our veterans.

Two weeks ago, the American Legion said this about last year's Democratic budget, ''For the first time in decades, the veterans and military community had a budget resolution worthy of the sacrifice asked of America's veterans and their families.'' It went on to say that, ''This budget resolution for fiscal year 2009 reflects the continued commitment to those earned benefits provided by a grateful Nation in recognition of honorable military service.'' That's what veterans leaders say about this budget.

We, in this resolution, add $4.9 billion to last year's historic increase in veterans' health care and benefits. This year's increase is $3.3 billion above President Bush's request. What does this mean? It means improved mental health care services for Iraq and Afghan war vets, more clinics for vets in

rural areas, and shorter waiting times for doctor appointments, and earned benefits.

This budget also targets funding toward our most pressing national security needs, such as military readiness, and protecting Americans from the threat of nuclear terrorism. It rejects the President's proposed TRICARE health care premium increases for those who have served our Nation's military for more than 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, supporting our troops, our veterans, and their families is what Americans do. It is who we are. Since our Nation's founding, shared sacrifice during time of war has been a quintessential American value, a promise to keep. Under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SPRATT, we are keeping that promise to America's heroes.

Vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire as to how much time remains for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mr. CONAWAY.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I also want to congratulate our chairman on getting the job done. Getting a budget is obviously never easy in an election year, it's never easy in an off year, but his perseverance has us here today debating a budget that I couldn't be more strongly against.

It fails on a number of occasions, a number of points, not the least of which is that it fails to address entitlement reform. We have recent reports that we've got some $57 trillion in unfunded promises that we've made to each other; no attempt to address that. What that means is this government, over the next 75 years, would have to run a $57 trillion surplus in order to make that work. And this government has never been good at running surpluses. In fact, if you look at the last 40 or 45 years, there is only a handful of years in which an actual surplus occurred.

Now, the other side talks often about the projected surpluses that were there in 1999 and 2000, but those projections weren't worth the paper they were written on as it turns out, as no projections are. But the actual surpluses in years totaled some $17 billion, well short of the $57 trillion that we'll need to run in order to meet these promises.

This budget does include $683 billion in new spending that they fund through the tax increases that will automatically happen in the law that's currently in place. Now, you will hear a lot of rhetoric about this being the largest tax increase ever; and we'll say it is, they'll say it's not. It's true, there is no tax law included in this budget. But what happens with the tax law that's currently in place is that the projections are that it collects an additional $683 billion in taxes from the hardworking Americans and companies in this country. And this budget gives us a blueprint of what the other side intends to do with it. They don't intend to address the surplus, they intend to spend it on other programs and continue to grow this Federal Government.

So, while I congratulate my chairman on getting this to where we are today, I intend to vote against this bill and urge my colleagues to vote against it as well.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, a member of the committee, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the budget, it's helpful to know where we are and how we got here. This chart shows the budget deficit over the years and shows that when President Clinton came in, we reversed the trend of deficit and actually went into surplus and were going to stay into surplus until the Republican leadership had a President who would actually sign their bills. We immediately went in the ditch and have bounced around in the ditch ever since then.

We had, when this administration came in, a projected surplus of $5.5 trillion, more than enough to pay Social Security for 75 years without reducing benefits. Unfortunately, those 8 years will come in at about a $3 trillion deficit, a reversal of over $8.5 trillion deterioration.

And although they overspent the budget that much, they didn't create any jobs. This is the job growth since the Great Depression. These last 8 years have produced the worst job growth since the Great Depression.

And so we have a budget that will reverse this. We have a budget that is fiscally responsible, it balances in 2012, remains in balance using realistic CBO estimates. It posts smaller deficits over the 5 years than the Republican alternative. It continues emphasis on fiscal responsibility by maintaining pay-as-you-go that served us so well during the 1990s.

It also addresses our priorities, increases veterans' funding, energy funding, particularly renewable energy and energy efficiency, and assistance to low-income families. It invests in education and social services. It rejects the administration's cuts in environmental protection. It funds first responders, community development, and other high-priority services. It fully funds the defense budget.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. It also maintains accommodations for children's health care, higher education, and rejects the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. It does this, maintaining the middle class tax cuts. So instead of following the reckless fiscal policies of the past, instead of following the reckless recommendations of this administration, this responsible budget funds our priorities in a fiscally responsible way.

I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership in presenting this fiscally responsible budget. I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. BARRETT from South Carolina.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the budget conference report.

By allowing tax relief to expire, the House-passed Democrat budget resolution calls for a $683 billion tax hike. And in my home State of South Carolina, the Democrat budget is about a $2,500 tax increase for the average South Carolinian's home. This would be, Mr. Speaker, the largest tax increase in history.

The government spends too much money, Mr. Speaker, and I can't imagine giving the government an additional $683 billion. We have serious challenges facing the Nation, and money is not the answer.

The conference report fails in many areas, but the most notable is in spending. It increases discretionary spending by $21 billion above the President's request and pushes discretionary spending past the $1 trillion mark in FY 2009.

It fails to maintain emergency funds that were included in the Republican 2007 budget resolution. It has 37 reserve funds, which include the promise of billions of additional spending, which I can only assume will be paid in additional taxes.

And finally, the House Budget Committee listened to testimony from budget experts indicating that our Nation was facing a financial crisis when it comes to entitlement spending, yet the conference report does nothing to truly address this issue. We cannot continue just to raise taxes and hope that entitlements will be solved by themselves, Mr. Speaker.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, in a time when we have economic hardships with our folks trying to put their entire paycheck in their gas tanks, to bring tax increases, additional spending, more government regulation I think is unconscionable.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this budget resolution and bring some fiscal sanity back into this process.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) be allowed to manage time for our side for a moment of time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), also a member of the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, with the consideration of this budget resolution conference report, we're taking another important step towards restoring fiscal discipline as a priority of our Congress, and that's why I rise today to express my support.

We all know it's going to be a great challenge to get our fiscal house in order after 7 years of mismanagement and an increase in our national debt of $3.4 trillion. We must recognize the serious fiscal situation our country is in and begin to take practical steps to address it. This budget does it.

I am policy cochair for a group in Congress called the Blue Dog Coalition. We believe in fiscal responsibility and being within a budget, like most American families do, and this budget puts us on a path to reach a balanced budget by 2012.

Responsible budgeting is about enforcing strong budgetary principles, which is why I'm very pleased this budge adheres to what we call PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, and that it contains a commitment to the extension of statutory PAYGO requirements.

This budget directs House committees to conduct regular performance reviews of programs, recommend legislative and administrative measures to improve them, and to identify waste and to eliminate waste and unnecessary spending. These efforts, in combination with the House PAYGO rule, will provide House committees with incentives to seek out and eliminate inefficient programs.

Finally, you will continue to hear talk about this budget raising taxes on middle class and working families. It does nothing of the sort. It specifically calls for a responsible fix of the alternative minimum tax and the extension of middle-income tax relief in a manner that is fiscally responsible and does not pass on trillions of dollars of debt to our children and grandchildren.

This budget resolution is not perfect, but it's another important step towards restoring fiscal discipline as a guiding value of our government. The Blue Dog group in Congress is dedicated to seeing that commitments made in this budget are adhered to so we can put our country back on a sustainable fiscal path, and we're not mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren.

As a member of the House Budget Committee, I would like to thank Chairman SPRATT and his great staff for all the work they do.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this resolution.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it was about 2 weeks ago that the front page of the USA Today publication wrote, ''Taxpayers' Bill Leaps By Trillions.'' The first sentence says, ''The Federal Government's long-term financial obligations grew by $2.5 last year, a reflection of the mushrooming cost of Medicare, Social Security benefits.''

$2.5 trillion, Mr. Speaker, under the Democrat watch imposed upon the next generation. It just so happens that two members of the next generation that I'm very concerned about, my 6-year-old daughter and my 4-year-old son, are in the gallery today. And I take the matter very, very seriously that we have a Democrat budget before us today that is absolutely stone cold silent on the number one threat to their future of greater opportunity and greater freedom. And this budget, this Democrat budget does nothing to reform entitlement spending, to give us greater retirement security and better health care at a more reasonable cost.

Mr. Speaker, there is a tale of two budgets here. One, again, is stone cold silent on reforming entitlement spending that threatens to bankrupt future generations, including my children.

Let me tell you what it's not silent on. It's not silent on tax increases. This budget includes the single largest tax increase in American history. An average family of four working in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas—that I have the honor of representing—over the course of the next 3 years will see a $3,000-a-year tax increase at a time when they're having to go to the convenience store and making the decision, do I buy a gallon of milk or do I buy a gallon of gas?

What does this budget do? It raises taxes on a family of four by $3,000. The elderly will see their taxes go up $2,181. A single parent who has two children could see their taxes go up by over $1,600. People are wondering, how am I going to send my kids to college? How am I going to put gas into the pick-up truck? How are we going to commute the 25 miles to work every day? And what does this budget do, Mr. Speaker? It raises taxes, single largest tax increase in American history.

Here's another thing this budget does. It says, you know what? The pork barrel factory is alive and well. Let's just keep it going. Let's let Members of Congress continue to have monuments to themselves. Let's continue to subsidize fashion landscaping in the L.A. fashion district, and let's send the bill to the next generation and let's send it to the taxpayers.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage, and for the sake of today's taxpayers who are struggling and for the sake of future generations, we must reject this conference report.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 2009 budget resolution before us today.

I want to thank Chairman SPRATT and my other colleagues on the Budget Committee for their hard work in bringing to the House a bill that represents the priorities of this Congress.

This budget places families and communities first. It increases funding for our veterans so they receive the health care and benefits they have earned and deserve. It increases funding for homeland security officers, including funding for firefighters and police officers, who keep our communities safe. It protects Medicare and Medicaid and includes a plan to increase the State Children's Health Insurance Program to keep our communities healthy. It protects funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and funds important efforts to promote renewable energy initiatives and protect our environment. This budget stands in sharp contrast to the President's proposals, which included cuts to these vital domestic programs that invest in our children, our communities, and our economy.

In order to strengthen our economy and our country, we must invest in those who drive it: the middle class. That is why this budget also includes a plan which I strongly support that will extend and expand middle class tax cuts, including the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and the 10 percent bracket.

This is a budget that will strengthen our middle class, our communities, and our economy and make our country safer. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, when you try a lawsuit, one of the things they say to you is to pick out just a few salient facts, talk about that during the argument through the questioning of the various witnesses, and, hopefully, those few facts or statements will appear in the instructions to the jury, and then in your final argument you refer to those. So the hope is that, as the jury deliberates, the jury will have a chance to think about the most important facts.

So in attempting to distill this argument about the budget down, I have tried to figure out a couple salient facts. And it seems to me the one needs repeating and repeating and repeating is the most obvious one: the largest single tax increase in the history of this Congress, which means in the history of this Nation, which means in the history of the world, $683 billion over the next 5 years.

Now, one of the reasons I think it's a salient fact is that we oftentimes just gloss over that. Yesterday we had a bill on the floor in which we were starting an entirely new program where we are now on the Federal level going to be responsible for paying for heating and air conditioning of local schools. Now,

heating and air conditioning of local schools is important, but when did that become a Federal responsibility? But the argument we heard on the floor was, well, they can't afford it at the local level; so, therefore, we magically can support it on the Federal level. What does that translate into? The largest single tax increase in the history of the American people, in the history of this Congress, in the history of the world.

We passed a farm bill, which we found, as it was going through, got larger and larger and larger and larger and larger, and we set up price supports for certain commodities at historically high levels so that if corn, which is now at the all-time high level, which is causing ripples through the international system and one of the reasons causing some lack of food to be available to people, if somehow we come to our senses and say maybe we want too far on corn ethanol production and the price drops, what happens? The American people magically pay for it because we've set price supports up so high that they're above the historically high levels, billions of dollars.

Two weeks ago we voted on this floor for foreign aid for cats and dogs. Now, we bring up suspension bills all the time when we don't have other important things to do, and sometimes at the end of the session, we say now we'll bring out the cats and dogs, and I have been here for 14 years and I've seen that happen. This is the first time in my 14 years that we actually voted on cats and dogs. We voted for foreign aid for cats and dogs. How can we do that? All you have to do is pass the budget with the largest single tax hike in the history of the Nation.

It seems to me, with all due respect to my friend the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of this committee, who has done yeomen's work to try to bring this forward, he is being pushed and pulled, and, unfortunately, we brought forth this, not a mouse but the largest single tax increase in the history of the world.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have put children in single-parent homes in an untenable situation. On the one hand, we demand that their parents move off welfare and take financial responsibility for these families and that absent parents, fathers typically, work and pay child support, but on the other hand, government bureaucracies continue to skim dollars off child support repayments intended for these needy children because of administrative costs.

Child support payments are often the only safety net still available for kids in single-parent families. Congress should make every effort to ensure that child support is collected and that all of it goes to families to whom they are owed and who are working so hard to succeed.

That's why I am absolutely delighted that a provision that I introduced, along with my good friend from Wisconsin, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, was included in this budget resolution. It restores the ability of States to pass along every cent of child support collected, ensuring that the dollars get to where they're intended and not into government pocketbooks. This is a commonsense provision that will help parents as the cost of living continues to rise.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this important budget agreement.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this budget. It represents a downpayment on our commitment to restoring middle class prosperity, a clear, practical approach to strengthen our economy, help our workforce thrive, and allow families to reach for the American Dream.

Today the Bush economy continues to weigh heavily on America's families and businesses. Incomes are down; everything else is up. Gas prices, food prices, the cost of health care and higher education.

This back-to-basics budget maintains fiscal discipline, reaching balance in 2012, remains in balance in 2013. If we pass this budget, it will mark the first time since 2000 that the Congress has been able to agree on a budget blueprint in an election year.

What does the budget mean? Middle class tax relief, including an extension to the refundable child tax credit and the Senate reserve fund to lower the income threshold and extend the benefit to more families. Last month we recognized the importance of expanding the child tax credit, lowering the income eligibility threshold to $8,500, providing relief to more than 12 million children.

It means crucial support for energy initiatives. It means enhancing our competitive edge, increasing funding for math and science education and research. And at the same time, we reject the administration's cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, first responder grants, emergency home heating assistance, and Community Development Block Grants. We bolster our economy's long-term health and help workers by making an investment in our national infrastructure and creating quality jobs, rebuilding crumbling bridges, fixing our roads, and reducing congestion, paving the way for new growth and new opportunity.

I urge my colleagues to stand behind this responsible budget. It is the foundation of a safe country, a strong economy, and future growth.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Congress right now is a dysfunctional place. We've got terrorists who want to kill us, and we can't pass the FISA law. We've got $4 gas, and we can't drill for more oil. And now in the face of a $10 trillion national debt, we have a budget in front of us that has the largest tax increase in history and is the largest budget in history. It just doesn't make sense.

In this time of economic uncertainty, with record-high energy prices, with the cost of food and fuel taking an increasing share of the family budget, Congress has a moral responsibility, a moral responsibility, to find ways to tighten its belt. Congress should be laser focused on cutting wasteful and redundant spending from the Federal budget in order to lower taxes to let families and business owners and taxpayers keep more of what they earn.

This budget, the largest in human history, does exactly the opposite. It has the largest tax increase in history to pay for the largest spending in history. This budget spends $100,000 per second, $6 million per minute, $350 million an hour every day for the entire year. It spends more than $23,000 per family, again, a record amount. Does the average American family feel they're getting their $23,000 worth from the Federal Government? It sort of reminds me of I think it was Will Rogers, who said, if we ever get all the government we pay for, look out.

Mr. Speaker, this reckless, out-of-control spending is not only unneeded; it has put us on a path toward economic disaster.

And I will be the first to admit Congress' spending problem wasn't created overnight and the blame does not lie in the lap of one single party. In terms of real fiscal year 2000 dollars, real dollars, Congress has quadrupled spending over my lifetime with both parties sharing in the blame. Our priorities have shifted dramatically from national defense and toward entitlement spending. It has become clear to me that here in Congress, the dials are always set to ''spend.'' It's spend and tax. That's always the program.

I think back to the amendments I offered last year during the appropriations process, nine amendments that would have saved $23 billion by simply asking Federal agencies to do what all kinds of families have had to do: spend the previous year's amount, hold the line on spending. These amendments were defeated on party-line votes, with Members of the majority claiming the sky would fall, the world would end if we could not increase spending at three or more times the rate of inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. The government managed to survive 3 months on

a continuing resolution doing just that, living on the previous year's budget. If we can do it for 3 months, we can do it for a long time and we can save the taxpayers a lot of money.

The American people are ready for change. They're tired of reckless spending that happens in the Halls of their Congress. They demand that we stand up and do the right thing. I would urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this conference report in favor of a more conservative, fiscally responsible budget that respects taxpayers, business owners, and families across this country.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's newfound concern for the budget deficit, but let me remind him from 2001 through 2007, his party controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House and accumulated a record debt and record deficits, and it takes a long time to turn this battleship around, but that's what we do in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD of Florida. I thank the chairman, my friend from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), for not only the time but for his hard work in bringing this blueprint to the floor, for our vision about how this government ought to be run and how we manage the economic model.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, running a government shouldn't be rocket science, especially a great government like ours and a great country like ours. You identify the priorities that government should do. You perform those priorities well. They are limited. You know what they are. And you are willing to pay for them. That model, ladies and gentlemen, should continuously strive to enlarge the middle class. Let me say that again. This economic model and this government function should be continuously striving to enlarge and enhance the middle class of this country.

For the last 8 years, 7½ years, we've had policies which have shrunk the middle class. We have had a continuous increase of spending, continuous decrease in revenues. We go to the People's Republic of China and other lenders to fund the difference, and we've got a fiscal mess.

□ 1145

This vision, this blueprint, this budget that JOHN SPRATT and Senator CONRAD have brought to us in the form of a conference report changes that and puts us on a path to balancing our budget, complying with the PAYGO principles, which we strongly believe in, and also performing the functions that a government should perform in this great Nation of ours.

I strongly urge and hope that you will vote for this conference report. Again, I want to thank Chairman SPRATT for all his hard work in getting us to this point.

Mr. HENSARLING. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the champion against pork barrel spending in the United States, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It was once said of someone who didn't know exactly where he was going that he was traipsing down a flower-strewn path unpricked by thorns of reason. I don't think there's a better description of what this budget is, than that, traipsing down a flower-strewn path unpricked by thorns of reason.

We were just told the other day, the gentleman from Texas mentioned it, that when you include all unfunded liabilities, not just the national debt out there, but all the money that we promise to pay out, that every American citizen owes something like $500,000. Nearly half a million dollars for every person living. Yet, this budget does nothing to change the course of that.

We will be adding a couple trillion dollars every year in fact that this budget is in place. Over the next 5 years we will go from something like $39 trillion to $52 trillion in unfunded liabilities.

I am not here to defend our record as Republicans when we were here. We did terrible, frankly, in terms of reining in spending. We added a new entitlement program, Medicare part D, which Democrats by and large voted against. If you didn't like it, please repeal it now. Some of us on this side didn't either. But it's bankrupting us and we can't continue to traipse down a flower-strewn path unpricked by thorns of reason.

These budgets have consequences, and the consequence here is we are saddling future generations with untold debt, debt that you can't even contemplate, debt that dwarfs most Americans' personal debt, a mortgage that they pay on a house, that they owe to their Federal Government. Yet we still continue to add program after program, new entitlements, new spending.

Just last week, a huge massive bloated farm bill was passed. Just yesterday, we were getting into construction for school facilities. We can't continue to do this.

Please reject this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I always think my friend from Arizona is so rational, and I thought he was today. I always appreciate his remarks. It's a shame that together we have not reached what I think we need to reach, whether it's on entitlements, which are obviously an extraordinary challenge, or on discretionary spending, or on taxes, on revenues, on paying for what we buy.

The flower-strewn path unpricked by reason. Nineteen years of Republican Presidents during my term in the Congress of the United States have presided. They're the one person in the United States of America that can stop spending in its tracks. The only person. Nineteen years of Republican Presidents, $4.13 trillion of deficit spending and $1.68 trillion of that has been in the last 6 years. Eight years under Bill Clinton, $62.9 billion-surplus. That is the 27 years that I have been in the Congress of the United States.

Now you can attribute that to all sorts of things, but I attribute it to the fact that Democrats have taken the position we ought to pay for what we buy and we ought to have responsible budgets. The Republicans have not passed a budget except for once in an election year. If we pass this one, as surely I hope we will, it will be a precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT. I also want to congratulate the ranking member, who I don't see on the floor, but who is a responsible Member of this body. I disagree with him on some things but he engages in the debate in a responsible way.

I want to thank the members of the Blue Dog Coalition as well for their work, patience, and commitment to passing this budget conference report. This is the first budget adopted in an election year since 2000, the last time we were before this administration, and it is a signal accomplishment of this Congress and a demonstration of our ability to govern effectively.

This conference report is the continuation of the Democratic majority's effort to turn away from this administration's failed policies. In fact, the most reckless fiscal policies in the history of our Nation.

As the father of three grandchildren and as the grandfather of a great-grandchild, I am extraordinarily concerned about that. We have two young women sitting next to my colleague and friend, Congressman ROGERS. I don't know whether they are grandchildren. They are grandchildren. We have put those young children who sit here, these beautiful young women, deeply into debt. This budget is about keeping them out of further debt.

Let's remember, President Bush and the former Republican majorities in Congress turned a projected budget surplus of $5.6 trillion, and was that a real surplus? It was not. It was a projection for 10 years. Nobody really knows what's going to happen in 10 years. But it was a projected surplus of $5.6 trillion, on which the Bush administration relied, and in reliance on it, did some things that were extraordinarily irresponsible.

We are now more than $3 trillion in additional debt in just 6 years. We went from $5.9 trillion of debt to now $9.8 trillion. Almost $4 trillion, which is to say an 80 percent increase in the indebtedness of this Nation in 84 months while the Republicans enjoyed 6 years of hegemony. Total, absolute control.

Yet some of our Republican friends complain, audaciously so, that this budget conference report includes an increase in the debt limit. How soon

they forget. They forget or, more accurately, they deliberately ignore that they increased the debt limit four times in 5 years. Under Bill Clinton's Presidency, during his last 4 years the debt was increased not once. Not once. The debt limit increase included in this conference report is a direct result, a direct and predictable result of the fiscally irresponsible, failed policies of the Republican party, policies that could not be changed overnight.

Nevertheless, congressional Democrats have proposed a fiscally responsible conference report that returns our Federal budget to balance by 2012 and abides by the pay-as-you-go budget rules that we reinstated in January, 2007, which were abandoned in 2001. Why? Because you could not and did not have the courage to pay for your tax cuts.

The only way you could pass your reduction of revenues was to waive PAYGO because you did not have the courage of convictions, nor the votes of your conference to cut spending by the amount you cut revenue. To-wit: Exploding debt.

It's a budget that meets the critical needs of our people, making investments to keep America safe, to boost economic growth, and create jobs, to provide tax relief, and to help families struggling in the Bush economy. This budget matches the President's request for defense, while shifting funds to high priorities, such as nuclear nonproliferation programs. It increases homeland security funding over the President's request. And it rejects the President's proposed cuts to first responder-programs, who, in any emergency caused by terrorists or by natural events, will be the first responders.

It increases funding for veterans health care by $3.7 billion, increases funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency initiatives so we can become energy independent, as well as funding for scientific innovation, education, training and social services to grow our economy, create jobs and make the lives of our people better.

Furthermore, it accommodates an immediate and long-term fix to the alternative minimum tax and additional middle class tax relief. Middle class tax relief in this budget.

Finally, this conference report rejects the President's harmful cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, State and local law enforcement programs, such as COPS, and to Environmental Protection Agency grants to protect public health. It also rejects the President's proposal to increase fees for veterans and military retirees by $18 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat majorities in this Congress inherited a fiscal debacle last year. Today, through this budget conference report, we continue to address it and to meet the critical priorities of the American people.

This is a budget that we can be proud of. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility, vote for the appropriate priorities for our country, vote for a brighter future for our children, vote for the conference report.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I listened very carefully to the distinguished majority leader, who spoke eloquently on deficit spending. He should know much about it since, under his budget, the Federal Government's long-term financial obligations grew by $2.5 trillion last year, and we now have the single largest increase in the national debt.

As I listened carefully to the majority leader, I heard him say much. What I did not hear him deny was that his budget included the single largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I would be happy to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Perhaps the distinguished majority leader could get some additional time on his side.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank Mr. HENSARLING and the ranking member of the Budget Committee for their yeoman's work on the Republican alternative. I also want to express my admiration for the chairman of the Budget Committee, who I believe to be a sincere man and effective legislator.

I must say that I do love following the distinguished majority leader to the floor. He is, as has been said, an eloquent and effective champion for the Democrat agenda in Congress. But the American people deserve to know this budget puts that agenda in high relief. It is more taxes, more spending, no entitlement reform, and pork barrel spending as usual.

Now let me say Tuesday and Wednesday of this week we were beset by terrible tornadoes. I will be heading back home tomorrow after we finish up business. A military base in my district, 40 buildings compromised, some destroyed; dozens of homes destroyed and compromised through Rush County and Shelby County.

But you know what? I know what Hoosiers are doing today. I know what they are doing. They are grabbing a shovel, they are rolling their sleeves up. Some have been out all night long sacrificially coming alongside their neighbors in a community in crisis and they are cleaning up the mess.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are facing a fiscal crisis in this Nation, and it is a mess of extraordinary proportions: $9.3 billion in national debt, $43 trillion in unfunded obligation in Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

Let me say to the distinguished chairman of this committee: There is plenty of blame to go around. I do not take issue with the gentleman's characterization that the national debt grew precipitously under Republican control. Pork barrel spending grew precipitously under Republican control. But that is no excuse. Continuing the argument and the blame game is no excuse for not dealing with the problem in the way that the American people sit down and solve problems, and that is by confronting them head-on and coming together with solutions.

The Democrat budget here is not the solution. More spending, more taxes, pork barrel spending as usual, and not one penny of entitlement reform ignores the problem. It doesn't deal with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in Congress offered an alternative this year that would face this fiscal crisis head on. The American people deserve to know the Democrat budget is not the answer.

□ 1200

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of our caucus, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, to my two former speakers on the Republican side, one who described the Republican stewardship as ''terrible,'' the one thing you can say after 6 years of Republican rule with President Bush is that we will forever be in your debt.

You are right. $3.8 trillion in new debt under your stewardship, and so we are always going to be in your debt. And I just can't you thank you enough on behalf of the American people, because the reason you would use the adjective ''terrible'' to describe your record is for the fiscal mess you left. And when you describe $9.8 trillion in debt, don't act like, ''look mom, no hands.'' You had something to do with it, 6 years of your control.

This budget is a beginning, because what is a budget? It is a blueprint for the future. And, yes, we will make it. President Kennedy once said, ''to govern is to choose.'' We are making choices here. We are preserving middle class tax cuts and beginning to put our fiscal house in order and investing in education, health care and technology to start to grow the economy back. That works for middle class families.

Under your stewardship, middle class household income shrunk by $1,100. Costs for education, health care and energy went up. This is about turning the country around and changing the direction of this country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR). The Chair would remind Members to please address their remarks to the Chair.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, what this is all about is priorities, that

is what budgets are, and when you take a look the priorities in this budget, it is a huge missed opportunity.

I started the beginning of this debate by complimenting the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for bringing a budget to conclusion, and I really sincerely mean that. I am from Wisconsin. I didn't really know what the definition of a ''distinguished southern gentleman'' is. I do now know by serving with JOHN SPRATT, and he deserves credit for bringing a budget resolution to the floor in an election year, which is something that is not often done around here. So I sincerely want to compliment the gentleman for that.

But what about the budget we have here being brought to the floor? I see some young people in the audience here, some young people in the well here. I have some young people in my family. I have a daughter who is 6, a son who is 5, and a son who is 3 years old, and by the time my three kids are exactly my age, this Federal Government will be doubling their taxes.

The pathway that we are on right now with the unsustainable fiscal crisis in this country is one in which, instead of taxing 18.3 cents out of every dollar to pay for the Federal Government, which is what we have been doing for the last 40 years, the next generation, my children's generation, when they are raising their kids will be paying 40 cents out of every dollar just to pay for this Federal Government.

We know for a fact that we are shackling the next generation with a mountain of debt and taxes that is unsustainable. We are bequeathing this to the next generation, unless we fix this, unless we step up as every preceding generation has done in this country and make things better.

What does this budget do? Not only in a time of economic recession, not only in a time of $4 gas prices, not only in a time where the grocery bill is twice as high as it was last year, we are raising taxes across-the-board the most we have ever raised them before, taxes on marriage, taxes on having children, taxes on making money, taxes on starting small businesses, taxes on pensions, taxes on retirement. This budget does that. But what is even worse than that is that this budget proposes to increase this debt, this legacy of debt to our children and our grandchildren, by $14 trillion for just two programs alone. It is unconscionable.

Both parties lay blame, but should claim responsibility for getting us to where we are. I am not simply saying here that Republicans have always been pristine and Democrats have always been bad. We got into this together. We are going to have to get out of this together. The problem is, this is no way to go. We shouldn't be doing this to our grandchildren, to our children, to the ''X Generation.''

That is what this budget does, the largest tax increase in American history, which is going to hurt our economy even further and cost jobs. When you raise taxes, you lower jobs. When you raise taxes, you take money out of paychecks. You hurt families. You don't give them the ability to get going, to succeed. Their paychecks don't get stretched farther, they get stretched shorter.

And when you consign the next generation by simply walking away from the problem and saying to our kids and our grandkids, instead of giving you a $40 trillion debt for Medicare and Social Security, we are going to give you a $54 trillion debt for Medicare and Social Security, each household today, if we want just these two programs to work, would have to set aside $353,000. What this budget says is each household will have to set aside $474,000.

We are abdicating leadership in this budget. It is wrong. What we need to do is come together, both sides, recognize this problem, and realize that the way to prosperity in this country is not to tax our way out of this problem; it is to address this spending problem in this House, address the culture of earmarks, address the spending that we have here and get it under control so that the next generation can be better off.

That is what my folks told me the legacy of this country is all about. Each generation rises to the challenges in this country and leaves the next generation better off. Well, what we are doing with this budget is we are severing that legacy. We know for a fact, it is guaranteed, it is statistically a truism by all sides of the aisle, we are going to sever that legacy and we are going to give the next generation an inferior standard of living, unless we defeat this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate, I now yield the balance of our time to our distinguished Speaker, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the Chair of the Budget Committee, for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this excellent document to the floor, a budget which will help us protect our country, grow our economy, give middle income tax cuts, and do so in a fiscally sound way.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, our budget is a statement of our national values. At least it should be. Now for the first time in our New Direction Congress, last year and this year, for 2 years straight, we have put forth a budget resolution, the first time a budget resolution has been put forth in an election year by the Congress since the Republicans took over. Now the Democrats are in charge and we have had 2 years of responsible budgeting.

I listened with interest to our colleagues and their views on this budget. They certainly are entitled to their opinion, but they are not entitled to their own set of facts. I want to just quote from some of the responsible independent budget organizations, some of them conservative-leaning organizations, when it comes to their false claim about this budget increasing taxes.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget says, ''The conference agreement does not raise taxes.''

The Hamilton Project of the Brookings Institution says very clearly, ''The budget would not raise taxes.'' Indeed, your budget, Mr. SPRATT, indicates that one of your priorities is making up-front cuts in taxes for alternative minimum tax relief that ultimately would be paid for without increasing the budget deficit.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities says, ''Some claim that the budget plan of the conferees would constitute 'the largest tax increase in history.' This claim is inaccurate. This year's budget plan does not include a tax increase. It actually calls for a $340 billion reduction in revenues.''

The problem that our friends on the Republican side have is that these tax cuts are for the middle class, not just for their friends in the upper 1 percent bracket. These tax cuts address the marriage penalty, address the 10 percent tax bracket, address the child tax credit. The middle class and those who aspire to it benefit from this budget.

This is a fiscally sound budget, and for that we are all in Mr. SPRATT's debt. This budget has to be balanced in terms of its spending and its priorities, and, indeed, it is a statement of our values.

I would like to see anyone in this room who supports veterans say they cannot support the budget provisions in this legislation. In this bill, for our veterans it provides an additional $3.7 billion for veterans health care and services, which is why this budget has the strong support of major veterans groups.

When it comes to energy, an issue of major concern to households across America, this budget provides $7.7 billion for renewable energy, energy efficiency and other energy initiatives, which is $2.7 billion more than just last year.

In innovation, let's stop having these stale debates about trade or no trade. Let's educate, innovate, compete and prevail in the global marketplace. This budget provides nearly $2 billion to fully accommodate the commitments made in the America COMPETES Act, which was voted on by an overwhelming number of Republicans to give us a huge vote in the Congress and signed by the President. This is to spur innovation and invest in basic scientific innovation.

Again, by setting the right priorities and making tough choices, our budget also cuts taxes again for the middle class and those aspiring to it and protects 20 million households from the alternative minimum tax.

In any year, creating a budget is a difficult challenge. In an election year, it is even more challenging, because of all of the competing priorities that

want to be in the budget. But this year we have a budget that is in balance in terms of its values and is in balance in terms of the track that it puts us on.

Thank you, Mr. SPRATT, for putting us on track, with no deficit, for the budget to be in balance by 2012. It is fully compliant with pay-as-you-go rules. It is a budget, again, of the statement of our values, fiscally responsible, pay-as-you-go. It has tremendous merit, and it should have the support of every person in this body.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the budget.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the FY 2009 budget resolution conference report represents another missed opportunity to address the financial crisis facing our nation. Focusing on these economic challenges, reining in entitlement spending, and curbing Congress's appetite for autopilot spending will take strong bipartisan commitment from both sides of the aisle. Our ''long-term'' spending crisis has arrived, and our children and grandchildren will bear the burden if Congress does not act.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the German theologian who was at the heart of the German resistance against Nazism, said, ''The ultimate test of a moral society is the kind of world it leaves to its children.''

This Congress is leaving the next generation saddled with $54 trillion in unfunded liabilities and $9 trillion in debt, $1 trillion of which is held by the Chinese. They also face potential loss of our country's triple-A bond rating—as early as 2012, according to Standard & Poor's, or by 2018, according to Moody's Investors Service. This is an economic issue, but also a moral and generational issue.

Representative JIM COOPER and I have been working together with over 100 cosponsors on a solution that would put everything—entitlements and tax policy—on the table in order to turn things around. The Cooper-Wolf SAFE Act would create a bipartisan entitlement review commission, culminating in a required up or down vote by Congress on a legislative proposal born from the commission's work. Mandating action is what makes the SAFE Commission unique.

We had the opportunity in this year's budget process to take the initial steps to get our financial house in order. But again this budget cycle, Congress is choosing to look the other way. I am hopeful that my colleagues will recognize that the budget resolution makes little progress on this pressing issue and join our efforts with the SAFE Commission.

When educating his colleagues in the British Parliament about the horrors of the slave trade in 1789, William Wilberforce said, ''Having heard all this you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say that you did not know.''

Not one member of the 110th Congress can say they don't know about the category 5 storm off our shores, which former Comptroller General David Walker says could result in a ''tsunami of spending and debt that could swamp our ship of state.''

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of 2009 Budget Conference Report. I know many Members here today shared with me the opinion that the President's proposed budget was ''dead on arrival.'' This conference agreement upholds that opinion and goes a step further by rejecting many of the proposed cuts the President suggested in February including his proposal to gut billions of dollars from Medicare and Medicaid.

For the last two years the House has held true to its commitment to American families by increasing funding for domestic priorities such as energy assistance program, state and local law enforcement programs, education, among many others. And while it might be hard for this administration to grasp, this Congress has proposed increases in funding for domestic priorities without increasing our deficit. In fact, this conference agreement will balance the budget by 2012 and provide a surplus of $22 billion in 2012 and $10 billion in 2013.

What I am most pleased about is the commitment this conference agreement makes to areas that are of the most importance to me—Medicare, Medicaid, education, job-training and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, among many others.

Our veterans, many of whom have served multiple tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, will benefit from this budget through a $3.7 billion increase in funding. This is a sharp contrast from what President Bush originally proposed—$18 billion in new fees over five years. These men and women have served our country honorably and with dedication and under no circumstances do they deserve to come home to a fee from our government.

This budget agreement also strives to address rising energy costs. Just this month gas in Romulus, Michigan, located in the 15th District, hit $4 gallon. The ever rising cost of fuel in our country is becoming more and more unmanageable for our families. This budget agreement increases funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency initiatives, while also providing full funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program which has helped numerous families heat their homes through the winter and cool their homes during the summer. Without a doubt this does not solve our energy problems, however, it does help families whose pocketbooks are already stretched thin.

More importantly, this conference report will provide increased funding that will help prepare our workers to compete in the global marketplace. The America COMPETES Act, which I strongly supported, created a commitment to increase training and funding for math and science education and research. This legislation upholds that commitment. It also increases funding for education that will help to address the rising costs of college tuition and the rigorous standards of No Child Left Behind. A successful workforce depends on access to quality education and this legislation will help our constituents with that.

The Democratic budget provides funding that is crucial for job creation. As we have seen here at home, our economy is heading towards a recession. From 2001–2006 alone, Michigan lost 235,000 jobs, many of them high-paying manufacturing jobs. With the rising unemployment rate, it is clear that we need to invest in our workers and new industries that would promote job creation here at home.

I am again proud to say that this budget proposal will follow through on our commitment to expand children's health insurance coverage by providing a $50 billion increase to the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) so that we can provide healthcare to millions more children who otherwise would go uninsured. As we all witnessed last year, the President vetoed legislation expanding SCHIP on two occasions. In my home state of Michigan we have seen the number of uninsured increase to one million Michigan residents. Rather than making healthcare coverage less accessible, Congress must be doing everything it can to ensure that every individual who wants healthcare coverage has the means to get it.

The Democratic budget also rejects the proposed $500 billion in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid proposed by the President. I have long said that this administration neglects our families and his proposal to cut funding from two of our most important healthcare programs is ill-advised. This Congress will not stand for it and this budget will not stand for it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the budget process is never easy; however, I stand in support of today's conference report with great pleasure. Not only am I pleased that this is the last budget that this Congress will work on with this administration, but I am also pleased that once again Congress has shown that it will not rubberstamp the priorities of this administration.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of the S. Con. Res. 70, the conference report to the FY 2009 Budget.

Every day, new reports suggest our economy is slowing. It is imperative that the Congress help Americans during these tough economic times. I am supportive of the Democratic budget because it will expand health care for needy Americans, provide tax relief for the middle class, strengthen safety net programs, and reject the President's draconian funding cuts. In effect, S. Con. Res 70 will lead America in a new direction.

The Bush budget slashes a half trillion dollars from Medicare and Medicaid over the next decade. The Democratic budget rejects the President's proposed cuts to health care, and instead provides program improvements to State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). Last year, the President twice vetoed legislation that would have expanded this essential program. S. Con. Res. 70 will provide $50 billion for SCHIP, which significantly reduces the number of uninsured children. The Democratic budget further helps Americans with the skyrocketing cost of health care by investments in health information technology and research grants in medical technology.

The Democratic budget provides tax breaks for low- and middle-income families, including an extension of the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10% individual income tax bracket and an extension of the deduction for state and local sales taxes. S. Con. Res. 70 will also stop the Alternative Minimum Tax from raising taxes on more than 20 million middle-class tax payers.

In this era of globalization, it is crucial that we give our youth the best possible education without burdening them with insurmountable debt. The Bush budget would eliminate important educational programs such as the Thurgood Marshall Legal education, Perkins Loans Cancellations, Mental Health Integration and Reading is Fundamental. In contrast, the Democratic budget provides significant increases to vital programs in education, job training, and social service programs.

Mr. Speaker, my home state of Michigan is facing serious economic challenges, in part

due to the President's failed policies. The Democratic budget will offer working families a chance at the American dream. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, a budget is a moral document that demonstrates our values and priorities. I want to congratulate Chairman SPRATT for again bringing forth a budget that represents values of which we can be proud. This budget would make real investments in education, hometown security, veterans' programs, healthcare, and research and development while bringing the budget back to surplus by 2012.

I am pleased that this Fiscal Year 2009 budget continues to follow the pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) principle that the House restored at the start of the 110th Congress. This ensures that every new dollar of spending is offset and will not worsen the deficit. Although the budget resolution does not set the taxes or appropriation money, it does lay out the plan for the coming years to spend money and to raise revenues.

The budget would require the Ways and Means Committee to find the savings required to prevent millions of new Americans from having to pay the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT), which has slowly morphed into a middle-class tax hike. More families in Central New Jersey are affected by the AMT than anywhere else in the country. Last year, Congress prevented nearly 23 million Americans, including more than 88,000 in the 12th Congressional District, from paying the AMT in 2008. Without action on this issue even more Americans would be affected by the AMT in the future.

With the price of oil now over $130 a barrel, this budget would make a significant investment in our Nation's energy future by providing $7.7 billion for renewable energy, energy efficiency, and other energy programs. This is $2.8 billion—or 55 percent—more than the Fiscal Year 2008 budget. In doing so, the budget would reject the President's budget cuts to energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, and instead invest $2 billion in new programs to create ''green collar jobs.''

Mr. Speaker, this budget honors our commitment to our Nation's children by investing in education. The budget would provide $8.4 billion above the President's request—new funding that could support vital programs like Head Start, special education, school improvement programs, and Title 1. The budget also would help make college more affordable and accessible for students in New Jersey and throughout the country by increasing funding that could support Pell grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, and programs that broaden access to Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Facing difficult and uncertain economic times, this budget would invest in job creation and job training. In addition to investing in programs to create ''green collar jobs,'' we reject the President's cuts to Community Development Block Grants and his proposal to eliminate four job training programs. We also look to a long-term economic growth strategy, one that invests in science and research and development. This budget would support our Innovation Agenda by increasing funding for the America COMPETES Act, which authorized robust funding for research at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy's Office of Science.

Our budget also addresses the fact that our Nation has more Americans than ever living without health insurance, including over nine million children. We would include funding to provide up to $50 billion for children's health insurance. This would help insure millions of children. Likewise, our budget recognizes the importance of Medicaid and Medicare and would reject the President's harmful proposal to cut Medicaid by $94 billion and Medicare by $479 billion over ten years.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of this budget's commitment to making America more safe and secure. Notably, we would provide additional funding to implement the 9/11 commission recommendations, including required 100 percent screening for shipping and air cargo. We would also place a greater emphasis on funding nuclear nonproliferation programs, one of the most severe threats to our security.

Additionally, we would restore funding for vital first responder programs, including the State Homeland Security Grant Program (cut $705 million), Firefighter Assistance Grants (cut $463 million), Byrne Justice Assistance Grants (eliminated all formula funding), and COPS (cut $599 million).

This budget continues our commitment to fully fund veterans' health care by providing $48.2 billion for 2009, which is $4.9 billion (11.4 percent) more than the 2008 level. In fact, it would provide $3.3 billion more than the President's budget for 2009 and $39 billion more over five years. Consistent with past practice, the President's budget actually cuts funding after the first year. This budget also would allow the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to treat 5.8 million patients in 2009, including an estimated 333,275 Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans, many of whom suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injuries, or blast-related injuries. Additionally, the budget rejects the health care fee increases imposed by the President's budget, which total $2.3 billion over five years, including a new enrollment fee and pharmaceutical co-payment increases. Finally, this budget increases funding to speed disability claims processing, so that VA can continue to reduce its backlog.

I would like to recognize the budget's impact on voting reform. Implementing a nationwide requirement for independently auditable, and audited, vote counts is a priority of mine. As such, I was deeply disappointed that the President's budget made no request for funding under Title II of the Help America Vote Act. Approximately $560 million of the funding authorized under that Title remains unappropriated, and jurisdictions across the country could use that funding to improve the accuracy, integrity and security of their voting systems, as well as improve the administration of elections generally. Additionally, I was disappointed to see that the President requested only half of what remains authorized to fund disability access grants to ensure polling place accessibility. As we continue to debate the budget, we should address these budget shortfalls.

Mr. Speaker, this budget reflects values for which we can be proud. We reject cuts to important healthcare, education, veterans, and national security programs while maintaining our commitment to fiscal responsibility. By adopting this budget and supporting the designated funding levels throughout the appropriations process, we would be investing in priorities important to our future.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, the Fiscal Year 2009 budget resolution.

I want to commend Chairman SPRATT, Ranking Member RYAN, as well as Senators CONRAD and GREGG, for their outstanding work in fashioning a fiscally responsible budget that will improve our Nation's flagging economy and address vital funding priorities.

Many people in Georgia and across the Nation are struggling in these difficult times.

They are struggling with skyrocketing energy costs, especially the high gasoline prices. In some parts of the Georgia's Second Congressional District, the price of a gallon of gas is over four dollars. It is having a ripple effect in many if not all sectors of the economy.

They also are struggling with the rising cost of health care and education. It is especially troubling to me why programs which help low- and middle-income Americans—especially veterans—afford medical care and a college education have been placed on the chopping block by our President over the last 7 years.

They are struggling with the weakening housing market. As many as two million Americans may see their mortgage rates increase in the next two years, with many of them losing their homes as a result of bad lending practices. Tens of millions of homeowners could see the value of their homes—their primary investment—drop in value as well.

America needs to put its fiscal house in order if it wants to retain its competitive edge and remain strong into the future.

I am pleased that the Fiscal Year 2009 budget resolution rejects the President's harmful discretionary spending cuts and makes important investments in veterans' health care, Medicare and Medicaid, affordable housing, education initiatives, our Nation's transportation infrastructure, as well as renewable energy and energy efficiency programs.

As a member of the Blue Dog Coalition, I am especially glad that the budget resolution brings the budget into balance by 2012 and fully complies with the PAYGO rule. It is difficult to believe that over the last 7 years we have gone from a $5.6 trillion surplus to a $3.2 trillion deficit. Our gross Federal debt is approaching $10 trillion dollars—the highest it has ever been in the Nation's history. The amount of this debt that is held by other countries such as China, Japan, and the OPEC nations also has more than doubled since the Bush administration took office in January 2001.

The budget resolution demonstrates that it is possible to fund vital programs, provide middle-income tax relief, eliminate the deficit over the next 5 years, pay down the national debt, and promote economic growth—all in a fiscally responsible manner. I strongly support this conference agreement, and I urge my colleagues to approve it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the 2009 Budget Resolution. This legislation strongly reflects the values of Oregonians and Americans across our country and I urge my colleagues to pass the bill.

Today I am especially proud to be a member of the Budget Committee. It is worth noting that this is the first budget passed in an election year since 1998. The new Democratic majority has shown that they are committed to passing a budget despite an uncooperative

President. Today's budget agreement is a balanced budget with balanced priorities. We have rejected the President's misguided cuts to programs that serve as a safety net for our most vulnerable citizens; cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and the Community Development Block Grants.

This budget also recognizes that we must strengthen our middle class, a group that has suffered tremendously over the last 7 years. The budget provides fiscally responsible, deficit-neutral middle income tax relief; including keeping 20 million middle-income households from being hit by the Alternative Minimum Tax. It also extends the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and the 10 percent individual income tax bracket.

However, tax relief will do little without reinvestment in the priorities which strengthen our Nation and its citizens. Building our Nation must include a strong commitment to physical infrastructure, human capital, and innovation to keep us competitive globally. This budget does all these things. Recognizing that our current crumbling infrastructure is both structurally unsafe and hindering growth of our economy, the 2009 Budget includes an Infrastructure Reinvestment Reserve Fund to accommodate legislation that would provide robust Federal investment in projects such as rail, bridges, transit, ports, and more. The budget invests in our human capital both by creating a Higher Education Reserve Fund to make college more affordable for families, and by including funding for investment in renewable and energy efficient technologies to train workers in rapidly expanding ''green collar'' jobs. These investments, along with increased funding for the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health keep our Nation on the cutting edge and maintain our position as a global leader.

Today's budget reflects America's priorities in a fiscally responsible way and brings our budget back into balance by 2012, while abiding by pay-as-you go rules. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me today in supporting and passing the 2009 Budget Conference Agreement.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to accompany S. Con. Res. 70, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009. This Budget Resolution strengthens our economy, restores fiscal discipline, and makes America safer.

A budget is a statement of our priorities. As the only former State schools chief serving in Congress, I am particularly pleased about this measure's provisions for education and innovation. This resolution rejects the President's proposed education cuts and instead provides greater investment in our Nation's schools, including the school construction bonds Chairman RANGEL and I have been working on for nearly a decade and increased Impact Aid for federally impacted local public schools.

As a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am pleased that after 7 years of this administration failing to address fully some of our most pressing security needs, this budget provides the necessary resources to meet critical threats to the Nation. Specifically, this budget resolution rejects the President's proposed cuts to critical State and local law enforcement initiatives, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, Byrne Grants, and the COPS initiative. I strongly believe that homeland security starts with hometown security and I am pleased that this resolution rejects the President's misguided cuts.

I am also pleased to report that the Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Resolution also makes our Nation's veterans a top priority. This budget is strongly supported by all the major veterans organizations because it provides $3.3 billion more than the President's proposed budget for 2009 and $39 billion more over 5 years. This budget continues our commitment to fully fund veterans' health care by providing an 11 percent increase from last year. This resolution also rejects health care fees and TRICARE enrollment fee increases and includes additional funding to speed the veterans' disability claims process. I am proud to represent thousands of veterans in North Carolina's Second Congressional District, and they deserve a budget that reflects the importance of the sacrifice they have made in serving our country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly concerned about the legacy of debt this administration is passing on to future generations. The $5.6 trillion projected surplus that the administration inherited when it took office has been transformed into a $3.2 trillion deficit. More than 80 cents of every dollar of new debt since 2001 is owed to foreign investors, including foreign governments. The high level of indebtedness to foreign investors heightens the American economy's exposure to potential instability or even from financial threat from unfriendly foreign governments, and places additional burdens on our children and grandchildren. It is a massively irresponsibe tax on posterity.

However, this Budget Resolution is a positive step in restoring fiscal responsibility. Using realistic Congressional Budget Office estimates, this budget reaches balance in 2012, remains in balance in 2013, and posts smaller deficits than the President's proposed budget for the next 3 years. In addition, this budget continues the House of Representatives' emphasis on fiscal discipline by following the pay-as-you-go rule.

On behalf of North Carolina's children and working families, I support the Budget Conference Report for Fiscal Year 2009 and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report and urge its approval.

It deserves support for many reasons, beginning with its very existence—if it is approved we will have a final budget resolution in an election year for the first time for nearly a decade.

To govern is to choose, and one of the most basic responsibilities for those who want to be entrusted with positions of leadership is to make hard choices. This year, Chairman SPRATT and his Budget Act colleagues—and their counterparts in the Senate—have demonstrated real leadership and have reached agreement on a conference report that will enable us to make the choices needed to keep us on a responsible budgetary path.

This conference report will make it possible for us to provide tax relief for the middle class; make needed investments in energy, education, innovation, and infrastructure; and to properly support our troops and veterans. And it does so while maintaining fiscal responsibility, because it complies with a strong pay-as-you-go rule and makes it possible to return the budget to surplus in 2012 and 2013, without raising taxes.

One of its best features, in my opinion, is the way it encourages investment in new businesses and industries that focus on renewable energy, clean fuel technology, and energy efficiency. This will create jobs, reduce our dependence on foreign energy, strengthen the economy, and ultimately help with high energy costs for consumers.

It also rejects the President's budget cuts to energy programs by providing for significant increases in programs such as weatherization assistance, renewable energy, and energy efficiency; and includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for energy legislation.

It also will enable us to continue working to retain and expand a skilled, technologically literate workforce and a strong research and development base. It provides for increasing funding for the Department of Education, and the National Institutes of Health. It also allows for more funding for science, space, and technology programs.

In addition, it sets the stage for much-needed investment in our nation's infrastructure, including more than President Bush has proposed for discretionary transportation accounts as well as full funding of Highway and Transit programs as authorized in the highway bill and funding for the Airport Improvement Program. All these are very important for Colorado, where the pressures of population growth have put severe strains on our highways, roads, and airports.

As a Member of the Armed Services Committee, I am particularly glad to be able. to support the conference report because it will enable us to provide the funding we need for national defense and to address the most critical threats facing our nation. It places a higher priority than the President's budget on programs such as Cooperative Threat Reduction and other nuclear nonproliferation programs, and on improving the quality of life for our troops and their families.

The conference report also recognized the need for higher funding levels for homeland security while rejecting the President's proposed cuts in law enforcement, the COPS program, firefighters, and other first responders.

And it takes an important step to help veterans get the quality health care they need and deserve by providing $3.3 billion more in discretionary funding for 2009 than the President's budget and $39 billion more over five years for veterans programs.

Similarly, it strengthens the safety net for those families most in need, allowing for more funding for home energy assistance (LIHEAP), for children's health, for nutrition assistance for women, infants, and children and for the Social Services Block Grant. And it accommodates legislation to reauthorize and expand the trade adjustment assistance program and to improve unemployment insurance.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that despite claims to the contrary, the conference report does not include any tax increases—in fact, it supports significant tax relief, including continued marriage penalty relief, child tax credit, and the 10 percent bracket, and provides for an additional year of tax relief for more than 20 million Americans who would otherwise be subjected to the Alternative Minimum Tax.

Nonetheless, some of our colleagues will object that it does not provide for making permanent all the tax cuts enacted since the Bush Administration took office. I supported

some of those cuts—including the 10 percent tax bracket, the increased child credit, and relief from the marriage penalty—all of which should be made permanent, but this conference report is not the place for an all-or-nothing approach to the entire list. We will have time later to consider which of the rest of President Bush's tax cuts should be extended.

Consistent with that more responsible approach, this conference report allows for only a small increase in revenues above the levels assumed in the President's budget—an increase that can be accomplished through closing loopholes that enable some corporations and affluent taxpayers to take advantage of offshore tax havens, and by doing a better job of collecting taxes that are already due under current law.

Mr. Speaker, seven years of fiscal irresponsibility have left a legacy of deficits and debt that it will take time and work to overcome. But the sooner we begin, the sooner we will complete the job of restoring fiscal responsibility and reordering our national priorities—and now is the time to take an essential step forward by approving this conference report.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conference report on the fiscal year (FY) 2009 Budget Resolution recognizes the importance of meeting our nation's infrastructure investment needs. Adequate investment in our transportation and other public infrastructure is critical to our nation's economic growth, our competitiveness in the world marketplace, and the quality of life in our communities. Despite the importance of these investments, many of our nation's infrastructure needs are going unmet.

Rather than addressing these unmet needs, the administration's FY 2009 budget proposed to cut virtually every infrastructure investment program within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, including highways, public transit, airports, Amtrak, wastewater treatment, and water resources development.

In contrast to the harmful cuts proposed by the administration, the conference report before us today fully funds highway, transit, and highway safety programs at the levels originally authorized in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU). The conference report rejects both the negative $1 billion adjustment for Revenue Aligned Budget Authority, and the administration's proposal to cut highway and transit funding by an additional $1 billion below the authorized levels, which would be detrimental to short-term economic stimulus efforts, as well as long-term economic growth.

For the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), the conference report rejects the $765 million cut proposed by the administration, and instead provides the full amounts authorized in the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2007 (H.R. 2881), as approved by the House last year. Specifically, the conference agreement allocates $3.8 billion for AIP in FY 2008, increasing to $3.9 billion in FY 2009, and to $4.1 billion by FY 2011. This funding will allow the AIP program to keep pace with inflationary cost increases, and begin to address the investment gap in airport safety and capacity needs.

For Amtrak, the conference report rejects the $525 million cut proposed by the administration, which would essentially shut-down our national passenger rail system, and instead increases funding to meet the costs of Amtrak's new labor agreement, pursuant to Presidential Emergency Board 242.

For environmental infrastructure, the conference report rejects the administration's proposed cut to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) program, the primary Federal program for funding wastewater infrastructure projects throughout the nation. A year ago, the President requested $687.5 million in capitalization grants for CWSRFs for FY 2008. At that time, it was the lowest level requested by any administration since the creation of the program. For FY 2009, the administration requested a pitiful $555 million, a 20 percent cut from last year's appropriation of $689 million. The administration's proposal puts at risk the water quality gains achieved in recent decades, and the conference report correctly rejects this cut.

Finally, the conference report rejects the administration's proposal to cut funding for the Army Corps of Engineers by $845 million in FY 2009, and instead provides increased funding to begin to address the growing backlog of water resources development projects, including those authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

I am also pleased that the conference report includes an Infrastructure Investment Reserve Fund, which provides the flexibility necessary to accommodate legislation to increase investment in our nation's infrastructure in FY 2009.

I look forward to working with Chairman SPRATT on continued improvements to our nation's infrastructure, and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the FY2009 budget resolution. This budget includes nearly $179 billion to fund the war.

Congress should not in good conscience vote to continue the Administration's illegal occupation of Iraq. The greatest tragedy of this war is the staggering loss of life, starting with the 4,091 brave men and women in U.S. military uniform. Tens of thousands more have been injured. Both of these numbers will continue to rise.

The U.S. policies in Iraq have failed as is evidenced by the fact that close to half of the population is struggling in extreme poverty. Estimates are that 1,000,000 innocent Iraqis have died as a result of the U.S. invasion. A reported 70 percent of Iraqis—nearly three quarters of the population—are without clean water; 80 percent lack effective sanitation; and 90 percent of hospitals lack essential surgical and medical supplies needed for Iraqi health and wellbeing.

Iraq's ability to meet the basic needs of its people is in shambles and our beloved troops remain in harms way. This body should act on the mandate of the American public given last November and bring our troops home now. Instead we continue to forfeit the public's trust with this unrelenting commitment to keep the war going when we have the power to end it. All it requires is a refusal to consider any legislation that contains or implies continued funding for this war.

The grand total for all defense related spending, including war funds and nuclear activities, is $607.8 billion. This is 56% of all discretionary spending in the budget for FY09. In other words, this budget continues the same failed policies that dedicate the majority of tax payer funds to defense spending while hard working Americans continue to struggle to afford basic necessities such as food, health care, homes and good schools for their kids.

The money in this budget that will go to fund war could be used to provide 39,912,404 people with healthcare; it could be used to offer an additional 1,053,429 affordable housing units; it could be used to provide 20,937,104 college level scholarships to the young minds of America. The budget should be reflective of America's priorities, but this budget falls far short of reflecting the priorities of the majority of Americans, so I oppose it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Chairman SPLATT for his leadership and for his hard work on this budget. I also want to thank all the staff, especially Tom Kahn and Scott Russell.

They have put together a very good budget that we should all support.

The Democratic budget restores vital funding to programs that will help American families during these difficult economic times.

The Democratic budget rejects the President's cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, rejects his cuts to food assistance and rejects his cuts to higher education.

Our budget will expand children's healthcare, increase support for first responders and for veterans, expand support for renewable energy initiatives and fund new green job training programs.

I'm also very pleased that the budget retains language that I and Republican WOOLSEY worked on with Chairman SPRATT to address the continuing waste fraud and abuse at the Department of Defense.

Again I want to thank and commend Chairman SPRATT for his work on this budget and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution 70.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1233; adopting

House Resolution 1233, if ordered; adopting the conference report to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution 70; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5940.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5540, CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK CONTINUING AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1233, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 194, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
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
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
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
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
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)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
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 (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus
Bean
Boucher
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Cardoza
Dingell
Fattah
Garrett (NJ)
Gillibrand
Hinchey
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Marshall
Pryce (OH)
Renzi
Rush
Shuler
Wolf

□ 1237

Messrs. WHITFIELD of Kentucky and MARCHANT changed their 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. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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 225, nays 195, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

YEAS—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
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
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
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
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns

Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
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)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
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 (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bean
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Campbell (CA)
Dingell
Everett
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Marshall
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Shuler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1246

Mr. DOOLITTLE changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 70, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 210, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

YEAS—214

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
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
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—210

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Cazayoux
Chabot
Childers
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
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 (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bean
Boucher
Campbell (CA)
Everett
Fattah
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Marshall
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Shuler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1303

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 2008, I missed the vote on Senate Concurrent Resolution 70. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

NATIONAL NANOTECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5940, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5940, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 6, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Broun (GA)
Coble
Flake
Paul
Poe
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—20

Bean
Boehner
Boucher
Braley (IA)
Campbell (CA)
Conyers
Everett
Fattah
Gohmert
Hall (TX)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Manzullo
Marshall
Mollohan
Pryce (OH)
Reynolds
Ruppersberger
Rush
Shuler
Weldon (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1310

Mr. POE changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the following rollcall votes: rollcall 380 on ordering the previous question, rollcall 381 on agreeing to resolution H. Res. 1233, rollcall 382 on agreeing to the conference report of S. Con. Res. 70, and rollcall 383 on a motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5940 on Thursday, June 5, 2008. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall 380, ''yes'' on rollcall 381, ''no'' on rollcall 382, and ''yes'' on rollcall 383.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5540.

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

There was no objection.

CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK CONTINUING AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1233, I call up the bill (H.R. 5540) to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1233, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5540

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 ''Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 502 of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 105–312) is amending by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 110–677 if offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5540, legislation that will reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network which will otherwise expire at the end of 2008.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL and Chairman GRIJALVA for their leadership in getting this bill to the floor. They've been stalwart advocates in this effort.

The Chesapeake Bay has a tremendous tale to tell.

□ 1315

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Program connects those who live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to the natural, cultural and historic resources of the bay, and thereby encourage individual and citizen stewardship of these resources.

I guess the best way to describe the Gateways program is an insurance policy on our larger investment in the Chesapeake Bay. There are three parts to cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay; there is funding, which of course is extremely critical, there is regulatory guidance, and then there is citizen stewardship. Without individual responsibility, without widespread engagement by the 16 million people that reside in the watershed, it would be impossible to achieve and maintain the goal of cleaning up the bay. For a very modest investment, the Gateways program helps to foster the citizen stewardship that will be necessary to advance bay clean-up and maintain the gains that we hope to make.

As many of my colleagues know, the Chesapeake Bay is our Nation's largest estuary. It is a national environmental treasure and an economic catalyst as it pertains to the region's tourism and seafood industries. Unfortunately, as many also know, the bay's health in recent years has been significantly and negatively impacted by multiple factors, such as increased nutrient runoff, chemical contaminants, and other forms of pollution. As a result, there has been a severe deterioration in the bay's water quality in recent years and a rapid loss of living resources and natural habitat.

To combat these trends, in 1983 the Chesapeake Bay Program was created. It is a partnership between the States of Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia and the Federal Government, which is dedicated to restoring and protecting the bay. I am also committed to reversing these trends and restoring the bay's water quality and natural habitats, and that is why I have introduced this legislation to continually reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network.

The Gateways program is the National Park Service's component of the greater Chesapeake Bay program. The Park Service has entered into a memorandum of understanding under the Chesapeake Bay program that tasks the Park Service with ''conserving the Chesapeake Bay's national and cultural heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations.'' It goes on to say that the Park Service will provide assistance to the bay program through resource planning and grants management, rivers and trails conservation assistance, public education, interpretation, and cooperative heritage planning support.

That is precisely the purpose of the Gateways program. It provides grants and technical assistance to parks, volunteer groups, wildlife refuges, historic sites, museums, and water trails throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed. It also provides assistance to the critical volunteer groups that have stepped forward to support the Gateway sites.

The network ties these sites together to provide meaningful experiences and to encourage individual citizens to invest their own time and energy in the clean up of the Chesapeake Bay. Since 2000, the network has grown to include 156 gateways in six States and the District of Columbia. That is why the Park Service has repeatedly praised the Gateways program.

In September of 2004, the Service released a special resource study recommending that Gateways be a permanent Park Service program. It goes on to say that an enhanced version of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network would be the most effective and efficient way for the National Park Service to help protect and tell the story of the Chesapeake Bay.

In 2005, the White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation recognized Gateways as ''a cooperative conservation success story.'' And therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we act now to reauthorize this program so that the network and its partners can continue to educate residents of the Chesapeake Bay watershed about the natural, cultural, historic and recreational sites throughout the bay region, and how their communities relate directly to the health of our largest estuary and a national treasure, the Chesapeake Bay.

By maintaining the network and providing access to these sites, we can help develop the next generation of environmental stewards, which is one of the best ways to truly save the bay.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, before I give my opening statement, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 5540, the Chesapeake Bay Watertrails Network bill.

While I understand the value of the bill we're discussing today and I commend my colleague, Congressman ROB WITTMAN from Virginia, for the hard work he has done on this bill, his efforts will be all for nothing if we do not address the energy crises we're facing in the United States today.

In my district of coastal South Carolina, my constituents are dealing with the same problems as those who live and work along the Chesapeake Bay. Just as the watermen of the Chesapeake Bay cannot afford to bring their boats out of the dock to catch blue crab due to the all-time-record-high diesel prices, my constituents in our fishing communities cannot bring their shrimp boats on the water to catch shrimp due to the high cost of diesel fuel.

Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible for our Democrat colleagues to continue obstructing responsible energy legislation that will help our energy crisis from being considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we currently depend on foreign—and in many cases unfriendly—nations for over 60 percent of our Nation's energy needs. This is a serious national security concern for my constituents in coastal South Carolina.

On behalf of all the recreational and commercial fishermen, the shrimpers, the tour boat operators, and the recreational boaters in coastal South Carolina, I would like to ask the Democrat majority why we are not voting today on the many pieces of legislation that have been introduced that would open up domestic sources of energy and help them get back on the water immediately?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield 3 minutes to Representative SCOTT, who is a leader on the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Task Force.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his hard work on this bill and for his leadership on the Chesapeake Bay issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5540, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Reauthorization Act. I commend my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for introducing the bill, which will help further the Chesapeake Bay's restoration.

I serve as cochair of the bipartisan Chesapeake Bay Task Force, and I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Over 400 years ago, the first permanent English settlers of North America sailed into the Chesapeake Bay and settled on the banks of the James River at Jamestown, Virginia. Although the Chesapeake Bay played a significant role in the founding of this great Nation, the bay is often one of the most overlooked natural and economic estuaries in the United States.

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed touches 41 congressional districts in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I have been actively involved in ensuring that the resources are available to protect and restore the

Chesapeake Bay since my days in the Virginia General Assembly. When I served in the Virginia House of Delegates, I was a member of a joint Virginia/Maryland legislative task force that first recommended in 1980 a multi-State commission to address bay issues. And that multi-State commission continues to recognize the Chesapeake Bay as a vitally important regional and national treasure.

H.R. 5540 will reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network, which is the National Park Service component of the greater Chesapeake Bay Program. The goal of this network is to conserve the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the bay for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations through grants, technical assistance to parks, volunteer groups, wildlife refuges, historical sites, museums and water trails throughout the bay watershed. The network ties all of these sites and projects together to actively engage citizens to help clean up the Chesapeake Bay. Since 2000, the network has grown to include 156 gateways in six States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership. And I want to take the opportunity to thank our new Virginia colleague, Mr. WITTMAN, for his long-time leadership and activity in Chesapeake Bay issues. I commend the Committee on Natural Resources for reporting the bill favorably to the full House and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI).

Mr. SALI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on H.R. 5540, permanent authorization for the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

As my colleague pointed out, today's bill would permanently reauthorize these Federal funds and remove the $3 million annual cap.

When we held a hearing on this bill in committee, the administration testified that there have been some successes with this program, and consequently Federal funds are no longer necessary to subsidize this partnership. So I rise with serious concerns over the permanent authorization of this program.

In committee, I offered an amendment that would strike a compromise limiting this authorization to 5 years. Today's legislation, however, proposes to put the taxpayer, including taxpayers in Idaho, on the hook permanently funding this program, and that in spite of the administration's claim that no Federal funds are even needed.

This comes on the heels of the vote of this body we just took approving the largest tax increase in American history, a tax increase of some $683 billion, as well as action raising the national debt to an all-time record high of $10.5 trillion. This, together with skyrocketing fuel prices and increases in fuel cost, has the American taxpayer, the American family, and everyone across this country, including my great home State of Idaho, under a tremendous burden.

Idahoans are considering the reality that they may not have enough money to pay their bills, let alone enjoy the majestic beauty of Idaho's outdoors this summer. Notably, however, this is not a problem limited to weekend excursions or vacations. The price pinch is hitting folks who have a job, but wonder if they can afford the fuel to get to work, those people that have called my office to complain. In addition, schools across this country are cutting programs and moving to four-day school weeks to address rising fuel costs.

People being hit the hardest by these high gas prices don't even drive, they're our parents and our grandparents, those seniors who rely on services like Meals on Wheels to deliver the food they eat each day. In Idaho, it was reported on Tuesday that five volunteers had quit because they couldn't afford the gas they needed to complete their routes and deliver meals to seniors.

This is a moral issue, an issue which for many senior citizens and low-income, hardworking families affects their access to food as well as to education and even doctors. It's time for Congress to act on that moral obligation, to make provision so the needs of the poor and the elderly will be met. It's time for Congress to lift the restrictions on America's energy-rich public lands, to responsibly increase exploration for production of American crude, and to increase American supply and bring down prices of gas and diesel.

Increasing the supply of crude oil and ultimately lowering its price is the single most effective thing Congress can do to lower gas prices. Today, 73 percent of every dollar we pay for gasoline is the price of producing crude oil. Almost two-thirds of it comes from foreign countries, including OPEC nations and dictatorships like Hugo Chavez's Venezuela.

Congress could vote today to unlock huge American onshore oil and natural gas reserves on public lands in the United States. In a study just released by the Bureau of Land Management, while onshore public lands in the United States are estimated to contain 31 billion barrels of oil and 231 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, some 60 percent of these lands are completely closed to leasing because of the actions of Congress.

□ 1330

Once such example is the oil reserves in Alaska, where in 1980 President Jimmy Carter set aside 2,000 acres specifically for energy production. According to the U.S. Energy and Information Administration, the mean estimate of technically recoverable oil on those section 1002 lands is 10.4 billion barrels. That's more than twice the proven oil reserves in all of Texas and almost half of the total U.S. proven reserves of 21 billion barrels. The recoverable oil within these lands represents a possible 50 percent increase in total U.S. proven reserves.

Congress must act to lift the restrictions on America's energy-rich public lands and increase exploration and production of American crude oil and natural gas. We can do this in an environmentally friendly manner. But we have to act and we have to act now. Of that there can be no dispute.

With those pressing needs before us, why would Congress act on this bill to give a permanent authorization and increase the amount of money to go to the subject of this legislation when the administration has told us that no Federal funds are even needed? Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to note a couple of things. First, that this is a bipartisan bill, and I want to salute, as Representative SCOTT did, the partnership of Congressman WITTMAN from Virginia in helping to marshal support for this bill.

I also want to point out that the annual appropriation process will determine the funds that go to support this authorization. Otherwise, the claims that it's sort of breaking through the cap or not are not correct.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), who is another leader with respect to the Chesapeake Bay and co-chairs the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Task Force.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for taking the initiative on this important piece of legislation and for all his leadership in our effort to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and to Mr. WITTMAN for joining him in this bipartisan effort.

Before I say a few words about this bill, I do think it's important to point out that this body has now passed numerous pieces of legislation to try to address the energy crisis and the rise in gas prices around this country, including legislation to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by diversifying our energy portfolio. One of the things we passed out of this body to do that was to say we shouldn't be giving taxpayer subsidies, giveaways, to the oil and gas industry at a time when they're already making record profits and Americans are facing record prices at the pump. We should instead be using those resources to invest in renewable energy and energy efficiency. That's the direction this country needs to go.

The President was in Saudi Arabia recently having tea with the leaders of the Saudi Royal Family asking them to reduce prices. They said no. We need a long-term strategy. We passed that out of this House, and, unfortunately, the President said he's going to veto it

because he wants to keep giving those subsidies to the oil and gas industry rather than taking a new and different approach to our energy crisis. That's what this House did. Unfortunately, the President continues to block those efforts.

Now, we do need, as a country, to protect our beautiful and vital natural resources like the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay, as my colleague Mr. SARBANES has pointed out, is the Nation's largest estuary. It is a national treasure; it's a natural treasure. And that's what this bill is about because the Chesapeake Bay is currently under assault from a whole host of sources of pollution. Point sources of pollution like the kind of pollution that comes out of a sewage pipe when it's not being adequately treated before it gets into the tributaries, like the Potomac River, the Anacostia River, the Susquehanna River; and nonpoint sources of pollution, the kind of pollution that washes off our driveways from oil dripping from cars or the pollution that comes off of fields that are under agricultural production.

Now, not long ago we passed in this legislature, in this Congress, the farm bill, and that farm bill provided vital additional help to our farmers, who are good stewards of our land. It provided them with vital new tools to help prevent that kind of nonpoint source pollution. And that will give them a vital boost in the years ahead in our effort to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and meet the goals that have been set.

But the other key element to sustain that support is to engage the public. And we mean not just the Department of Agriculture but the other departments and agencies of the United States Government like the Department of Interior and the National Park Service, who has played such an important role in raising the understanding of the public that we all need to be part of this effort to clean up the Chesapeake Bay.

In our State of Maryland, when you go down your roads and you see the systems where the water dumps into the pipes to take it out to rivers, it says this drains into the Chesapeake Bay. We have done a good job of trying to raise that public support. But this system, this whole effort, the Gateways effort that we are talking about in this bill, has also been a vital component of that to let people know what the Chesapeake Bay means to our region and to our country.

And it would be very shortsighted to end this program. What we need to do instead is to say, as has been said by others, that this program has worked in raising that public awareness, enlisting the support of students and adults, young children and senior citizens in this big effort to protect this vital estuary. And this Gateways program has been a very important component in that effort. We need to keep it going, and we need to make it permanent.

I salute my colleague from Maryland, JOHN SARBANES, for his tremendous effort in this region and for reaching out and making this a bipartisan effort along with Mr. WITTMAN, and I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland, the other gentleman from Maryland, for working on this project, the Gateways and Watertrails system. It is a system, Mr. Speaker, that provides, as the gentleman from Maryland described, public education about the ecology of the Chesapeake Bay and what an individual can do not only to enjoy the landscape, not only to explore and paddle the landscape, but to understand the landscape.

Now, a lot of discussion here recently has been about energy, fossil fuels, should we drill for more oil? The issue of the Gateways is about education. A quote from Norman Cousins, the editor of the Saturday Evening Post some 30 or 40 years ago, said, ''Knowledge is the solvent for danger.'' So let's focus on a little bit of information, knowledge. The United States can never become energy independent if it continues to be dependent on fossil fuel. There is simply not enough here. We peaked in the 1970s. Energy from fossil fuels has created the situation we now call ''climate change'' or ''global warming.'' Global warming creates a transition for the Chesapeake Bay. This is not a geologic transition. This is not a natural forces transition from a changing ecology. This is a human-forced transition for the Chesapeake Bay that will continue to degrade the water. What can we do about it? One of the things is a source of education, a source of knowledge.

The Gateways program involves the public in understanding some amazing things. Number one, the geology of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. Why is the Chesapeake Bay here? Why is the Delmarva Peninsula here? An understanding of how geologic forces created this magnificent estuary over millions of years.

Number two, Gateways helps people understand the ecological evolution of the Chesapeake Bay. Why are there forests here? Why is there a whole range of song birds or water foul or marine life? It is a magnificent place unknown anywhere else on the continent but the Chesapeake Bay. The ecological evolution of the Chesapeake Bay.

And the other thing the Gateways program does is help us understand human history, when the first Native Americans got here about 10,000 years ago, to John Smith 400 years ago, to the transition that we see today in the Chesapeake Bay. The Gateways and Watertrails program is an educational program.

To understand the transition that the bay is now going through is not a geological change. It's not an ecological change. It's that human activity is not compatible with nature's design. And this program helps us understand those views so we can be a part of the solution and not part of the problem.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for his career's work on behalf of the environment and the Chesapeake Bay and thank him for his support.

Mr. Speaker, it is my extreme pleasure now to yield 1 minute to the majority leader, another champion of the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I had the great privilege of being elected to the Maryland State Senate in 1966. There were two other individuals—there were a lot of other individuals, but there were two other individuals who were elected with me. The other two were elected to the House of Delegates. One of those was BENJAMIN CARDIN, who is now Maryland's junior United States Senator. The other individual elected that had same year was Paul Sarbanes.

Paul Sarbanes served for 4 years, then was elected to the House in 1970, served in the House for 6 years, and in 1976 was elected to the United States Senate. I was in the State Senate and had the privilege of working hard for his election that year. He served longer than any other individual representing our State, and one of the programs that he fostered was the program that we are reauthorizing today.

He can swell with pride not only on the substance of this legislation but also on the fact that his extraordinary son, who now represents a district that he used to represent, the Third Congressional District of our State, is now sponsoring and shepherding this legislation through the House of Representatives.

My colleagues have spoken about the substance of this legislation. John Smith in 1607 came up a bay that was pristine and essentially unspoiled. In the next 400 years, man, in his somewhat irresponsibility, has not husbanded that asset that God gave us as he should or as she should.

This legislation, sponsored by Senator Sarbanes many years ago, now shepherded by his son, Congressman JOHN SARBANES, was an effort to ensure that we understood what Congressman GILCHREST talked about and the importance of this asset we call the Chesapeake Bay, not just to Maryland, not just to Pennsylvania or Delaware or Virginia, but to our country. An extraordinary ecological resource.

So I rise simply not to recite what my colleagues have already recited but to congratulate JOHN SARBANES, to say how proud we are, as I know he is as well, of the extraordinary service given to our State by his father, Senator

Paul Sarbanes, the original author of this legislation, and to thank him for carrying this torch forward on behalf of a resource that is priceless, as the ad says.

So I thank him for yielding this time, congratulate him for his efforts, and urge my colleagues to strongly support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 5540, legislation introduced by Representative JOHN SARBANES which seeks to permanently reauthorize the National Park Service's Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Program.

Those of us fortunate to live in this region have been blessed with a multitude of magnificent natural resources, not the least of which is our Nation's largest estuary—the Chesapeake Bay, a body of water that has played such an important role in shaping the cultural, economic, political, and social history of our region.

Unfortunately, the Chesapeake Bay of 2008 is not the pristine body that Captain John Smith first charted on his expeditions some 400 years ago. Indeed, earlier this year, the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program released the Chesapeake Bay 2007 Health and Restoration Assessment which found the overall health of the bay remains significantly impaired.

In the 110th Congress, I have joined with my colleagues in successfully advocating legislation to improve the health of the bay.

We've strengthened the ability of the Army Corps of Engineers to undertake bay oyster restoration, water pollution control, and environmental infrastructure projects in the 2007 WRDA bill. And, we've included approximately $438 million in mandatory funding to help Chesapeake Bay watershed farmers in their ongoing efforts to implement practices to prevent runoff and control shoreline erosion.

H.R. 5540, the legislation we consider today, takes another important step forward in our efforts by permanently authorizing a program that has already done so much to raise awareness of the fragile health of the bay and directly engage our region's citizens and visitors to take an active role in fulfilling our shared goal of restoring the Chesapeake.

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network, which includes more than 156 museums, State parks, wildlife refuges and other sites in 6 States and the District of Columbia, was established to link together these wonderful places in the hopes of enabling visitors to better understand and appreciate the role they can play in the bay's survival.

The program enables sites to compete for grant funding—which must be fully matched—for projects that will help conserve, restore and interpret their roles in the bay's natural, cultural, and social history.

The Gateways Program is a critical component to fostering a commitment among our citizens to restore the bay and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So here we are debating a bill under a rule which we all know should have best been under a suspension. It's not a perfect bill. If they accept an amendment later on, it will be a perfect bill. But for any imperfections that are here, this bill has far better drafting, far better intent, far more bipartisanship than perhaps some illogical partisan gamesmanship that produced vociferous debate under suspensions yesterday.

But one would wonder why we are taking time on the floor to consider a bill which was passed out of the Resources Committee by a voice vote and a bill in which I intend to vote in favor? What is it about this bill that is actually so important that we are talking about it rather than other more pressing national issues such as an energy crisis? Why does such a relatively innocuous bill take precedence over finding solutions to gas prices that are now around $4 a gallon and probably going higher?

□ 1345

It must be that this bill accomplishes something so dramatically important that we are foolish to consider other issues, such as national security or our deepening dependence on foreign oil.

This bill deals with an area that includes no Federal waters. There are no Federal assets that are a part of it. It could easily be done with an inter-local cooperating agreement, which many States in the West use. Instead, the Federal Government is involved in that. Despite that fact, I still intend on voting for this particular bill.

This is a recreational bill. This bill provides moneys for trails, maps, signs, and all the nice things in the quest of healthy outdoor recreation in the Chesapeake Bay region. This program was originally authorized in 1998 as a 5-year program, and then reauthorized for another 5 years in 2002. And now the authorization, not for the program but for the appropriations for this program, are set to expire and the proponents are offering this legislation to authorize funding this program for eternity.

There will be no caps on the funds that can be appropriated for this program, no time limit. Maybe this is such a big priority for the Democratic majority because the National Park Service testified this program has received $7.7 million in earmarks since its creation. Maybe the Democrats wish to preserve a conduit for earmarks masquerading as a recreation bill. This is what takes precedence over national security and the energy crisis here on the floor of the House.

Yet, I don't object to the earmarks that were made for this particular bill, even though some of them are different. Part of the money that goes to this particular bill or has been earmarked in the past has been $20,000 dollars for a Native American interpretive brochure. I don't oppose that. Funds go into this for a Dino-Mania! Camp-In so that people can delve into the world of dinosaurs as your family spends the night in a Virginia Living Museum, explore how big some dinosaurs were, find out what might have caused their extinction, and it also comes with an evening snack and a breakfast.

My favorite, the Tree Spirits. The ancients believed the trees had spirits, and if you look hard enough, you see them in this woody bark. This workshop will focus on the old beliefs to trees, their meaning, their practical purposes. Fathers and sons will join the rangers on a hike as we scavenge the materials to make our own Tree Spirits for you all.

I actually don't object to that. I still intend to vote for this particular bill.

Nature hikes, picnics in the park, learning about ecology are causes to champion, and I'd be happy to support those things, but this bill doesn't solve the major threat to those activities. How will one be able to afford to get to these outdoor locations, enjoy these earmarks when the gas is too expensive to allow them to travel anywhere. At this point, Americans are not working to live, they are working to pay for the gas to get to work and back home. With gas at $4 a gallon, weekend family visits to the Chesapeake are becoming less and less of a possibility.

Unfortunately, our unwillingness to address the dramatic spike in energy prices today hurts American families, not only by putting some recreational activities beyond their reach, but by wrecking the household budget for basics, such as food, electricity, and medicine. Some people talk about our goal should be to get revenge on companies that produce energy, but such a program does not add one barrel of energy to meet the demands of the present time.

The Resources Committee, from which this legislation originated, is the same committee that has jurisdiction over domestic resources, resources on public lands, such as the Outer Continental Shelf and ANWR. It's past time for the Resource Committee to stop in its quest to become merely a ''Recreation Committee.'' This country has locked up more resources in America than other nations have in their entire country. America is blessed with a wealth of natural resources and historically we have had the unique ability to develop and continuously improve the technology needed to use these resources.

We have faced and overcome bigger challenges in the past, but we in Congress must act now to meet the critical energy needs of today. We need to stop creating obstacles to domestic energy production so the American people can get to work and solve the problem. That should be the priority of the people, that should be our priority as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. How many minutes remain?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both sides have 15 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am gratified that Representative BISHOP intends to vote for the bill. I did want to point out that this is about as far as from an earmark as you can get. The projects under this particular

Gateways program are determined at the discretion and based on application to the agency by the National Park Service.

At this time, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to another champion of the Chesapeake Bay and someone who understands the importance of reaching out to partners throughout the watershed, and that is the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding. I want to thank him for his tremendous leadership, outstanding leadership with regard to such a critical issue.

As I listened to the last speaker from the other side, I could not help but think about how many people in our country simply want to have an opportunity to have a little life brought to their lives. This is not a major measure, but it is one that will bring spice to life.

We are very blessed to have the Chesapeake Bay. We are very blessed to have this program. When you think about my favorite saying, and that is, That we did not inherit our environment from our parents but we borrowed it from our children, I think this program goes a long ways to making sure that we leave an earth better than the one we received when we came upon the earth.

This Gateways program and its reauthorization are very important because through its partners it can continue to educate people about the natural, cultural, historic, and recreational sites throughout the bay region and about how their communities relate directly to the health of our largest estuary and national treasure, the Chesapeake Bay.

And so what will happen as a result of this is that children will have an opportunity to learn about what part the bay plays in their lives and how important it is and, believe it or not, some of them even being exposed to the bay to really understand that it is indeed a very, very wonderful feature of their State and their backyard.

So, again, I congratulate Mr. SARBANES and all of those who have anything to do with making this happen. I think it's very important, as I said before, that we bring spice to the lives of our citizens, and this bill goes a very, very long way in doing that.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the newest member of the Virginia delegation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding time to me on this important issue.

I rise in support of H.R. 5540, legislation to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. I represent Virginia's First Congressional District, which is largely defined by the Chesapeake Bay. My constituents live, work, and play in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. My district also includes many components of the Gateways Network, including historic Yorktown, Colonial Williamsburg, historic Jamestown, all the way to Washington's birthplace in Westmoreland County.

This is a fantastic effort here that, as you have heard, was spawned by lots of great ideas and leaders in the past, and one of those that was part of this effort was the late Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis. She did a tremendous amount of work to put together the ideas to help in creating this network. She had a passion for the Chesapeake Bay and all the assets that are there in the Chesapeake Bay and passion to make sure people knew about those so they could appreciate the bay, they could appreciate the culture that it brings to our region, that folks could appreciate the natural resources there, and that they could understand how all of those parts are interrelated to understand the importance of the bay to our region.

The Gateways Network links together over 100 parks, museums, wildlife refuges, and other cultural and historic sites into a comprehensive system so that people can understand it and so that they realize the parts of the things that make the Chesapeake Bay important.

This Gateways program connects visitors with the natural beauty, rich history, and the recreational opportunities there within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. That's extraordinarily important so that folks can make the effort to understand the bay and be part of the effort to preserve and protect the bay.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, my constituents, like everybody else, are dealing with the cost of rising prices for gasoline. These increasing cost are impacting their budgets and cutting into their planned summer vacations. I am strongly in support of this bill. But I do join Mr. BISHOP and many of my colleagues to call on Congress to take action on a comprehensive plan to rein in gas prices.

We should take a number of steps to promote American-made energy. We need to encourage next-generation technologies, we need to promote conservation, we need to look at bridging from the present and the use of fossil fuels to the future. But, let's face it folks, fossil fuels is going to be part of that bridge to the future. So we need to make sure that we have them available for us to get to this next generation of energy.

We need to make sure that we, as part of that, look at our dependence on foreign oil, while keeping in mind the environment that we must protect in all parts of that puzzle in creating a comprehensive energy policy.

Unfortunately, unless gas prices come down soon, I am concerned that families that may want to come to the Chesapeake Bay and enjoy the Chesapeake Bay watershed and enjoy the Chesapeake Bay network may not have the opportunity to do so. That means it's incumbent upon us to put together a responsible, comprehensive energy policy the make sure that folks can indeed enjoy the Chesapeake Bay, enjoy the network that this program provides so they can understand the importance of the different cultural and environmental and economic aspects of the Chesapeake Bay.

So let's not miss this opportunity as we work to extend this particular network system to make sure that we also use this as a conduit to talk about energy policy, energy issues that are important to this Nation and to the Chesapeake Bay. Let's face it, the bay these days is being affected by the impact of man, and energy is part of that. So let's make sure that across the board we address these particular issues and make sure that we provide some relief to our hardworking American families that are dealing with these high energy prices. Again, it needs to be a long-term energy solution to make sure that we are able to address this in a way that is important for our future.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank, again, Congressman WITTMAN for his support and his lifelong commitment to the Chesapeake Bay.

Congressman DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER has been a champion of the Chesapeake Bay throughout his career, earlier in his career as county executive for Baltimore County, Maryland, and now as a Congressman from the Second District of Maryland. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I thank you for yielding. Congressman SARBANES, thank you for your advocacy. The Chesapeake Bay is so important to our region, to our country.

I do want to respond though to my colleagues on the other side about the issue of oil prices. We are talking about the Chesapeake Bay, which is very important to our country. We all know that the oil prices and energy is a very important issue. Believe me, we have had 8 years trying to deal with that issue. And we will continue to deal with it because we know people are suffering. But we are talking about the Chesapeake Bay today.

The Chesapeake Bay is very important to those of us who live in the Chesapeake Bay. We feel that we are stewards of the Chesapeake Bay. There are 16 million people that live within the watershed of the Chesapeake Bay, and that is very relevant. It's very relevant that we generate millions of dollars in seafood from the Chesapeake Bay. It's very relevant that our citizens who work around and within the Chesapeake Bay are also paid money for their jobs.

But, more importantly, it's also about an issue of the environment too. The watershed. Right now, the Chesapeake Bay is having problems. We have to deal with those problems. This bill is a very important bill because if we don't move forward with this bill, we will not be able to educate our peers, 16

million people who, unfortunately, don't understand that when you pour a toxic substance down the drain, that it could go to the Chesapeake Bay.

We need to educate our farmers to let them know that we need to have no-till farming, make sure that the fertilizer don't go to the Chesapeake Bay and kill the fish and the crabs and the oysters that are generated through the Chesapeake Bay.

So I feel very, very strongly that we need to pass this bill. It's a relevant bill. We will deal with the issue of energy. We need to. We can't keep relying on other countries for our oil. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of reauthorizing this critical program to continue and expand the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network and make sure that the treasures of the Chesapeake Bay are preserved for future generations.

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

□ 1400

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of other points I wanted to make. First of all, I am pleased to indicate that we have a letter that came to Chairman RAHALL and to Ranking Member YOUNG from the six Governors of the six States that make up the watershed and from the Mayor of the District of Columbia. So that is the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York and West Virginia, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia, who have written to indicate their very, very strong support for this legislation.

JUNE 5, 2008.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington DC.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAHALL AND RANKING MEMBER YOUNG: We are writing to express our strong support for H.R. 5540, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act.

The Chesapeake Gateways Program (''program'') plays a vitally important role in our efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay by improving public access, enhancing public education, and fostering citizen stewardship of the many natural, cultural and historical resources of the Bay region. Since its establishment in 1998, more than 150 sites and water trails have been designated as Gateways throughout the watershed in Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia, New York, and the District of Columbia. These Gateway sites are helping to promote a greater understanding and appreciation of the Chesapeake Bay and a greater commitment to the Bay's restoration. The relatively modest federal investment in the program has leveraged substantial matching contributions—both financial and in-kind—from our States, community organizations and other partners. For these reasons, among others, the program was recognized by the White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation in 2005 as a cooperative conservation success story.

However, there is still a tremendous need for improved on-site interpretation, enhanced public access, and additional strategies to engage visitors and residents alike in the Chesapeake Bay restoration and protection effort. In 2004, the National Park Service completed a Chesapeake Bay Special Resources Study which recommended, as its preferred alternative, that the Gateways Program be made permanent and expanded. The Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrail Network Continuing Authorization Act would codify this recommendation as well as enable implementation and fulfillment of the original vision for an expansive Gateways and Watertrails Network. It is critical that the Congress reauthorize this important program and reject efforts to weaken the legislation or sunset the Network. Doing so will pay significant dividends in the years ahead by helping to preserve and enhance our nation's largest estuary.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

MARTIN O'MALLEY,
Governor, Maryland.
TIMOTHY M. KAINE,
Governor, Virginia.
RUTH ANN MINNER,
Governor, Delaware.
EDWARD G. RENDELL,
Governor, Pennsylvania.
DAVID A. PATERSON,
Governor, New York.
JOE MANCHIN III,
Governor, West Virginia.
MAYOR ADRIAN FENTY,
Mayor, District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to just mention one site, because we talked about the 156 sites and I wanted to bring that to life a little bit. The Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, which is not far from here, located in Maryland between Baltimore and Washington, is the oldest and really only National Wildlife Refuge that conducts wildlife research. It is 13,000 acres. It is the largest contiguous block of forest in the Baltimore-Washington corridor and it is the site of a tremendous amount of environmental education.

Not too long ago we had the opportunity in connection with some other environmental education legislation that I have sponsored to do a field hearing at the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, and in the morning we had six schools represented from Maryland that came there with busloads of children to participate in activities of environmental education. If you could have seen the look on their faces and how excited they were to be outdoors and engaged in this kind of learning you would have I think been very, very impressed with the resource that exists there.

That is just one site of 156 sites across the bay watershed that are providing a tremendous opportunity to our citizens to connect not just to the environment, but to the heritage and cultural history of this area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, if you recall back to the movie ''The Natural,'' if you remember there is that one wonderful scene where this mythical team, the New York Knights, have called in a psychologist to talk to the team to try to get them out of their losing slump. And as they are sitting there, talking to these ballplayers he says, ''The mind is a strange thing, men. We must begin by asking, what is losing? Losing is a disease that is as contagious as syphilis. Losing is a disease as contagious as the bubonic plague, attacking one, but infecting all. But curable. Now I want you to imagine you are on a vast ocean. You are on a ship at sea gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking.''

In that scene Roy Hobbs, now in disgust, breaks out of that and leaves this therapy session, because he recognizes that the solution to their losing season is not sitting there talking philosophically about it, but actually going out on the field and doing something.

We today in the issue of energy are in the mode of simply talking about it. All we are doing is coming here and talking about these theoretical approaches, gently rocking, gently rocking. We are talking about building straw men that we can then knock about, whether it is big oil or a so-called bubble, or yesterday someone said the reason we are paying so much at the pump is because of Enron. Ken Lay has somehow reached up from the dead and somehow hiked up the price of gasoline. And our only solution to this entire situation so far is we have passed a piece of legislation that allows lawyers to go out and sue OPEC, in the hopes that maybe they might give us some more energy money.

It is almost as if what we are trying to say is we are going to have everyone sit down and listen to a psychologist that will try and convince us that freezing in the dark can be an enjoyable thing if we just have the right attitude towards it, because losing is simply a mind game and it is contagious.

What Roy Hobbs did is the exact opposite. He left that stuff. He went out on the field, he knocked the cover off the ball, and when they actually started doing something, that is when this mythical New York Knights team started to win.

If we want to solve the problem of energy for American citizens, we have got to stop, quit talking about it and our secret plans and coming up with these mythical enemies which we want to attack, and we simply have to go out and do something. And that means production now. We cannot sit here simply idly by while American people are suffering without actually doing something in reality. And that means yes on conservation, but it also means we have to increase production. If we don't do that, recreational opportunities like this particular bill have no purpose and have no meaning. There is nothing left for them to do.

If I could give a few statements that have been given by people who live in this area and who will be impacted by this particular bill and what they are

saying about the energy issues and how it impacts and affects them.

''Repercussions,'' a quote here, ''from the escalating price of fuel are felt everywhere. Sportsfishing is no exception. Neither is the business of chartering, headboating or commercial fishing. The same applies to businesses associated with fishing. One big tackle shop proprietor told the other day, 'I have four people and myself working now and not a single customer in the shop. Haven't seen one in 10 minutes.'''

''Alex DeMetrick reports gas prices are soaring, having an impact on those who depend on boats and the Bay to make a living. Naming a work boat the 'Last Penny,' which may have been a stab at some kind of subtle humor, it is striking a little too close to reality at the fuel docks around the bay as diesel is now at $4.50 a gallon and climbing. 'Gas is doubling and the price of seafood is going down,' said one of the watermen who works there. 'Working the water takes constant moving, but with crabs spotty and fuel high, watermen are trying to conserve. They are hurting us bad,' he says. 'It's almost double in the past year, so it is taking a right good bite out of us,' says another one of the watermen who works there.''

Over at Dredge Harbor, New Jersey, another one of those people who work there said high gas prices are also affecting his customers. ''Instead of taking four trips down the Chesapeake Bay, they now might take two trips this year, and most of their customers use their boats as homes afloat so they can conserve as much fuel as possible. High prices are somewhat affecting the sales.''

Another one of the reports from this area, ''Elevated prices are causing some charter fishing captains to want to jump overboard.'' As one said who owns a yacht yard, he is selling gas for $4.20 per gallon at his fuel dock, and he has noticed fewer and fewer small power boats on the water.

What we are simply doing as we go along with this, there are other people that simply say, ''Now I can see no way of getting over the hump of fuel costs. We have got good fishing, but we have fewer and fewer customers. With gas prices going this way, we are simply losing the opportunity of using this resource for the purpose in which it was therefore designed. High costs not only affect the fishing industry on the water, local businesses are also feeling the gas price pinch. A local tackle shop simply said, 'I still got people working there and no one is coming in there.' Gas prices are dipping into his resources and his ability to make a living.''

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. One of the things we have to deal with if we are actually going to deal in a proper way with the reauthorization of this entire program is to understand that if we are going to have these types of opportunities, either for people to recreate, people to learn, people to enjoy, people to enhance their entire environment, we have got to be able to get them there. Kind of like today. We seem to be needing to get people up from the White House, in which case they are walking because we can't afford the fuel to put them on buses to get them here. Therefore, things change because of those circumstances, and it is one of those concepts in which we are working.

If we really need to be serious about this, we have to realize that our energy crisis today is limiting the ability to experience this type of an environment, this type of attitude and this process. And if we want to make full use of the Chesapeake Bay resources that are there, we have to make sure that real people have the opportunity of going there and experiencing it. Because when we talk about oil prices, we are not simply talking about some concept, some ethereal project that is out there. We are talking about real people, how they live, how their jobs work, how they get to the chance to recreate and make their lives fuller and better. And that has to be an integral part of this discussion, ought to be an integral part. In fact, it is a more significant part of this discussion on a bill that still is a decent bill that should have been done as a suspension, not as a rule here on the floor.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, a couple of points.

First of all, the gentleman from Utah spoke to the livelihood of people who work on the Chesapeake Bay, but the biggest threat to those who make their living on the Chesapeake Bay is the decline in the health of the Chesapeake Bay and the fisheries in particular that are in the Chesapeake Bay. So if we have the interests of those people at heart, we ought to be committing ourselves wholeheartedly to this continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, because it is designed to enhance and improve and protect over the long term the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

To address another point, one of the reasons that the Democratic majority has been so steadfast in urging the pursuit of alternatives to fossil fuels in terms of energy sources is to reduce our dependence there, which obviously could go a long way towards the concern over fuel prices and gas prices. But another reason is because it will reduce these greenhouse gas emissions, which, again, impact the environment. If we don't take steps to do that, then there is not going to be any environment for us to enjoy.

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Program, it has been alluded to the fact that this is noncontroversial bill, that it should have come up on suspension. I agree. The minority resisted our desire to have it permanently authorized, and that is why we are in the process we are in today. But that permanent authorization I think is very much a part of the strong statement that we are seeking to make to the citizens in the watershed and to the many millions of visitors who come to the watershed every year, that our national government stands steadfast in this partnership with our citizenry.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I would still like to try and reemphasize as we are talking about this particular bill is this bill deals with the reauthorization of the appropriations concept. This is not about cleaning up the environment. Several of the speakers who have spoken today talked about the necessity of environmental protection. This is not the EPA's program. This is a wholly separate issue and a separate concept.

One of the things that we should keep in mind is the purpose and the concept of an authorizing committee, is an authorizing committee should be reviewing what we are trying to do at periodic bases. That is our purpose.

One of the things in this particular bill that is a problem, is problematic to the future, is that it rejects the ability of Congress to take periodic reviews of this particular program. When it was first initiated in 1998, there was a 5-year statute in which we would then review it. In 2002 we reviewed it. We are now looking at a bill that I think we are all going to agree is needed to go forward, but there still should be some kind of review.

It should not be forgotten that when we voted this particular bill in the Resource Committee on a voice vote, there were six other bills at that time similar in scope, similar in fashion, similar in funding, but each of them had a periodic review attached to it. So a bill by Mr. UDALL, a bill by Ms. BALDWIN, a bill by Mr. BILBRAY, by Mrs. BONO MACK and Ms. BORDALLO, all of them had the responsibility of allowing Congress to do what it is supposed to do and try to take some kind of review at regular basic intervals.

That still is the wisest approach to it. It is one of the few flaws that I actually find in this particular bill, and it is one of those flaws that probably should be addressed.

We talked about the kinds of grants that have been awarded in the past. There are $7.7 million worth of earmarks not asked by the agency that have been added to this. We have added grants in certain years that have been, for example, $34,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Marine Museum, $21,000 for the Stratford Hall Plantation; $12,000 for the Mason Neck State Park; and $18,000 for the Annapolis Maritime Museum. I am not objecting to these as being inappropriate. In fact, I could probably argue they were appropriate and they were needful. They are useful. But I am

saying that what Congress should do if we actually fulfill our responsibility is make sure that we look at these on a periodic basis, and that should be part of the statute. That is what we commonly do in most pieces of legislation, and it all should be part of this legislation at the same time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 1 minute. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one more time, if we can try and emphasize the point of this.

This is still a decent bill. There are a few flaws, but it is a decent bill and I support it going forward with this particular bill. There are still some changes I would like to see in that bill.

Also, we must realize, though, that if we are talking about the overall use of this bill, we are taking time on the floor when we should be talking about much more significant and vital issues than this particular bill.

Having a rule on this bill is a strange use of the time of Congress, especially when there are much more significant issues that need to be debated and discussed at this particular time. And even though I plan on voting for this bill, it is one of those things that is still sad that we are as a Congress not addressing the core issues for which the people have sent us here and not looking at what should be the core issues for which the people have sent us here.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, again, I am gratified the gentleman from Utah plans to vote for this bill. I do note that the reason that we are here, the reason this was under a rule in part was to allow the gentleman to present an amendment, which I guess is going to be coming next.

In terms of safeguards, the appropriations process provides that on an annual basis in terms of looking at the program and deciding what kind of support ought to be given to it. The permanent authorization is about making a statement, making a statement to the citizen partners that we are asking to step up and be part of this effort to preserve the Chesapeake Bay.

The way we are going to save the bay, the way we are going to enhance its health over time is not by turning it over to experts, but by taking ownership at the community level, having every citizen understand what they can do in their own backyard, working with nonprofit groups, working with museums, with wildlife refuges, with historic sites, et cetera, to stake a claim in the future of the bay. And that is what the Chesapeake Bay Gateways program is all about; it is a gateway to this national treasure, 156 sites, 1,500 miles of water trails, and a tremendous investment on the part of ordinary citizens in the future of this national treasure. That is why we sought a permanent authorization. That is why we continue to seek it. That is at the heart of H.R. 5540, and I urge my colleagues to support it when it comes to the vote.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, I would like to commend our colleague, Representative JOHN SARBANES, for his tireless efforts on behalf of the pending legislation.

This bill is a simple, straightforward measure that would permanently authorize the highly successful Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, which would otherwise expire at the end of this fiscal year.

Over 10 million people each year visit one of the 156 gateway sites supported by this program. They come to kayak or canoe, hike or bike, picnic, hunt or fish or to watch wildlife. Others come to visit the Chesapeake's many maritime museums or to renew their acquaintance with turning points in our Nation's history at sites such as Fort McHenry and Yorktown Battlefield.

Each of those visitors comes away with a strengthened awareness of the crucial role of the Chesapeake in our national story and as the ecological and economic heart of the mid-Atlantic. And that is the goal of the Gateway Network, to renew our connection with that great bay.

The program is so successful that the National Park Service has heaped praise upon it, and the White House, in 2005, declared it to be a ''cooperative conservation success story.''

Congress originally authorized this program for 5 years, and renewed that short-term authorization in 2002. In 2004, a National Park Service special resource study concluded that a permanent commitment to the program would ensure its long-term viability and enhance the Chesapeake's status among America's national treasures.

Anyone who saw the Washington Post article on Monday knows that the bay's oyster population is in trouble. That situation is both a symptom and one of the causes of the precarious health of the bay. Keeping people connected with and concerned about the Bay is vital to each step in restoring that great estuary—from its headwaters to its oysterbeds.

The Gateways Network does just that. The program is a proven success, and should be permanently authorized. I commend the gentleman from Maryland, a valued member of the Natural Resources Committee, for his advocacy of this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5540.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, my district is home to many beautiful American treasures and one of them is the Chesapeake Bay. ''Save the Bay'' is one message that reaches beyond all political boundaries.

Working alongside my longtime colleague and friend Jo Anne Davis in the 109th Congress, we passed legislation to create the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail—which is part of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network we are reauthorizing today. As many of you know, this initiative falls under the larger Chesapeake Bay Program, which was created in 1983 to restore and protect the bay.

I am proud to lend my vote in favor of this bill today, however, I would like to call attention to one of the greater matters that this Congress should also be voting on: legislation to help the American people pay for the astounding cost of energy. One example is a comprehensive bill by Representative PETERSON that creates a partnership between energy development and the environment. This bill opens up the OCS for natural gas exploration and uses an estimated $86 billion dollars in royalties for environmental restoration efforts. The Chesapeake Bay Commission estimated that the total cost to restore the Chesapeake Bay is $19 billion. The NEED Act fully funds the Chesapeake Bay restoration effort at $20 billion. This energy bill is another way we can help Save the Bay, and the budgets of American families.

I am an original cosponsor of the NEED Act and I believe it is an example of bipartisan energy legislation. We must all come together in a bipartisan manner to pass legislation that will increase our domestic energy supply and help alleviate soaring prices. I cannot speak for your districts, but families in Virginia's Second District need an energy solution now and it is our job to give them one.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Page 2, line 14, insert after ''section'' the following: ''for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1233, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I proposed here was actually proposed in the committee as well, and it is an amendment which in all sincerity is an effort to try and make a good bill into a very, very good bill. It has no intentions whatsoever of trying to derail the path of successful completion of this particular bill, but actually solve a problem and present a sense of comfort that might not necessarily be there as the bill proceeds to the other body.

We are dealing, obviously, as some people have—not here on the floor, for all of us here on the floor who are Members, but some people have said that this is simply a sunsetting provision. It is not that. This program is not going to be sunsetted. But there is an authorization of appropriations which desperately needs that time to be looked at.

My amendment is designed to bring this bill in line with all the other bills that we have passed out of the Resources Committee this year. Typically

in the Resources Committee we review authorizations on specific periods of time. For this reason, I anxiously anticipate the support of Democratic colleagues, because this is good government. It is a fiscally responsible amendment.

My amendment reauthorizes the review of this program after 5 years. This is a compromise between the National Park Service request, which was no authorization at all. They were fine about technical assistance, but they suggested there should be no more grants given to this program, as they said this program has matured enough and don't need any more, and the bill's sponsor who was asking for an eternal unending authorization of appropriations. Five years was good enough the first time this program was authorized, it was sufficient when this program was reauthorized, and it ought to be a sufficient time for Congress not to abrogate our responsibility but do our responsibility to review the programs that we authorize and how they are being funded.

There is a reason we add these positions to bills. As I told you in the committee, the very committee that sent this bill out, there were six other bills in a similar status; and on each of those six bills we put in this process so that the committee could review that authorization and the funding source and what those programs were doing at 5-year intervals. Some bills we have passed out have no time limits, but in every situation they have funding limitations that are put on them. This particular bill in the course it is drafted right now has no funding limitation nor any review process to it. And that is where it can be improved.

There is a reason we add these provisions to bills. Without them, programs have a tendency of languishing, depending upon Federal funds, where we want them to encourage recipients of these funds to use them wisely and to have an incentive to produce results. When programs expire, we have a chance to reevaluate them and conduct this oversight. That is our responsibility as an authorizing committee and as Congress as a whole, and we should not abrogate that responsibility. Without my amendment, we are relinquishing our oversight and leaving it simply to appropriators.

Already this program has received, as I said earlier, $7.7 million in unrequested earmarks. This bill also eliminates the annual cap on the funds that are eligible to be received. I understand that this has been an excellent conduit for earmarks, but let us not lose the fiscal responsibility that we have to do and get away from simply handing out a blank check.

I mentioned earlier parts of the program that are funded, somewhat sarcastically, I admit. They do sound on the surface humorous. I am not opposed to what they are doing; I am not opposed to those programs. I am simply saying that Congress should have the responsibility of looking at those at a regular period. That is our job.

It is nearing impossibility for the average family to drive to any of these recreation areas; much of the responsibility for that lies here in Congress as well. Despite that fact, the other side of the aisle is unwilling to increase oil and gas reductions. I hope they will cut the taxpayers at least a small break by accepting this good government amendment, and allow us to review how the money is spent on a periodic basis as we traditionally do in most bills that come out of this committee.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the Bishop amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman indicated some anxiety that the program would languish if it was permanently authorized. And I can assure him that this is one program that will not languish, because it has so stimulated the interest and the engagement of so many citizens and volunteer groups across the six States and the District of Columbia that make up the Chesapeake Bay watershed. And that is the point. That is the point of permanently authorizing it, because the citizenry has stepped up and they have shown that they are ready to work in partnership with their national government, and it is time for the national government to make an equally powerful statement to the citizenry that, when it comes to the Chesapeake Bay, we are going to be here as a steadfast ongoing supporter of that partnership.

Gateways has a proven track record. Initially authorized in 1998 and reauthorized in 2002, the Park Service conducted a special resource study on the program in 2004, and it concluded that Gateways should be made permanent and expanded. That is because the program is tested and proven. Park Service has already made the Gateways network a permanent unit of the Park System. Again, another reason it certainly will not languish, and a reason why the kind of oversight that the gentleman from Utah is concerned about will be there in terms of the agency's responsibility.

The appropriations process, which he dismissed as a significant way of overseeing the program and providing scrutiny to it, is there on an annual basis and can certainly serve that purpose.

So it is the essence of this bill in fact that we permanently authorize it, because we want to make the statement to those volunteers and citizens who stepped into this tremendous partnership to preserve the Chesapeake Bay that we understand the commitment they have made, and we are prepared to make an equal commitment from our side.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate one more time the opportunity of talking about this.

It is one of the fundamental elements that we have as the concept of good government that Congress should exercise its right of oversight on programs. Even if we authorize a program, however good it should be, there still should be at a regular basis an oversight. It is not threatening to a program. It is the responsibility of Congress.

We do have a bunch of programs that simply run without that kind of oversight. Some programs whose authorization has lapsed still function on. That is not the concept of good government. We have things especially in our area, Coastal Zone Management, Endangered Species Act whose reauthorization has lapsed, still functions on under their authorization by the appropriators, but it needs to be reviewed by the Appropriations Committee. That is its purpose.

We have some programs that are permanent, that have no oversight whatsoever: Defense, food stamps, child health care, school lunches. But, once again, in each of those areas what Congress should be doing is exercising our responsibility, and simply saying there is nothing that we should pass that shouldn't ask Congress to relook at a bill and relook at a program, and evaluate the essence of that program if it is still the most significant thing we should be doing. Or perhaps our priorities have changed. That should not be seen as an attack on the bill, it should not be seen as something that is negative or unfriendly. It should be seen as something simply as reauthorizing and re-recognizing what we are supposed to be doing. That is our job as representatives of the people, is to constantly be looking at what we have authorized, reevaluate, and reappropriate. And we are doing something in this particular amendment in an effort to do that at a 5-year basis. That is not illogical. In fact, that is the norm. That is rational. That is what usually happens in these particular situations, and it is what should happen in this particular situation. Again, it is nothing again to try to harm the bill in any way; it is simply an effort to try to move us forward to make sure that Congress does its job, and does its job on a regular, appropriate level. That is why we are here. We should not abrogate that responsibility. We should accept that. We should embrace it. And we should try to move forward from that position.

I apologize for trying to elongate this in some particular way. I think I have said repeatedly what the crux of this issue is. This is not a proposition from Liechtenstein; this is simply the concept of, do we periodically review what we authorize. It is a plus thing that we should be doing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am new to Congress, but I have already sat through a number of hearings in the

Natural Resources Committee where we scrutinize the appropriations requests and presentation of various agencies that are under our jurisdiction. So I have high confidence that the congressional oversight that is needed for this kind of program will be there through the annual appropriation process.

And I say again that this is about making a statement to all of those citizens who stepped forward and have supported the Gateways program, that are there to back these sites, to preserve our environment and the Chesapeake Bay, its heritage, its cultural legacy. And if we vote today as I hope we will, to permanently authorize this program, we will be saying to all of those citizen stewards that we are thankful for the commitment that they are making, and that their national government is ready to step up and make an equal commitment to protecting and preserving the Chesapeake Bay.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1233, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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 178, nays 232, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

YEAS—178

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Carney
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey
Gohmert
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
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)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Forbes
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
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
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Blunt
Boehner
Boucher
Campbell (CA)
Carter
Delahunt
Ehlers
Ellison
Everett
Fattah
Gillibrand
Granger
Jackson-Lee (TX)
LaHood
McCotter
McKeon
Pascrell
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rodriguez
Rush
Shuler
Tiahrt

□ 1454

Messrs. TANNER, MURPHY of Connecticut, CANTOR, ABERCROMBIE, COSTELLO, LARSON of Connecticut, SPRATT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Messrs. SAXTON and SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. SALI

Mr. SALI. I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SALI. In its current form I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sali moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5540 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly in the form to which perfected at the time of this motion, with the following amendment:

Section 502(a)(1)(B) of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 105–312) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) to identify and utilize the collective resources as Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites for enhancing public education of and access to the Chesapeake Bay, including educating the public regarding the effect of high fuel prices on access to and use and enjoyment of all present uses of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and Chesapeake Bay Watertrails;''.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, this motion is a straightforward one and one that I hope we can all support.

Because the underlying bill is a permanent authorization of appropriations for this regional program, it is suitable that the Secretary of the Interior should use some of these funds to help the residents of the Chesapeake Bay better understand exactly how their recreational opportunities, their livelihoods and even their everyday lives are affected by the shocking gas prices affecting the country, prices which have skyrocketed over 71 percent since the current majority was installed in the House of Representatives.

I have read several news reports that show exactly how high boat fuel prices have affected the watermen of the bay. They cannot afford to run their boats to catch seafood we all enjoy. In the meantime, the price of those delicious crabs is climbing almost as fast as gas prices just so these fishermen can make their costs.

While this program creates popular Chesapeake Bay watertrails, tour operators have shuttered their boats because they cannot afford to fill up their tanks. Families are forced to stay home rather than vacationing on the Chesapeake Bay shore to enjoy its historic sites, education programs and Chesapeake Bay gateway sites supported by the authorization in this bill. This is a shame because the area has much to offer.

I wish I could offer a motion to actually decrease these prices, but the majority won't allow a vote on a measure to open up secure, American supplies of oil and natural gas, or oil shale, on our public lands. In the meantime, we are occupying hours of our legislative day with this minor program.

Our constituents, including the millions who live near, use, and enjoy the Chesapeake Bay, deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that we're going to hear from the other side of this body that there's a problem with this motion being made ''promptly.'' As we also know, the majority controls the work of this committee and schedules the House. Just as they have scheduled this bill today, they can bring this bill back early next week. This motion is made promptly so that, in addition to the matters that are considered within this motion to recommit, that the committee can take up all of the matters and make sure that we have fully addressed all of these issues as they affect the people who live and work in the Chesapeake Bay area.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, this is an odd motion as you read it and one that I don't think takes full account of how aware people are of the effect of gas prices, which is the issue that the other side has talked about all day. It says that there will be education of the public regarding the effect of high fuel prices. I think the public is fully able to educate itself with respect to that impact.

This is a distraction. It doesn't really connect to the underlying bill. It was not offered in committee. It was not offered as part of the rules process. But more importantly than that, this is styled, as was just indicated, as a ''promptly'' motion and, therefore, effectively would kill the bill. And I can't imagine why anybody would want to kill this bill.

What this is designed to do is to recognize the incredible commitment that has been made by ordinary citizens on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay. It would reauthorize on a permanent basis the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Program and Watertrails Network, which was first enacted in 1998. This is a successful, efficient and effective program. The White House Conference called it ''a cooperative conservation success story.''

It includes 156 sites across six States and the District of Columbia, parks, wildlife refuges, museums, historic sites, watertrails, and most importantly, it reaches out to volunteer groups that have stepped forward to take stewardship of the Chesapeake Bay, millions of visitors from around the country and around the world every year.

It's an efficient and effective program, and this reauthorization makes an important statement. And that's why I object to the motion because the ''promptly'' nature of it would effectively kill this bill, and we need to make a statement now to those citizens that have stepped forward, that just as they have made an important and steadfast commitment to the health of the Chesapeake Bay, so their national government will make a similar commitment to the Chesapeake Bay and the watershed by stepping forward and permanently authorizing this outstanding program.

I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, isn't it true that if this motion did pass, that this bill could be referred back to the committee or committees of authority and be reported back the next business day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair reaffirmed on November 15, 2007, at some subsequent time, the committee could meet and report the bill back to the House.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you.

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. SALI. 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 recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to suspend with regard to H.R. 3058.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 223, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

YEAS—181

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

NAYS—223

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee

Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
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
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
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
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—29

Barton (TX)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boucher
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carter
Delahunt
Ehlers
Ellison
Everett
Fattah
Gillibrand
Granger
Jackson-Lee (TX)
LaHood
Langevin
McCotter
McCrery
Pascrell
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ruppersberger
Rush
Shuler
Tiahrt
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1522

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 385, I was in an Intelligence committee briefing. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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 321, nays 86, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—321

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—86

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (KY)
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Reichert
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—27

Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boucher
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carter
Delahunt
Ehlers
Ellison
Everett
Fattah
Gillibrand
Granger
Jackson-Lee (TX)
LaHood
Linder
McCotter
Pascrell
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rangel
Rush
Shuler
Tiahrt
Walsh (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1529

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LAND COMMUNITIES TRANSITION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3058, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3058, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 193, answered "present" 2, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—193

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Carney
Carter
Cazayoux
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Capuano
Melancon

NOT VOTING—21

Berman
Bonner
Boucher
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Delahunt
Ehlers
Ellison
Everett
Fattah
Gillibrand
Jackson-Lee (TX)
LaHood
Linder
Meek (FL)
Pascrell
Pryce (OH)
Rangel
Rush
Shuler
Tiahrt

□ 1544

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. CHILDERS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, on the afternoon of Thursday June 5, 2008, I have an excused absence to attend my son's school graduation. If I were present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 384 and 385. I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 386 and 387.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to my friend from Maryland, the majority leader, to tell us what we plan to do next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

We will consider several bills under suspension. The final list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

We will consider H.R. 6003, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008; H.R. 6063, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008; and also hope to consider the Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

On the appropriation bill, supplemental appropriations bill, I think we are getting close to the time that the Pentagon may have to send out furlough notices to civilian employees, and probably beyond the time where they had to start shifting money from other accounts to the Army.

Does my friend believe we will have that bill relatively early in the week, or is your confidence it will just be sometime next week?

Mr. HOYER. I am reasonably confident it will be sometime next week. It is my hope it will be earlier in the week rather than later in the week. But I cannot say that at this point in time. There's still work being done on the bill. Chairman OBEY is working very hard on a draft proposal that can be enacted in a short time frame.

We are aware of the time constraints of which the gentleman spoke. I anticipate we will include a package of items that we believe are a cost of the war, the GI benefits that have been discussed, and also items that address a small number of pressing needs. We are strong believers in PAYGO, as you know, but we understand that we have to deal with the other body and the White House, who has not supported that effort. We are sometimes not in agreement with their position, and we will have to keep working on that issue. I know Mr. OBEY is working hard on that.

Mr. BLUNT. In that regard, has any conclusion been reached or not about whether tax increases similar to the ones that the House sent over to the Senate or other ways to pay for the ongoing expenses of the GI Bill that we all hope that we can arrive at a language on that we can be supportive of will be part of the package, or will the Senate view that there doesn't need to be a pay-for in this package be the prevailing view?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, I would reiterate, as you know, we feel very strongly that the

new entitlement program for the GIs, which is something we strongly support, but ought to be paid for as a new entitlement so that it does not add to the debt.

The Senate did not agree with that proposition. As a result, that is not in the bill that has come back to us from the Senate. So we are currently trying to figure out what to do on this issue, but we feel very strongly that the GI Bill ought to be adopted one way or the other.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for that.

On other appropriations bills, you have announced in the press that the Appropriations Committee will begin its subcommittee markups next week. Do we anticipate that some of these appropriations bills would be on the floor this summer, and if so, which ones?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

I can't tell you exactly which ones, but I do anticipate there will be appropriations bills on the floor this summer. I don't, at this point in time, have the ability to tell you specifically which ones.

Mr. BLUNT. On gas prices, as I am sure you have noticed, Republicans have been talking about gas prices a lot this week. We'd like to see some legislation scheduled that would allow more exploration, more American security in our energy sector. Is there anything like that scheduled?

Mr. HOYER. Not next week. Although, as you know, we passed a major energy bill last year that was signed by the President that looks to real solutions to the problem of reliance on petroleum products and that is relying on alternative energy sources. We believe strongly on this side of the aisle that both from an environmental standpoint, a global warming standpoint, and an energy independence standpoint that looking to alternatives is absolutely essential.

As you know, gas prices have risen very, very substantially during the course of the last 7½ years. As I have indicated before, during the 8 years of the Clinton Presidency, they rose approximately a nickel a year, from $1.06 to $1.46. Under this administration, they have gone from that $1.46 to now $3.86, $3.90, $4, and over $4.

I know your contention is that it has just been in the last 12 months that this has happened. We disagree with that proposition. It's an interesting proposition to try to sell to the American public. But the bottom line is, frankly, for the last 35 years, since the late seventies when we had the long gas lines, we have not moved to alternative energy sources in the way we should have, in my view, so that we could not be held hostage by some, frankly, who have profit, understandably, in mind, but not necessarily the best interests of our consumers or our country. We support a diversified clean energy portfolio for our country.

I want to make an observation because I have been listening today with interest. You may find this of interest. We have nearly a whole refineries' worth of capacity idle right now. Not for lack of supply, but for lack of use of existing refineries. As a matter of fact, we are at 87 percent, which is about 10 percent below what we usually are over the last 10 years. So for whatever reasons, refiners are now at 10 percent below the capacity they usually are on average over the last 10 years at this time.

Secondly, since 2000, drilling on land has increased dramatically. Your side of the aisle has talked a lot about how we need more capacity to drill. I will tell you that since 2000, drilling on land has increased dramatically, climbing 66 percent. A two-thirds increase. Notwithstanding that increased drilling, gas prices have increased.

In addition to that, I will tell my friend that oil and gas companies hold leases to nearly 68 million acres of Federal land and waters on which they are not producing oil and gas. It is our belief and experts' belief that these 68 million acres of leased but currently inactive Federal lands and waters could produce an additional 4.8 million barrels of oil and 44.7 billion cubic feet of natural gas each day. That is existing leases on existing land that are not being used today.

As a matter of fact, well less than half of the currently authorized leased land for oil drilling is not being used. It would nearly double if we did that total U.S. oil production and increased domestic natural gas production, by 75 percent. That is without a single new lease or single new drilling authorization being passed.

It would also, of course, cut U.S. oil imports by more than a third and be more than six times the estimated peak production from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that is discussed so much on your side of the aisle.

So while we are trying to focus on understanding what effect high prices have today and what manipulation may be going on in the marketplace today that is impacting on prices, we do continue to focus on the long-term solution, which is not, frankly, looking at petroleum products, which are a wasting resource and which will not in your lifetime and my lifetime but in our grandchildren's lifetime not be the source of energy to either power our cars or our economy but alternative sources of energy.

We look forward to working with you on all of those. We believe that there is a lot of excess capacity in refining, excess capacity on leases for oil and for natural gas that currently exists that, for whatever reasons, are not being pursued now.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the gentleman's information on that. I will even be glad to accept some of it. Maybe gasoline was $1.46 in 2000. It had moved almost to $2.50 in the next 6 years. It has gone to $4 in the last 18 months. That is a record we are more than happy to talk about.

In terms of refining capacity, actually we have been bringing refined gas product into the country in recent months. I don't know enough about refineries to know if a 10 percent downage in refineries is normal or not. I do know we haven't built a new refinery since 1976, and a number have closed.

In terms of seeking oil, the Chinese now have an agreement with the Cubans that they can drill for oil 45 miles off our coast. Our companies can't do that. There's tremendous potential, I believe, and I think many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle do, in the water, in the oil shale, and certainly the gentleman is right, and neither of us want to particularly give away our age in suggesting that that transition that we both anticipate will occur, will not totally occur in our lifetime. Even if we knew what it was right now, the last person will put the last gallon of gas in the last car that burns gas 30 or 40 years after we move toward whatever that next thing is that powers the economy.

We certainly need to encourage getting there, and I think there are many parts to that puzzle, from wind and solar and nuclear and better battery technology. But we firmly believe that you can have impact, and I don't mean we in the royal sense, I mean those of us who have been talking for years about supply, that you can have impact on the world price by just announcing that the United States was going to go after its reserves, known and unknown, and that unknown criteria is much more promising because of recent finds in this entire hemisphere than we would have thought it would have been.

We are eager to enter into that and feel strongly that more supply is part of the important transition to a different energy future, and would like to see legislation on the floor that increases supply.

In terms of legislation, one issue that we have talked a lot about, you and I have worked on, one of my colleagues has worked on a lot, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, I am going to yield for a moment to my good friend from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to underscore the seriousness of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act fix. We did it, as the gentleman knows, last August, for a 6-month period of time, the Protect America Act. It was enough bipartisan support that it passed, but it had a 6-month life on it. Since February 16 at 12:01 a.m. we have not had that or similar ability for our intelligence community to act.

While they made some decisions within that 6-month period which carry over to the present time, as the gentleman from Maryland knows, we

are up against it with respect to this summer.

□ 1600

I know that the distinguished majority leader announced his hope that we would have some sort of answer on this before Memorial Day. We missed that date. The gentleman knows our position, that a vast majority of Members on this side of the aisle, combined with the Members on your side of the aisle who have publicly said they would support the bipartisan Senate version, would give us that answer today. But I understand that the gentleman is attempting to mollify more Members on his side of the aisle.

So my question would be, can the distinguished majority leader give us some idea of when we might see something on the floor that we might vote on that might in his judgment get enough bipartisan support to pass in the event that you continue not to bring us the Senate bill?

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank the gentleman for his observation and question. While I don't have a date, I do believe that we are making very significant progress. You have heard me quoted as saying that on the floor. I think that has been true for the last, frankly, 4 to 5 weeks, and I really think that everybody who has been addressing has been working in a very forthright, open and conscientious way to get us to a place where we can have legislation on the floor which will accomplish the objective the gentleman seeks.

I think we are making good progress, and I am therefore hopeful that this will be sooner rather than later. I don't want to set a date. I wanted to do it by Memorial Day. We didn't get there. But we are working very hard, and I am hopeful in the near future we will get there.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I further yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. The distinguished majority leader has indicated we did not have the urgency of passing this because until August of next year it appeared that we had certain protections. We can't articulate what those are here on the floor. So I guess my question would be, does the gentleman expect that we will have it to vote before we leave for our recess in August?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman.

After next week, we have 2 weeks remaining before our July 4 District Work Period, and I hope we can continue to work together to find a solution to that problem, to get the supplemental on and off the floor in a way that it properly funds the troops, and we get our work done. We will be working together to do that.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 9, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING HOUSE PAGES

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the pages to come up here and occupy the seats in the Chamber. Anywhere you want, either side. Maybe the next time you occupy that seat, you will be a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude and the gratitude of the entire House to all the pages who have served so diligently in the House of Representatives during the 110th Congress.

This is the 16th Congress that I have served in. I have been Chairman of the Page Board or ranking member for about 20, 23, 24 years. I was appointed by Tip O'Neill. That is probably ancient history to you. That is very recent history to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have attached a list of the fine young people who have served this House as pages and will include their names as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGES
SPRING CLASS OF 2008

Adriana Daniela Aguilar, TX; Claire Jumanna Ashcraft, CA; Cole Salim Ashcraft, CA; Hannah Elizabeth Barkley, MS; Maurice Patrick Barry, MA; Erika Lauren Bertrand, NE; Amber E. Cassady, TX; Charles E. Coe, PA; John Cowart, FL; Maggie Carlisle Cupit, MS; and Matt Cyr, TN.

Carlos DeLaTorre, TX; Stephanie Diaz, HI; Brandon Estes, FL; Kelly Jo Fuller, GA; Shara Guarnaccia, NJ; Philmon Ghirmai Haile, WA; Jane Elizabeth Hamm, OK; Kathleen Shea Howard, NC; Michael J. Janusa, TX; Evan R. Johnson, IA; and Matt Jolley, UT.

Tara Marie Kelly, MA; Esther Kofman, CA; Satchel Clay Kornfeld, OR; Lauren LaVelle, CA; Thomas Lerum, CA; Brian Licata. NJ; Victoria Linville, TN; Jessica L. Malekos-Smith, CA; Jill E. Marshall, NY and Tara Mason, MO.

Elizabeth Milner, MS; Elizabeth L. Monsma, CA; Tiana Moore, CA; Jesse Mark Neugebauer, NE; Kaleigh Elizabeth Nolan, NY; Courtney Shene Owens, SC; Daniel Pavlovic, CA; Emma Peel, TX; Jacob William Peeples, MA; Ashley S. Pierce, DC; and Wylee M. Price, NM.

Miles Pulsford, KY; Andre Renaldo Fernandez, PR; Elizabeth Ann Reynolds, WA; Yi Ping Caitlin Patricia Roberts, VA; Max D. Robertson, NC; Jason Oliver Roman, NY; Jeffrey P. Schumacher, OH; Lea Shipman, AK; Hannah Leigh Shuman, FL; and Katie Smith, CA.

Feddie Justin Strickland, SC; Lianna Stroster, MI; Alexandria Christian Templeton, AL; Callie Sioux Tysdal, SD; Timothy Wainwright, PA; Megan Walden, CA; Nicki Warner, WV; Gabriel M. Weinstein, MD; Nicole M. Westergaard, IA; and Kiyan H. Williams, NJ.

To the Page Class of Spring 2008—Thank you and good luck!

I am sure you will pick up several copies of that RECORD when you go home.

We all recognize the important role that congressional pages play in helping the U.S. House of Representatives operate. This group of young people, who come from all across our Nation, represent what is really good about our country.

To become a page, these young people have proven themselves to be academically qualified. They have ventured away from the security of their homes and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. Through this experience, they have witnessed a new culture, made new friends and learned the details of how government operates.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and for their energy. In addition, they must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people at a personal level. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, they face a challenging academic schedule of classes in the House Page School.

You pages have witnessed the House debate issues of war and peace, hunger and poverty, justice and civil rights. You served this House during a time of war. Many pages have never experienced that. You have seen the awesome responsibility Members of this House have when they vote on that question of war and when they vote on the funding of that war. You have witnessed a great deal of real history.

You have seen Congress at moments of greatness, and you have seen Congress with all its human frailties. You have witnessed the workings of an institution that has endured well over 200 years. No one has seen Congress and Members of the Congress as close up as you have. I am sure that you will consider your time spent in Washington, D.C., to be one of the most valuable and exciting experiences of your lives, and that with this experience you will all move ahead to lead successful and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the House Page Board, I ask my colleagues

to join me in honoring this group of distinguished young Americans. You certainly will be missed. Individually and collectively, you are great. I try to walk by the desk and say hello to you. I see you in the hallway carrying flags or whatever your mission may be. But individually and collectively, you are great.

In closing, I would also like to thank the members of the House Page Board who provided such fantastic service to this institution. Myself as Chair; Congressman ROB BISHOP, the Vice Chair; Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE; Congresswoman VIRGINIA FOXX. One nice thing about the congressional members is we are not only members of the Page Board, but we like one another. We get along really well, and that is very helpful.

We have also the Clerk of the House, Lorraine Miller; we have the Sergeant at Arms, Bill Livingood, as a member; and we have two members who are not directly attached to the House; Ms. Lynn Silversmith Klein, who is the parent of a page, and Mr. Adam Jones, a former page. I want to thank you for your service on the House Page Board. It has been really a great experience for me.

And I want to thank our departing pages. I can really say this: You have influenced us. You have inspired us. We look at you and say most of what we do here is going to affect you more than it affects us. I really have great hope for the future when I look at you. This House I can say because of that is a better House, because of you. I thank you.

I yield first to the Vice Chair of the Page Board, my friend from Utah.

ROB, come forward here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have to join with Representative KILDEE in thanking you for being here and being part of the system and for the service that you have rendered. I hope it has been profitable for all of you as it has been profitable for us as we benefited from your particular system here, and I hope it also spurs you to have a continued interest in government and in politics. I realize that is not the norm.

When I was born, my father was mayor of the community. I always saw him involved in politics. I thought every family did that. What I found out, quite frankly, is that it is atypical. But what I hope for you is it is not atypical, and this spurs you on to continue to want to study, to participate and be a part of government.

The brilliance of our system of lay government is that common people can come together and you don't have to be trained to do this job. I know the way we do it, you think probably we should be trained. But, at the same time, common people can talk about issues and can make decisions for themselves.

We are both old teachers. As a history teacher, I now get to talk about F–22s and F–35s and public land policy and can do that because that is the way the system is designed. And through all of the flaws and the bumps and the grinds, the bottom line is still our system works.

I encourage you as you go back there to finish your education, become involved in your communities, become involved in your political parties, become involved in the system, and keep that encouragement, that interest alive. The future of this country depends upon you doing that.

So thank you for being here.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. BISHOP.

You know, it is interesting. We have friendships across the aisle and we do cooperative things across the aisle. I remember very early in your career here you came up to me and you said, I have an amendment I am going to offer in the Resources Committee, and could I talk to you about it and maybe get your help? I looked at it and it made good sense.

We do that. We do that more than what people realize. I appreciate working with you.

I yield now to the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland, and a dear friend.

Mr. HOYER. I am pleased to be here with all of you young people.

About, well, 45 years ago I was about 5 years older than you are now and I started working on this Hill for a Member of Congress. His office was on the sixth floor of the Longworth Building. You know enough about our offices to know that he was a junior Member, being placed on the sixth floor of the Longworth Building, those spacious offices that you have visited with various different items from time to time.

I had an opportunity, not as intimately as you have had because I did not have access to the floor as somebody working in an office, but I did have the opportunity to see the Members, to talk to some of the Members, to see what they were doing.

You have had an opportunity that very, very few Americans will ever have. I presume most of you are 16 years of age. Maybe some have reached 17. Maybe some are late 15. In any event, you average 16 years of age. As Mr. KILDEE pointed out, you have seen firsthand the best and the not-so-very best. To that extent, hopefully you have said, you know, they are a lot like us. Sometimes we are really good, and then sometimes not quite as good as we would like to be.

Because you have had this special window on your democracy, we call this the people's House. It is the people's House because every 2 years we have to go back to the people and get their imprimatur. We call it a vote. We have to be rehired. The Founding Fathers established that so we would stay in close touch with the people and reflect their hopes, their aspirations, yes, even their fears, their angst and sometimes their prejudices.

But we are a representative body. And there are too many people frankly around the country who don't have a lot of faith in this body and who don't think it works very well, and they see us on television largely in confrontation. You have seen us more at work and cooperation than sometimes happens on this floor.

So, on behalf of both my friend Mr. BOEHNER and myself and Speaker PELOSI, I would urge you to go home to your respective schools, your respective communities, your respective families, and talk to your peers about your experience. Some of it will be perhaps not quite as positive as some of us would like.

But my experience has been, as President of the Senate when I was in charge of the Page Program in the Maryland State Senate and here, that the overwhelming majority of you will go from this place with a very positive view of how our people work, the passion they bring to their commitment to representing their community, and the integrity they have with respect to the issues that they argue on behalf of.

□ 1615

Do they all believe the same? No. Any more than all of you believe the same. I know there have been no debates in the dorms. I know that all of you have said, yes, we agree 100 percent. And if I thought that, I would think you were a strange group of people indeed.

You have been here at an historic time. Young women, you must be extraordinarily proud of the fact that for the first time in history we have a woman leading this body. Now, we have a woman presiding officer right now, she is from Florida, Ms. CASTOR, but we have a Speaker of the House who is a woman. And African Americans, you must be extraordinarily proud that for the first time in history we have an African American who is the nominee, presumptive, but is going to be the nominee of one of the major parties. And you can also be proud of the fact that we have a gentleman, JOHN MCCAIN, who served his country in war, and served as a prisoner of war for 5 years experiencing very substantial physical abuse, and came back to America as a young man and rose now to be his party's presumptive nominee for President of the United States. What an historic time for you to have served here in the House.

And I say served, because, frankly, the work of this House was facilitated by everything you have done. Sometimes the tasks may have seemed simple, but they were important to us accomplishing the people's business. And so on behalf of Mr. BOEHNER and myself and Mr. BLUNT and Mr. CLYBURN and Speaker PELOSI, I thank all of you for the work you have done, for the kindnesses that you have shown us; and I hope you in turn feel that you have received from us the courtesy and respect you deserve as outstanding representatives of your generation that may in time be referred to as well as one of the greatest generations.

Thank you for your service. God bless and good luck.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Could I also ask that Representative FOXX from North Carolina, who is a member of the board, come and express her opinion as well.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for the comments they have made. I agree with them, and I will not repeat the points that they have made in their comments to you.

I often like to look back at what our Founders of this country said about different issues and remind us of the things they brought, because our founders were remarkable people and we are a truly blessed country that they came together at the time that they did.

I want to give you a quote from John Adams who was writing about the importance of civic education in 1787. He encapsulated the idea behind the page program in a very simple but profound sentence on the importance of learning about freedom. He said, ''Children should be educated and instructed in the principles of freedom.''

Now, I know you all don't consider yourselves children, but I am sure if John Adams had been here, he would say, ''Young people should be educated and instructed in the principles of freedom.''

The experience of being a page has given you the opportunity to be instructed in the principles of freedom with firsthand experience in the halls of the world's greatest democracy. And that is what the page program is all about. That is one of the reasons I am so honored to serve on the Page Board. Having the fantastic opportunity to interact with you is another reason that I am so honored to serve on the Page Board.

You are an excellent group of young people who, in completing this year's program, are embarking on a lifetime of building on your experiences, learning and working in the Nation's Capital. You have performed extremely important functions for us; but I think one of the most important functions that you perform is simply being here and reminding us every day of the people we are serving, and reminding us that the actions we take are going to affect people like you, young people like you who are growing up in this country.

I do want to mention that I have had the privilege this semester of having a page here, Max Robertson, who is from the Fifth District of North Carolina. And the only reason I call attention to Max is because I think he is a great example of all of you. You are all model citizens, I think, of our country. You are all civic achievers, like Max.

I know that many of you will not want to serve in elective office, but I think all of you will want to be citizens and voters after this experience. I hope that many of you will want to serve in the military, as I know Max has expressed an interest in doing, because that is one of the most sacrificial ways you can serve this country.

All of you, your lives and character are examples of the high caliber of students who serve as House pages. It really has been a delight for me to get to know all of you, to answer questions, to share my opinion with you, and to hear your concerns and your issues about things, because we certainly need to get the feedback that we get from you, too.

I want to congratulate all of you on successfully completing this program, and I want to wish you all the best in all your future endeavors. And I hope that you will not forget your experience here, and that you will stay in touch with us and let us know other successes that you are having and ways that the page program has impacted your life, particularly in positive ways.

I want to thank the chairman, Mr. KILDEE, for his leadership on the Page Board and Mr. BISHOP and all the other folks who are serving on the Page Board for their wisdom and insights, and the opportunity to serve and lend my few talents to that endeavor.

Mr. KILDEE. Much of the joy that I get from serving on the Page Board through the years is the pages. But you have heard the two Republican Members speak, and we indeed are friends and I really enjoy meeting with them. Our meetings, none are bipartisan, they are nonpartisan. The bottom line is you, and they are really friends of mine.

If you will make your concluding remarks, and then I will wrap it up.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Just stay involved, stay active, and stay the overachievers you are. Thank you for your service here. We have appreciated you.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you again for all you have done for us, for enriching this body, for, as I say, making myself a better person, making this body a better body. May the riches of God's blessings go with you as you return home. Thank you very much. God bless you.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DRIVE-IN THEATER

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

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of the drive-in theater.

On June 6, 1933, Richard Hollingshead, Jr., opened the first drive-in theater in the United States in Camden, New Jersey. Hollingshead's vision of enabling Americans to view movies from the comfort of their spacious cars was mastered through trials on his own driveway where he nailed a bed sheet between two trees and placed a film projector on the hood of his car. From its simple origins, Hollingshead's concept would transform the movie industry and later become a lasting icon of Americana.

Today, there are close to 400 drive-in theaters operating 650 screens in 47 States across the Nation. As summer approaches and evenings become warmer, thousands of families, couples, and groups of friends will gather at drive-ins to enjoy the latest Hollywood blockbusters on the largest movie screens in the theater industry.

Throughout the U.S., moviegoers are rediscovering the pleasures of the all-American drive-in experience, which often includes dining on classic American foods and beverages. My district in eastern Pennsylvania is home to the famous Shankweiler's Drive-In Theater built in 1934. It is the oldest operating theater in the United States. Every summer, many of my constituents flock to local drive-ins like Shankweiler's for an evening.

I ask my colleagues to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the drive-in theater and I encourage all Americans to rediscover their local theaters.

A TEENAGE HERO IN A TIME OF LOSS

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, recently communities in North Carolina's Fifth District were hit hard by severe weather in the form of tornadoes. No one was badly injured in the town of Clemmons, North Carolina, when a twister left a trail of destruction leaving several families homeless but thankfully alive. But one young man, Chris Ellis, who is a senior at West Forsyth High School, proved his selflessness and heroism when he rushed to the rescue of his neighbors on Frye Bridge Road in Clemmons.

Risking his own safety, Chris ran to the aid of Amber Parker and her two children who were trapped in the wreckage of their collapsed house. His demonstration of uncommon courage in the face of the awesome power of a tornado is nothing short of inspiring.

Madam Speaker, I hope the example of Chris Ellis is an inspiration to his entire community as they cope with the loss of homes and memories during this difficult time. In times of suffering, it is always encouraging to know there are selfless souls like Chris ready to lend a hand even at their own personal risk.

HIGH FUEL COST CRISIS

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today, just as many of my colleagues have done, to address the urgent high fuel cost crisis. Yes, Madam Speaker, it is a crisis that is facing all Americans. From the trucker who can no longer afford to operate his rig, to the farmer who must keep the tractors

in the barn, or to the small business owner who is being forced to close their doors, the daily commuter, or the general consumer. It is a crisis.

You know, we are being told that we buy petroleum from other countries, oftentimes countries that don't even like us, because many in this country see our resources as a liability, an economic or an environmental hazard. We have got to change that mind set. We must allow ourselves the opportunity to drill on our own land, in ANWR, off our own coastlines. We must increase refining capacity instead of continuing to shut down more factories.

□ 1630

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NEWS FROM THE SECOND FRONT

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, I bring you news from the second front. The second front, of course, is the border we have, the southern border, where there is a war going on. It's a border war between the United States and those people who wish to enter the United States illegally.

During my travels to the Texas/Mexico border and, really, the southern border with Mexico, I've traveled all the way from San Diego to Brownsville, Texas meeting with the various law enforcement officers. Of course I've met with the Border Patrol, but more recently I've met with the sheriffs along the Texas/Mexico border.

Let me make it clear. The Border Patrol does as good a job as we will let them do. They patrol the first 25 miles inland into the United States. But that's all they patrol. And if an illegal individual, no matter who they are, comes into the United States and gets past that 25-mile marker, it's up to somebody else to patrol that area. And much of that time it's left up to the sheriffs throughout the States of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico and California.

The sheriffs patrol the entire county. And let me give you an example. When a crime is committed in a county, a person calls 911, and 911 transfers them to the Sheriff's Department, not to the Border Patrol, because it's not important at the time where that crime or where that criminal came from.

And many times those criminals are cross-border criminals. They come into the United States from all over the world to commit crimes and then flee back across the southern border. And it's up to the sheriffs to protect the citizens of those counties.

Just to give you an example of a couple of counties, I've visited with Sheriff Arvin West of Hudspeth County. That's way over here in West Texas. That's a county that's the size of Delaware. And Sheriff West, like most of the 16 border sheriffs along the Texas/Mexico border, they look like sheriffs from Texas, they act like sheriffs from Texas. But, to a person, they are relentless in protecting their communities from criminal conduct.

And much of that conduct is the result of the failure of the United States of America to protect the border from people coming into the United States without permission. It is the duty, the first duty of government, to protect us from invasion by any source and by any means, and that includes anyone that comes into this country without permission.

Most recently, I've gone all the way to the other end of Texas, down to Cameron County, Texas where Brownsville is. It's a unique county because most of that county borders water, either the Rio Grande River or the Gulf of Mexico. And I've watched, and I went down with Sheriff Omar Lucio and some of his deputies who also are a relentless bunch of Texas deputy sheriffs trying to protect the border.

He, like Arvin West on the other side don't have a big budget for vehicles. So the way they get vehicles, Madam Speaker, is they have to confiscate the drug dealers' vehicles, those SUVs. And then once those are confiscated, they use those because they don't have enough money to fund their own transportation on the border.

As Sheriff Lucio said, the drug dealers, the drug cartels outman them, they outspend them, and they outgun them. That's because they have more money than we have on this side of the border.

And to give you an example of how the drug cartels work, and how it is very difficult for the sheriffs and the Border Patrol to stop the invasion of the drugs, down here on the Texas/Mexico border, the Rio Grande River is about as wide as this House of Representatives. And planes fly in from Mexico. They fly out into the Gulf of Mexico, come straight in across the Gulf of Mexico and the border of the United States, and they drop their cocaine, marijuana, and then other drug mules pick that up and move that throughout the United States on these interstates that are depicted on this map.

So it's important that we give the border sheriffs the resources that they need. And part of that can come from the Merida Initiative. The administration has offered and is promoting the idea of sending $1.4 billion in equipment and training to the other side of the border, to the Mexican side to fight the drug cartels.

Good intentioned, but in all due fairness, the history of Mexico along the border is not good. There is corruption, and many of the military and the police have started working with the drug cartels, some of whom have been trained in the United States have gone over to the other side. Maybe that money would be better spent if we left it on our side of the border and gave that money to the sheriffs to patrol this entire area.

We should give the sheriffs surplus military vehicles that have come back from Iraq and let them patrol all this area, because you cannot patrol this part of Texas with a Prius. We have to use some type of SUV or pickup truck. And it's important that we do this. The number one duty of government is public safety.

Madam Speaker, June 6, 1944, the anniversary is tomorrow. We sent thousands of Americans over the lands and over the seas to protect the borders of countries that had been invaded. France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia and other nations, and it's the duty of our country to protect us from the invasion coming south of the border.

We should send the military to the southern portion of our border and have the moral will to stop the invasion into the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO PICNIC FOR IMPRISONED U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, today many Members of Congress and their families will attend the Congressional Picnic hosted by President and Mrs. Bush at the White House.

However, for two imprisoned Border Patrol agents, this day will not be a picnic. Today is day 505 of a terrible injustice in America. Agents Compean and Ramos have been in Federal prison in solitary confinement since January 7 of 2007.

These two U.S. Border Patrol agents were convicted in March of 2006 for wounding an illegal alien drug smuggler from Mexico. The smuggler brought $1 million worth of marijuana across our border into Texas, and the drug smuggler was given immunity by

the Federal prosecutor to testify against the two border agents. Since then, the prosecutor's star witness, the Mexican drug smuggler, returned to America with more illegal drugs. He has now been arrested and has pled guilty to four felony counts for smuggling drugs.

Ramos and Compean were doing their job to protect the border and to protect the American citizens. Yet, through a questionable prosecution, the agents were convicted and sentenced to 11 and 12 years in prison.

Many of us in Congress have called on the White House to pardon these two border agents. They are heroes, yet the administration has done nothing to reverse this injustice.

Those of us who have been speaking out on behalf of these agents for more than a year are waiting on the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans to render its decision in this case. During an oral argument for their appeal on December 3 of 2007, one of the judges considering the case, Judge E. Grady Jolly said, and I quote the judge, ''It does seem to me that the government overreacted here. For some reason, this one got out of hand.''

Madam Speaker, I hope that those attending The White House Congressional Picnic have a wonderful time this evening. I'm sure that Agents Compean and Ramos would also like to be home having a picnic with their family.

Madam Speaker, this injustice needs to be corrected. I hope that the American people will continue to care about Compean and Ramos, to let the White House know that these men should be free.

It is my hope and prayer that one day soon, this injustice will be corrected and these two heroes will be home with their families, maybe to have a picnic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRAYER TO HONOR THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, there was a time when our national leaders publicly felt the ability to invoke the Creator and invite His blessings on our national causes.

On D-Day, June 6, 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt read a nationally broadcast prayer as our troops landed at Normandy. I'm going to read this prayer in the House today, to both commemorate this event and honor the men and women of our Armed Forces.

''Almighty God, our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set forth upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our republic, our religion and our civilization and to set free a suffering humanity.

''Lead them straight and true. Give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness to their faith.

''They will need Thy Blessings. Their road will be long and hard, for the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again, and we know that by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph.

''They will be sore tried by night and by day, without rest until the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken with the violences of war.

''For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle for their return to the haven of home.

''Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants into Thy kingdom.

''And for us at home, fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters and brothers of brave men overseas whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them, help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

''Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer as we rise to each new day and again, when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips invoking Thy help to our efforts.

''Give us strength too, strength in our daily tasks, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our Armed Forces.

''And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons, wheresoever they may be.

''And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in Thee, faith in our sons, faith in each other, faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dull. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in your unconquerable purpose.

''With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogancies. Lead us to the saving of our country and with our sister Nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to the schemings of unworthy men, and a peace that will let all of men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil.

''Thy will be done, Almighty God.

''Amen.''

□ 1645

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

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KUHL of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUNSET MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is June 5, 2008 in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Madam Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,918 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first

handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Madam Speaker, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution; it says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Madam Speaker, it is who we are. And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this Sunset Memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,918 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is June 5, 2008, 12,918 days since Roe versus Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

FAITH IN GOD IS THE FOUNDATION OF OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, a deep abiding faith in God, I believe, undergirds and protects this Nation from its very start until today. As you and I tour this Capitol, as you and I work in this Capitol, and as you and I go about the business of the people in this Capitol, there are signs of that deep faith throughout the Capitol. Some are overt, such as the inscription above you that says ''In God We Trust,'' and there are others that aren't quite as overt that are particularly subtle, and it is one of these subtle remembrances and reminders that I want to talk about today.

As you move between the Statuary Hall and the Rotunda, there is a statue of a gentleman named John Muhlenberg. John Muhlenberg's story is what I want to talk about today.

John was a clergyman, a soldier, and a politician. John was a Virginian, and he was a member of the Assembly of Virginia; and he was a witness to the British taking over the armory in Williamsburg and taking the gun powder and the weapons out of that armory. He was incensed that his country, his communities would be attacked by these British soldiers.

So he rode his horse back to his congregation in Western Virginia, and on a Sunday morning began a sermon, and he spoke from that familiar passage Ecclesiastes 3 in which he said, There is a time for everything and a season for every activity under heaven; a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to uproot; a time to kill and a time to heal; a time to tear down and a time to build; a time to weep and a time to laugh; a time to mourn and a time to dance; a time to scatter stones and a time to gather them; a time to embrace and a time to refrain; a time to search and a time to give up; a time to keep and a time to throw away; a time to tear and a time to mend; a time to be silent and a time to speak; a time to love and a time to hate; and a time for war and a time for peace.

He then looked at his congregation, Madam Speaker, and said, This is a time for war. Standing in a pulpit with his clerical robes on, he then removed his robe to display his colonel's uniform and sword. Pastor Muhlenberg then went on to raise the militia of some 300 strong Virginians and fought valiantly in the Revolutionary War on behalf of his country.

In addition to John Muhlenberg, he had a brother named Fredrick Muhlenberg who was also a preacher in New York City. His brother, once understanding what John was doing, wrote to him telling him the error of his ways, that this was not his fight, he should not be participating in it, and to stand down and to leave this matter of a revolution alone.

Fredrick held that position until the Brits burned his church in New York City, and then Fredrick took up arms against the Brits as well. In addition to those feats, Fredrick became the first Speaker of the House of Representatives.

So as you walk between the Statuary Hall and the Rotunda, you will see a statute of John Muhlenberg. He's got clerical robes, and on he's also got a sword; and as you see this statue, be in remembrance of the fact that this was a clergyman who had taken up arms to create and defend this country.

Madam Speaker, I believe that this country should remain with a deep abiding faith in God, and that we should absolutely adhere to the inscription ascribed above your head and that in fact in God we do trust.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) entitled ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013.''

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

(Mr. TANCREDO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BACHMANN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN HONOR OF THE 2008 DETROIT RED WINGS AND THEIR STANLEY CUP CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, it's with great pride that I rise today to congratulate our Detroit Red Wings on winning this year's National Hockey League championship. It has been 6 long years since the Red Wings have last brought the Stanley Cup back to Hockey Town, which is what we call Detroit in our good seasons, but their hard work and their hard-won victory on defeating the Penguins in six games is the epitome of teamwork at its absolute best. If ever a championship fits the personality of a community, this one does.

This team was about true sportsmanship and selflessness. Every Red Wing could vie for the Most Valuable Player award because each of them played with remarkable fortitude and consistence. Whether Detroit won because of the stepped up play of goalie Chris Osgood, the excellent leadership of the Captain Nicklas Lidstrom (the first European Captain to hoist the Stanley Cup), Henrik Zetterberg's post-season offense led the way (scoring 13 goals in the playoffs), or the tremendous Red Wings bench. They are a true model of what can be achieved with team work: Success.

I am particularly excited that the city of Detroit won this championship at this time. Madam Speaker, during the past few years the Metro Detroit area has lost tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs, some of which will never come back to this great city. The Detroit Red Wings winning this championship has brought back hope and a sense of optimism that Detroit desperately needs. The team's success exemplifies the strength and tenacity both of the Red Wings and of the great citizens of Detroit.

The moral of this championship is that you never now what you can achieve until you try. Go Red Wings.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXVIII, as a result of the adoption by the House and the Senate of the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, House Joint Resolution 92, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, has been engrossed and is deemed to have passed the House on June 5, 2008.

COVER THE UNINSURED WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight one month after our Nation recognized Cover the Uninsured Week to draw attention to a national crisis, and that is the crisis of the uninsured. This crisis affects all Americans, and so for the fifth straight year, I have reserved this hour to highlight the issue of the uninsured.

Madam Speaker, I believe that all Americans have a right to affordable and comprehensive health care. But unfortunately, according to the Census Bureau, 47 million Americans are without health insurance. Millions more encounter a health care system that is inadequate in meeting their basic medical needs because they are underinsured.

According to a recent Commonwealth Foundation study, there are 16 million Americans who are underinsured, meaning their insurance did not adequately protect them against catastrophic health care expenses. That means that 63 million Americans, or one-in-five Americans, have either no health insurance, have only sporadic coverage, or have health insurance coverage that leaves them exposed to high health care costs.

Additionally, even those with health care coverage are faced with rising health care costs. As our economy continues to falter and the price of food and gas rises, high health care costs are straining more and more family budgets. The lack of affordable comprehensive health care affects every congressional district in the Nation.

To highlight this issue and the real impact that is being—that being uninsured has on the lives of Americans, I have reserved this time to share some of the letters that I have read in my office from constituents who have had difficulty in obtaining and affording comprehensive health care coverage.

Too often here in Congress, we speak of health care issues and the antiseptic jargon of policymakers and lawyers. We talk about Medicare Part D and insurance risk pools, but people across America are hurting. And these letters tell their stories in their own words.

I represent a district in south-central Wisconsin, and while the letters I read may be from Wisconsinites, they speak to the difficulties that people all over America face every day.

I'm going to start with a few letters about the ever-increasing price of health care.

Vickie in Beloit, Wisconsin, writes, ''I am a 51-year-old woman, and was recently in the hospital. I have no insurance and my bill was almost $22,000. I was unconscious when I was taken there by ambulance, so I didn't know they were going to run all of these tests which were going to be the biggest part of my bill. I really have no idea how I'm going to pay this. I inquired about health insurance about 6 months ago, and it was over $700 a month.''

Ross in Wisconsin Dells, Wisconsin, writes to me, ''I am 78 years old. My wife is 82. We have Medicare part A, B, and D and supplemental insurance. There is so much that is not covered that we spend ALL our Social Security on medical costs and stuff that Medicare doesn't cover, like hearing aids and dental bills. If we didn't have some income besides our Social Security, we would both be in a nursing home, but I am not sick.''

Michael in Poynette, Wisconsin, writes that ''I am a Federal employee and a member of the Wisconsin Air National Guard. This past year we were granted a wage increase of roughly 2.3 percent. At the same time, the cost of our Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan benefit increased by up to 44 percent. Along with this, many of the copays also increased. This has put a tremendous strain on my colleagues in the Wisconsin Air National Guard, many who have been deployed three or more times in support of operations throughout the Middle East region.''

Ed in Monroe, Wisconsin, writes, ''My wife and I live in the gap. Between our Social Security and the disability policy she had, we get too much money to qualify for help, but not enough to really get by. With the donut hole in Medicare D, we would only be able to get my wife's meds for three months if it were not for samples provided by her doctors. Four out of her 10 meds would take 65 percent of our total income if it were not for the help of that doctor. I live with chronic pain because of a cancer treatment, but as the years go by, it helps less and I have other medical problems that are gradually getting worse. I have a wife and a son that I have to take care of because neither can do it all for themselves. I am the one who battles with Social Security and the insurance companies. I have to deal with problems that arise with their medications, their finances and many day-to-day things. Every time I hear a politician talk about cutting Medicare and other programs for the elderly and disabled, it scares me to death because I am just hanging on by a thread.''

Glen in Wisconsin Dells, Wisconsin, writes, ''My wife and I are retired and are on Medicare and supplemental insurance with drug coverage through my former employer. Our monthly cost for both is about $1,050 a month. With next year's increase, it will take my whole monthly pension to pay for our health insurance. It's like an adjustable rate mortgage that only increases.''

Sue in Beloit, Wisconsin, writes, ''My husband was diagnosed with lung cancer. After treatment began, we found out that the insurance company had a small loophole for the treatment of cancer. Under our insurance, they have a $13,000 limit per year on radiation and chemotherapy. That amount did not even cover the first treatment of either radiation or chemo. I was not going to have my husband die for lack of treatment, so we started to use our savings and available credit to pay for

medical expenses. My husband later died. After having completely depleted our savings and facing insurmountable credit card debt, I had no choice but to file bankruptcy last year.''

□ 1700

Michelle in Middleton writes: ''My sister had been diagnosed with a possible brain tumor. She has a job with minimal pay and minimal insurance. It pays for the first $1,000 of medical costs per year and then the patient is to pay the next $5,000 before it kicks in again. She cannot afford this. She has already incurred the $1,000 of cost and bills are piling up. She has no idea how she will ever pay for all of the medical care she has needed and the stress is huge. Medical care should be a right of all. We all pay if prevention and early intervention don't happen.''

Michelle brings up an important point in her letter because people without comprehensive health insurance are often not getting the care that they desperately need. A recent study released by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that cost prevented 41.1 percent of uninsured adults from seeing a doctor that they needed to see.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to next focus on the connection between employment and health care. Only about 40 percent of businesses who employ low-wage or part-time workers offer health benefits. And at $11,480 per year, the average family's health insurance premium now costs more than a minimum-wage worker makes in a whole year.

And as we all know, the costs of health care are rising far faster than inflation. Between 2000 and 2006, health premiums for employer-sponsored insurance jumped 87 percent, far outpacing inflation's 18 percent overall increase over the same period of time.

Many of my constituents feel trapped. Either they cannot find jobs that offer good health care benefits, or they do have jobs that offer health insurance but they feel that they can't leave those jobs for fear of losing that health insurance.

Lisa in Beloit, Wisconsin, writes me. She says: ''My husband and I have been without insurance on and off for the last 8 months. My husband is diabetic and his insulin can run up to $500 a month, not to mention all the other medications he takes. Thank God for the VA and their assistance. So we are managing with his health issues, but I have not had any well-woman checkups in a long time because I either had no insurance or the work I was doing, I couldn't get any time off to go to a doctor. I have made quite a few job changes in the last year to find the right fit for me, and I feel that I have finally found one, but my concern is that why do we have to suffer healthwise? Why do I have to rely on employers for benefits and be at their mercy, employment-wise, in order to obtain health care?''

Carolyn from Madison, Wisconsin, writes: ''In 2002, I left my full-time job to pursue my dream of having my own business. Unable to afford COBRA, I looked around for affordable insurance with a high deductible. Imagine my surprise when five companies turned me down because of my controlled hypertension and 30 pounds overweight. I struggled for over a year, paying $150 a month for medication at the pharmacy. I developed extremely painful neuropathy in my feet and was unable to seek medical treatment for the condition because I had no insurance. So I just suffered, and I do mean suffered. After more than a year of endless suffering, I had no choice but to take a part-time job driving a school bus so that I could get health insurance. Eventually I had to give up my business because I no longer had the strength or energy to handle a growing business as well as a part-time job.''

Frank in Madison, Wisconsin, writes: ''I'm a 42-year-old male who has diabetes. I cannot get private health care coverage due to my illness. Two years ago, I stepped out of a corporate job to start my own business to fulfill a dream. I was not prepared for the fact that I would not be able to purchase a private health care policy for myself, due to my preexisting condition of diabetes. After 2 years of self-employment and lack of adequate health care coverage, I have no choice but to let go of my dream to own my own business and go back to working for a corporation so I can again receive health care coverage.''

Bonnie in Janesville, Wisconsin, wrote: ''I have, for years, had to be the one in our household, to maintain health insurance because my husband is self-employed. I could not take just any job I wanted. It was so nice when he turned 65 and was able to get Medicare. I was able to take a job that offered a plan for just singles. Since starting this job, I have had significant health issues. I have tried to keep working because I will be unable to find insurance and I can't afford the COBRA payments. I realize that there are people worse off. But I find it so difficult some days to have to come to work; if I work part-time, I would have no insurance to cover my health expenses.''

Madam Speaker, the high cost of health care affects employers as well as employees.

Greg in Verona, who owns a small business, wrote me recently. He writes: ''Since 1998, we've been providing health care to our employees. Every year, we've had double-digit increases in our costs. This year, the insurance company has informed us that we'll be paying 42 percent more next year, which will lead to one of several eventualities:

''1. We'll have to reduce what we cover as a benefit for our employees and hopefully retain them. Reality is, many will leave and we'll have trouble replacing them.

''2. We'll eat the increase but offer no employee raises for the next 3 years.

''3. We'll raise our prices and force customers to look elsewhere for the services that we currently provide them.

''The very real possibility is we'll end up with some element of all of the scenarios and end up not being able to keep the doors open. Very scary thought when one considers that my business has been around for 55 years.''

Madam Speaker, I also get many letters from constituents who are nearing 65 but are not yet eligible for Medicare. I'd like to share some of their stories with you, too.

Daniel in Madison, Wisconsin, writes: ''I am close to 57 and the combination of my disability and age are making work more difficult all the time. I have been thinking about retirement, but I found that if I do retire, I would lose my medical assistance that I count on for my medical needs. This is due to the fact that I would receive a small State pension. Pensions are considered unearned income, even though the pension was part of our compensation for working. One cannot have any unearned income and receive medical assistance. This seems very unfair. People with disabilities have a difficult time getting employed if they need benefits. Now I find it's just as hard to stop working and retain the needed medical benefits.''

Marilyn in Oregon, Wisconsin, writes: ''Tammy, I am writing you this e-mail to let you know how frustrated I am with the health insurance coverage in this country, especially for people over 50. I recently lost my job. I did not reach my retirement age. I was only 2 years away. My husband and I have had to use our life savings to pay $700 a month for health insurance. I just received a letter that the premium is going to go up next year $60 a month. My only choice is to cancel, since we have used up almost all of our savings. My husband and I do not know what to do for health insurance anymore.''

Charlotte in Baraboo, Wisconsin, writes: ''I am 54 years old and work 40 hours a week. A lot of jobs in our area have health care but might as well not offer any. It is really bad insurance. I know a lot of people in their 50s that have health problems that make it very hard for them to continue working, but they have to in order to have insurance for their health problems. Many of them would like to retire.''

Madam Speaker, simply put, our health care system is failing and America knows this. Among the thousands of letters regarding health care that I receive, there is a common thread, a common theme that binds them together; and that common theme is an overwhelming frustration with a system they know just is not working and a call for those of us in Congress to take action.

Here are some more stories. Michael in Burlington, Wisconsin, writes: ''My late daughter was diagnosed with lymphangiomatosis and Gorham's vanishing bone disease in March 2005. We

found out how much a child with a terminal illness costs a person. My wife and I used every amount of credit and refinanced our house three times just to take care of her. Since her death, the bills mounted so bad that now we will have to file bankruptcy and we have already been foreclosed on our home.

''Secondly, my wife was born with a hole in her heart. In 1972, the doctors repaired the hole. In doing so, through the blood transfusion they gave her hepatitis C. Now she is preexisting at 37 and can't get life insurance and has been repeatedly denied health care coverage. Her mental breakdown because of the death of our daughter left the insurance companies another reason not to let her have health care. This needs to change.''

Sherry in Lake Delton, Wisconsin, writes: ''I live in a place where most jobs are low quality and low paying and don't offer health insurance benefits. I have had jobs on occasion that have offered insurance, but they have never lasted due to the fact that this area prefers to believe that you are not entitled to a life if you work here. In 1995, I gave birth to my first and only child. In my quest to find employment that would allow me to afford raising my child and pay enough for me to support her without working 18 hours a day, I met my future husband. I was employed when I sustained a work injury that went through on workman's comp. I was left with an injury that was never addressed and bills that workman's comp refused to pay. This injury has prevented me from even applying for better jobs, as the physical pain prevents me from performing many tasks that I have done in the past. My inability to bring a decent income to our home has created major stress on my husband. My marriage is falling apart daily due to health problems and my inability to support my husband. I tried to apply for Badger Care, Wisconsin's Medicaid program, and was told that we slightly exceeded the limits for a family of three, but if I was willing to leave my marriage and my home, that they would be more than happy to give me everything that was available. This just doesn't make any sense.''

Cindy from Fitchburg, Wisconsin, writes: ''I was in a motorcycle accident in Wyoming in 2004. The driver lost control on a gravel road. I ended up on the bottom of a mountain. I was found unconscious and covered in blood. Unfortunately, the people I was with didn't take me to a hospital. It wasn't until I was driven back to Wisconsin that I was taken to a hospital. When I did go to the hospital, doctors told me I should have died.

''My company where I worked had been sold just prior to this trip to Wyoming. I was supposed to start a new job when I returned. During that transition, I had just a few months without health insurance. I could not afford COBRA at $426 a month along with rent.

''The ER in Wisconsin did a CAT scan and recommended that I follow up with my doctor. At this point, I had problems talking, walking, and was in a great deal of pain. I had to give up my apartment and move in with a friend. I was able to continue my health care with COBRA paying for it with my unemployment. But once my unemployment ended so did my ability to pay for health insurance. My savings and 401(k) are all gone.

''My condition worsened without medical treatment. I had tried to get medical assistance, but was refused because I have no dependents and have not been diagnosed as terminal. I had applied for SSDI, which now takes 2 to 3 years for approval.

''I have been left with no income, unable to work, no insurance, and no home. The doctors told me that it may be possible for me to work again, if I can resume my medical treatments. As of now, I have no chance.

□ 1715

''With private health insurance or universal health care, I may have been taken to the hospital the night of the accident instead of being left to die. I would have gotten the treatment needed to prevent my brain from swelling, which caused further damage I may not have had today.

''If there were a mandatory law that people had to carry vehicle insurance, it might have also helped. If SSDI didn't have a 2 or 3-year waiting list, I may be able to get the health care and finances now for me to get better and return to work. If there were some dollars set aside for people without insurance, would my GP have helped?

''This can happen to anyone at any time. I was a homeowner, I had a professional career, and now I'm left without any help. I thought the United States was the richest Nation in the world. How can a human being be discarded?''

Julie from Beloit, Wisconsin writes, ''I was just notified that my insurance company will be raising my house insurance by nearly $100 per year solely based on my credit report. Eight years ago, I had a sterling credit report; in fact, I was able to get a very low interest loan for the house that I bought because of it. Five years ago, I had a medical emergency which caused me to default on two credit cards and to create medical bills I have no hope of ever repaying. I had the choice between buying bandages and ointments, which are not covered by my insurance, for my legs or making my monthly credit card payments. I chose life. For as my doctors told me, I would have eventually lost my legs, if not my life, if I had not sought treatment.

''I know it's legal for insurance companies to do this just as it is legal for businesses to do a credit report on potential employees, but that doesn't mean it's right. I can see the point, to some extent, if poor credit rating were caused by irresponsibility. What I do not get is why people whose sole financial error was to have a health care crisis should be penalized for it.

''It does not take a rocket scientist to see that this will affect the poor, the elderly, and the disabled the most, who are often already either underinsured or uninsured. As for me, I will have to raise my deductible substantially and seriously consider filing for bankruptcy in the hopes of eventually improving my credit rating.''

Eva from Madison, Wisconsin writes, ''I am contacting you in regards to my desperate need for public health care. I am a grad student. I recently sprained my ankle playing soccer and had to go to the emergency room for x-rays. My bill came out to $1,242.50 because I can only afford a measly insurance that has only catastrophic coverage. This is a ridiculous amount of money for such a visit, and it causes me to consider those less fortunate than me who have even more serious injuries and less familial support. This cost can truly make waves in the lives of people.''

Suzanne from Stoughton, Wisconsin writes, ''It is time to have the government deal with health care. We are covered under COBRA, which will run out in March. The cost is going from $500 per month to $900 per month. We checked with Blue Cross, and they refused us coverage because of a preexisting condition. They will not even offer a waiver for this preexisting condition. We checked with the Wisconsin State Insurance Program, which will cover us for $1,200 a month. Please let people over 60 buy into Medicare. It is impossible to find a job that offers health insurance.''

Silvia from Fitchburg, Wisconsin shared her story with me. Silvia was uninsured when she was hospitalized with the need for an appendectomy. Even after the hospital charity program reduced her bill, she still owed over $11,000 to the hospital. Sometimes bill collectors call her at home five times per day. Silvia chips away at the bills, sending $20 or $50 a month.

Roberta from Janesville, Wisconsin writes, ''I think the insurance bills for both medical and dental are horrendous. Both my husband and I work full-time with two small children, living paycheck to paycheck. My insurance costs have caused us many heartaches, with us owing more money than what needs to be paid. As a result, I will not get a needed medical procedure done.

''Something drastically needs to change in the United States of America where hardworking individuals and families can get the treatment they need without going broke.''

Patricia from Madison, Wisconsin writes, ''We need to fix health care. I have to choose between food, heat and medications. I have lost 80 pounds because of this. Please help.''

Heather from Waterloo, Wisconsin writes, ''I am married. And together with my husband I own a home. We live a modest, middle class life, managing to always have what we need, except

health care. My husband has excellent health care at his job, but for me to also be covered by his plan we would need to pay nearly $400 per month. That is two-thirds as much as our home mortgage.

''Through school, I have worked less and less in order to maintain health coverage. I have only been able to afford short-term major medical coverage. I am grateful that we can afford this, but it does make a difference. Even now, if I have a sore throat, I will wait a few days to see how I feel. I will wait because if I don't need to go, I certainly need to save the money. This is disturbing to me as a nursing student because I know the importance of early treatment and prevention. And it's upsetting to me as a person because I value my health. It's unacceptable to me as a citizen because I know there are other people just like me who wait and get sicker or can't take the medications that they need.''

Brad from Mount Horeb, Wisconsin writes me, ''I write you today to urge you to take action on a growing crisis in America, health care. I strongly believe that we need a national health care plan to insure all Americans.

''My major concern with the current system is when people attempt to obtain health insurance, insurance companies refuse them because of past health history. Let's face it, insurance companies are in business to make a profit. The best way to make a profit is to ensure the healthy so that you can minimize the claims you pay out, and not insure those who need medical care or who may potentially need medical care.

''I am 38 years old with a family of four. I currently participate in a health savings account. For all practical purposes, I pay for all of my own medical needs, including the recent birth of our daughter.

''I recently attempted to switch insurance providers. The insurance companies will insure me, but they will not insure my daughter for any type of treatment for her asthma for 3 years, along with no drug coverage for life. The policy I was requesting had a $10,000 deductible, yet they still refused coverage.''

Lisa from Madison writes, ''I'm a very healthy person, and my husband and children are very healthy. We cannot get insurance. I think everyone should attempt to get an individual health insurance policy just to see how impossible it is. I'm not a risk, really, I am not. I am terrified right now because we are uninsured.''

Carol from Madison, Wisconsin writes, ''As someone who has had no health insurance at all for 3 years, I can tell you that it was pretty miserable being one of the millions of people in this country without health insurance. Not long ago, my best friend died at age 42 because of ovarian cancer because she did not have health insurance and waited too long to see what was causing all of her symptoms. Yes, people in America actually die from not having health insurance.''

Darla from Fitchburg, Wisconsin wrote, ''I lost my job because of unpredictable attendance due to my health issues. Upon losing my job, I signed up for COBRA. Last week I received a letter indicating my COBRA eligibility ends soon. In order for me to get health coverage, I would have to work at least 20 hours per week. My physicians believe that would do me more harm than good relating to my health issues.

''If I do not get some kind of health insurance, I will need to stop all treatments, and I have no money to pay for doctor services. My prescription drugs will have to stop, as I will not be able to pay for them either. What can I do?''

Kimberly from Madison writes, ''I'm writing today because of my family's frustration and anxiety over health care. Although we hear a lot of rhetoric about making health care more affordable and/or more available for Americans, nothing is happening, at least not soon enough.

''My husband recently started his own business. Obviously it will take some time for his company to see any profits, much less income. In the meantime, we are without health insurance. I am 5 months pregnant, and we have a 2-year-old son. Because of my preexisting condition, we cannot buy affordable health coverage. COBRA would cost us $1,200 per month. I am currently applying for Medicaid and other forms of public assistance as a last resort. This is ridiculous.

''As someone with no insurance, I wonder what could possibly be the problem with implementing a public health care system. Oh, I have heard the horror stories about having fewer choices in doctors, longer waiting lists for procedures, and less incentive among doctors and researchers to develop new techniques. But what's most frightening to me is the chance that my son might get sick or my baby might be born with expensive complications while we are uninsured.

''I am not naive. I know that funding public health care is an issue. But is it wise to sacrifice the health and well-being of American citizens to avoid the challenge of implementing a change? I, for one, would be satisfied to pay more for goods and services if I could rest assured that my family's basic health care needs were being met.''

David from Cross Plains, Wisconsin writes, ''My wife and I have been self-employed for over 18 years and have paid thousands of dollars for health insurance premiums. As of a few months ago, we had to drop out and are now without health insurance. The cost is completely out of reach; in fact, it's nuts. Now that I am 50 years old, it's not a matter of if I will ever have health problems, it's when. Tammy, we will lose everything we have ever worked for. So much for the American Dream. Now we look forward to dying broke and possibly homeless.''

Victor from Stoughton, Wisconsin writes, ''My wife can only work part-time because of her health. Her employer offers a generic policy that costs $3.97 a week and requires no background check. This policy covers basically nothing. Medical supplies, check-ups, doctors visits necessary on a routine basis for my wife to survive are now not covered. My wife is uninsurable because of her health, and we have been turned down for health insurance that we have applied for. We cannot believe that this is happening to us.''

Ronald from Deerfield, Wisconsin writes, ''I was on COBRA insurance for 3 years, which ended this past fall. I spent from March until September trying to get private insurance, but could not because of my neck injury. I was, in effect, looked at and dismissed by 33 private insurance companies because of my preexisting condition with my neck injury. Just imagine how you would feel after being dismissed by this many companies. I was finally insured through disability and Medicare. The sad reality of it is that if I want to try to work full-time again, I cannot, because in doing so, it would cost me the only insurance option I have left.

''The truth is that many other countries can and do provide equitable health insurance to all of their citizens no matter what preexisting conditions they have or their ability to pay or what income level they have. I believe this country does have top-notch medical facilities, but not decent or equitable insurance for poor and middle-income families.''

□ 1730

Susan, from Baraboo, Wisconsin, writes, ''I'm writing you today regarding health insurance coverage for single people with no children. As of this time, I feel that I am left out of the loop in regards to this topic. I am 42, and last September, I was diagnosed with breast cancer. In January of this year, the company that I worked for informed us that they would be closing down. I was laid off in December while I was out due to my cancer treatments. I have been searching for health care everywhere because my COBRA will be going up, and I am on unemployment and am barely able to pay the $244.76 for the coverage now. I cannot get insurance because of the breast cancer. The high-risk insurance program in Wisconsin is too expensive for me to get coverage since they want 4 months of premiums up front, and they only cover some things. What are single people supposed to do? We don't qualify for any government assistance because we are single. We cannot go without insurance. There are no programs to help us out. So, when you are working on health care in the House of Representatives, please remember that there are other single people out there also in my shoes. I am at a crossroad because I have no avenue for assistance when it comes to health care. Come November, I will be unable to get coverage when I need it at this point in my life.''

Janet from Portage, Wisconsin writes, ''I have a 53-year-old brother

who has psoriasis all over his body and arthritis that is caused by this. Three weeks ago, he fell and needs surgery on his shoulder to repair it. He has no job, no money and no insurance. We started looking for a program to help him. There are none that we can find. There is nothing to help him get his shoulder fixed, but after it heals wrong and he is disabled because of it, then there are programs to help him. They will not help get it fixed so he could find a good job. Instead, they would rather support him for the rest of his life instead of trying to help him now.''

Gail from Janesville writes, ''My husband recently lost his job. He applied for over 100 positions only to be told that he lacked a college degree or he is overqualified or they can only pay $8 an hour. I was diagnosed with breast cancer in June of 1998 and again in 2003. I have gone through breast cancer twice and have undergone a mastectomy and reconstructive surgery. COBRA has run out, and without a stable income, we cannot afford to pay the premiums of our own health care policy. My husband is 59 years old, and I am 58, and we have no medical coverage. I have looked at every insurance company and get turned down because of my medical history. All our lives we have paid into these insurance companies only to be turned away when we need coverage the most.''

Lastly, Madam Speaker, I want to relay a story that was shared with me by Laurie, a fourth grade teacher in Madison, Wisconsin. Laurie recently had a student fall during recess and break his foot. Laurie writes me.

''As he was waiting in extreme pain and cold for the school nurse to get to him, he cried to an assistant, waiting with him, 'I can't go to the doctor. We don't have insurance.''' That a 9- or 10-year-old child should even think something like this is an atrocity.

Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing that obtaining comprehensive, affordable health care presents a very real challenge for millions and millions of Americans. We can not turn a deaf ear on our constituents' pleas for help. I invite my colleagues to join me in working on this most pressing domestic priority—to provide quality, affordable health care for all Americans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I yield back my remaining time.

AMERICAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the recognition and the opportunity to say a few words on the topic that has been talked about here on the floor repeatedly as well as by our constituents on almost a daily basis.

For those of you who may not have heard it originally earlier this morning, I want to harken back once again to that old movie, ''The Natural.'' As you will remember, the fictional team—the New York Knights—in an effort to try and stop their losing streak, brought in a psychologist to speak to them, to the team.

As he was sitting there, talking to them, he simply said, ''The mind is a strange thing, men.''

We must begin by asking what is ''losing.'' ''Losing'' is a disease as contagious as syphilis. ''Losing'' is a disease as contagious as the Bubonic plague, attacking one but infecting all. Now, imagine, if you will, you're on a ship at sea on a vast ocean, gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking.

At that stage, Roy Hobbs, not being able to take it anymore, realizing the possibility that actually winning a game has nothing to do with talking to a psychologist or to a psychiatrist at the team meeting but that it has everything to do with performance on the field, just bolted out of the room and ran up there because he couldn't take it anymore.

What Roy Hobbs realized is, if you are going to be successful, it has got to take action. You have to do something. There are too many people on this floor who have been talking and talking about energy. There are too many people who have tried to find scapegoats to blame for the energy situation we are in. They blame Big Oil. They tell you we're in an energy bubble of some kind. Yesterday, someone even suggested that Enron was the reason. The only thing we have done under the auspices of the majority party so far here is allow attorneys to go and sue OPEC countries so they'll give us more oil. Now, that is like talking to them and simply saying, ''Lack of energy is a disease.''

Imagine you're on a ship, on a vast ocean of oil, gently rocking, gently rocking, but are not doing anything to get the job done. Indeed, if we continue on that pattern, we can be living in reality the words of the book, which are simply ''how we get along by freezing in the dark.''

See, what Roy Hobbs understood in the movie was that, if you want to win, you don't get there by talking about it. You have to get out and do something. He went out on the field; he was given a chance to play, and he pounded the crap out of the ball. In so doing, he was able to be successful, and the New York Knights started to win, to win more than they ever had again.

One of the things this party is talking about is, if given the chance to play one more time on the field, we will go out there, and we will do things. We will promote action. We will not be satisfied with simply the psychology of saying, ''We will freeze in the dark and accept it and be happy about it.'' We will produce energy to eliminate the need for the consumption. Because you see? It is, indeed, an attitude. Our attitude should be that we are not accepting the status quo and that we are not going to be satisfied until we have a new goal in this country, which is to be energy-secure and energy-independent. That has to be our goal and that we are going to do things now to do it.

I hate to say this, but I am one of those who strongly supports American energy production. There was a time, if you actually admitted that in public, it was kind of like you're in favor of drowning kittens, but with gasoline's now costing $4 a gallon and being likely to rise, people's attitudes have now been changing. Some people used to say, if you were for American energy production, you were merely a shill for Big Oil. Unfortunately, there are still people who are saying that, but that's not the reality.

Who I am fighting for are the people who are being impacted by our energy crisis. I am fighting for the thousands of natural gas users in my home State of Utah who are going to be asked to pay next winter to heat their homes at an increased cost of around 36 percent. It will be the largest increase in their ability to heat their homes in the history of this country.

I am fighting for 1,100 citizens who lost their jobs last week and for the countless others who are going to pay increased ticket prices with the airlines because United Airlines announced it was cutting 1,100 jobs and was removing 100 airplanes from its fleet because it could not contain the spiraling oil fuel prices.

I am fighting for an Ethiopian-born, Washington, D.C. cab driver who for the first time since his kids started school was unable to greet them when they came home from school because, every day, he now has to work 2 hours longer just to make the same daily income he was making before this energy, gas price spiked.

I am fighting for people like Christine of Utah, who is actually selling her plasma now to make ends meet with this high-energy demand.

I am fighting for dozens of citizens in my State who are reportedly selling their jewelry, electronics—even one gold tooth—in order to cover the high cost of gasoline.

I am fighting for a young father in Virginia who was not able to attend his father-and-son outing last month because the cost of the gasoline to go there was too excessive.

I am fighting for the students in Nevada's Clark County School District who are facing a 62 percent budget overrun solely because of the amount of gas it takes to run the school buses in that county's district.

I am fighting for citizens in my home State who choose to risk imprisonment in order to fill up their tanks. One Utah minivan and truck driver, a minivan and truck that belong to the Alpine Medical Equipment Company, had his gas tank drilled, and the sole motive was to steal the gas in his tank.

Because of that, there were 30 needy people who did not receive their scheduled deliveries of oxygen tanks, wheelchairs and beds at their homes on that particular day.

Now, to my Democratic colleagues, I want you to notice there was no mention in that litany of people of Exxon or of Shell or of Conoco or of BP or of Chevron or of all of the other Big Oil scapegoats that we often hear about. But let me make no mistake. I do support these entities because I am for a fair and level-headed recognition that our main focus, that our main mission in this country, must be to deliver and to develop cheap, affordable energy for American citizens. They are not public enemy number one nor should we try and push off on scapegoats the inability to do that. We have the ability. We have the resources. That's why we're fighting today, and I will not cower in support of average Americans who need this kind of support.

Now, in so doing, the Western Caucus, of which I am a member, will be introducing a bill that is trying to do what needs to be done, which is to make sure that we have a comprehensive approach to energy development. Conservation is a key element in meeting our energy needs, but that alone will not solve the problem. Production of all means of energy because there is no one, single, silver bullet is a key element. That alone will not meet the needs. Innovation is also needed, innovation in some kind of effort that, when we have the new sources of energy that we can develop, we need to be able to deliver those sources of energy.

So the three elements that have to be in any particular bill and will be in a comprehensive American energy act are the concepts of pushing conservation, of pushing production and of pushing innovation, not necessarily in any particular order. All three of them have to be there if we are ever going to meet the needs of the American people. It has to be there.

There are some who would like to try and single out some particular area. There is a city in France that is kind of going back to the future. In fact, what the city in France did is they got rid of their entire municipal fleet, and instead of their municipal fleet of automobiles, they bought horse-drawn carriages. They are called eco-friendly, horse-drawn carriages. Each one of those fleets costs $17,000. They feature disk brakes, signal lamps, removable seats. That's how they're trying to solve their energy problem.

Now, the only thing I will caution once again, when we try to go backwards into history to try to solve our problems rather than using modern technology, is that, in 1900 in New York City, just before the automobile was introduced and everything was once again with those eco-friendly, horse-drawn carriages, New York City produced 90,000 tons of horse manure every year, not to mention the millions of gallons of horse urine every year. I'm sorry. That had to be disposed of, most of it in the water.

What they found in New York City is that it was impossible to get rid of all of the horse droppings, and therefore, there was on the streets a fine mist, a mist that was always in the air, and there was an endemic tuberculosis problem to the point where environmentalists in New York City, when automobiles were finally introduced, were happy because, for the first time, they could limit the amount of horse-drawn carriages and could actually improve the health of citizens in New York.

□ 1745

Sometimes, trying to go back in history or try to find a cheap, easy way is not the solution. The solution is technology. Technology can present solutions to all of our problems. Sometimes it's a long time in coming, sometimes it comes as rapidly as new cell phone plans.

Consider in 1900 what Jules Vern must have thought as he predicted in the future in his writings. Did he ever realize we would go from radios to iPods, from antibiotics to organ transplants? Do you think he actually envisioned the concept of bottled water? All those things are results of technology.

New technology will allow us to better use our existing energy resources, and that technology, which has to be part of this equation, the innovation part, has to be both in the public and the private sector. We need a major overhaul of the way Washington manages our input. We cannot solve all our problems by bringing in a bunch of experts to sit in a room in Washington. We must reach out with an aggressive national research effort.

One of the reasons we want to produce more energy in the United States is because the royalties we use can, and in this bill, will be funneled back into research so that technology can find even better ways of doing things. We also have to realize that as we are looking for that, it has to be market-driven. We cannot have an over-reliance on old technologies and uneconomical resources simply because they happen to be politically successful here in Washington.

The best way to destroy this effort of using technology is to allow government to pick winners and losers. It has to be done through the concept of the private sector. Federal mandates and massive government programs will not solve the problem. Certainly we will have government-funded labs. But they cannot be the only solution. I do not believe it is the only, nor is it the most practical way of solving our problem. If we want to think of how we can spur on innovation, what we have to do is tap the greatest resource this country has, which is the American people.

Just think of what American people have been able to do in history. In 1784, we invented bifocals, something I still don't use; 1794, the cotton gin, and it changed the world; 1805, Americans invented refrigerators, and the next year, coffeepots; 1837, it was power tools; 1849, the safety pin; 1867, the typewriter, which revolutionized the way information is handled; 1867, it was barbed wire, which enabled us to secure the West. Even more important, and also in 1867, we invented for the first time toilet paper.

In 1888, it was revolving doors. Three years later, it was escalators, which evolved into the Ferris wheel the next year. In 1903, crayons; 1905, windshield wipers; 1930, Scotch tape; 1945, microwaves; 1955, nuclear submarines; 1957, polio vaccine; 1970, optical fiber; 1972, the artificial heart. It continues on and on.

Clearly, a country creative enough to come up with bifocals, the first oil well, the first blue jeans, the first telephone, the first crayon, not to mention airplanes, lasers, computers, everything else, is capable of developing the next source of energy and the technology to develop and deliver that energy.

If we look at history, it's likely that we would have even begun it before we imagined it today. How are we able to do that? By doing what our bill proposes to do and presenting prizes for technological breakthroughs in innovation.

I remind you that the British government offered a prize in 1714 for a device capable of measuring longitude, and John Harrison, a clock maker, got 20,000 pounds for devising the first accurate and durable chronometer that transformed the way we traveled across the oceans. In 1810, the first vacuum-sealed food was produced, after 15 years of experimentation, because Napoleon offered 12,000 Francs as a prize. We still use that technology today.

Will the Speaker be kind enough to tell us how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 45 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In 1909, the first flight across the English Channel was spurred on by a prize from a newspaper. Charles Lindbergh made his flight, nonstop flight from New York to Paris because there was a prize offered. And a $30 billion aviation industry sprang out of that. The British Spitfire, which saved England in the Battle of Britain, was developed as a result of the Snyder Trophy, a prize for technological development.

The United States Government also offers prizes today with its NASA Centennial Challenge Program, and it reaches out to nontraditional sources of innovation in academia, in industry, as well as the public.

Americans have always looked to ourselves for solutions. If we just have the confidence in American ingenuity, American creativity to deal and to overcome our problems and to insist that we do it now, we do not wait, I am confident that we can do that.

As I said, in all sincerity, if we are to solve the problem at the gas pump

today, there are three elements that have to be there. We have to be able to produce more, to conserve more, and especially to innovate.

I am happy to be joined by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and ask him if he would join us and talk about one of these areas which is extremely important to him, and he knows so much about it, that is the production end that has to go along with the increased technology for the innovation, as well as conservation. But without production, we cannot make it fit.

I am sure if we can have one of our good pages bring the easel and the first of the charts here, it can illustrate exactly what we are talking about as we move forward in this particular piece of legislation in an effort to try and make sure that we have a complete and rational policy towards energy production and solving the problems of people; letting them have their lives back with cheap and affordable American energy.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Utah, my good friend, for his wise words on innovation. I think we are going to be forced into innovation. That is good. But I will have to say the current prices of driving a vehicle and heating a home this year in my rural district are going to be prohibitive for some people being able to handle it.

Their budgets are not prepared for the prices. Because as we have felt the oil prices, natural gas only increased marginally last year, but today the price for natural gas out of the ground is $12 and 40-some cents. Last year at this time, it was between $6 and $7. We are approaching a doubling of natural gas prices.

At this time of the year, we don't use a lot of natural gas because we are not cooling much and we are not heating hardly anything. So we have surplus. We are using it for industrial purposes, which is big, and to generate electricity and to run our plants, but we are not using it at the home as much. So this is the time of year we normally put it in the ground.

Last year, we were putting $6 and $7 gas in the ground. This year, it's currently, in the last few months, $11, now $12 gas, and seems to be going up a few pennies every day. So we don't know where that is headed. But the fear is we have a storm in the Gulf, which always interrupts supply, we could have $15, $16 gas, and that would make home heating almost impossible next winter.

Just to share with you, as he was talking about innovation and change, I come from Titusville, Pennsylvania. I live in the little town of Pleasantville, Pennsylvania, 5 miles from there. But I was born 1 mile from Drakes Well, the first oil well in the world. It was drilled in 1859. And I vividly remember as a young boy, down the Oil Creek Valley, a stream called Oil Creek because it always had oil on it because the way oil perked its way out of the ground naturally. So there was oil on that stream.

And when we had the rush of oil, those hills were naked. There was no vegetation. The trees were gone. But today, it's almost like a virgin, beautiful oak-cherry forest. And the streams there, Oil Creek naturally produces both trout and bass, which is not very common. And the brooky trout streams flow into it all the way down. It's a beautiful, pristine area. And nobody did anything. They just left nature purify it. So oil is not the horrible thing. It's a hydrocarbon. It went back to dirt. The trees grew and the streams are pure and wildlife is very abundant.

Now I guess what we want to talk about is production. How did we get to $125 to $135 oil and how did we get to this tremendous price on natural gas? Many years ago, we had a legislative moratorium to lock up the Outer Continental Shelf. Now back then natural gas was $2, oil was $10, and many argued that we shouldn't use ours, we ought to use theirs. Whether that was a wise argument or not, I won't say, but they have won and it has been locked up ever since.

In the early nineties, President Bush I put a Presidential moratorium on top of the legislative moratorium. Now what is a moratorium. The Continental Shelf is from 3 miles offshore. The States control the first 3 miles. Then the Federal Government, we the taxpayers, own the next 200 miles. That is considered our Continental Shelf. And most every country in the world, in fact, every country in the world produces there. Canada produces right above Maine. Canada produces right above the State of Washington, Great Britain produces on their continental shelf; Norway, Sweden, Ireland, New Zealand, Australia. It's just common practice. In fact, everybody gives Brazil great credit for being energy independent, and they give credit for ethanol. Well, ethanol is 15 percent of their energy use. The rest of it, they opened up their Outer Continental Shelf, had a big find out there, and they are now self-sufficient. They don't have to buy from anybody. Wouldn't it be great if America would be self-sufficient?

I think we have a lot more oil than was anticipated in this country. I know we have a lot of natural gas. We are currently importing 17 percent of our natural gas. We wouldn't even have to do that. We get 15 percent from Canada and we get 2 percent from LNG, which is from foreign countries similar to where we buy oil.

So we have locked ours up. Now what does that do? Well, we have locked it up and so we have taken our supply off the market. Now what is this Congress doing to react to that? Two or three weeks ago, we passed a bill, very thoughtful bill. We said, We are going to figure out a way to bring OPEC into court. We are going to bring OPEC to court. We are going to force them to produce for energy so we have more petroleum. Currently, we import 66 percent of our petroleum, about half from that area of the world and about half from Canada and Mexico. So we are going to force them because they are not producing enough. I think Saudi Arabia produces 12 million, I think another one, 7 million; another one, 6 million; another one, 5 million. But someone has determined that is not enough so we are going to have to bring them into court.

Now how you take someone to court for not producing enough oil when we've locked up our Outer Continental Shelf, we've locked up most of Alaska, we've locked up most of the Midwest, now how a country can think that we can sue our neighbors for not selling us enough oil when we have refused to produce our own doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

My taxpayers back home laugh at that when they hear the debate, but it's not funny. But we actually passed a bill to do that, as if it would make a difference. And I don't know what court we would bring it into.

Let's look at our energy use today. We are about 40 percent petroleum, 23 percent natural gas, 23 percent coal, 8 percent nuclear, 2.7 hydro, 2.4 biomass. And this is the one people have not paid a lot of attention to. This is woody biomass. This one has grown measurably in the last few years. Eight hundred thousand Americans use a wood pellet stove today to heat their homes, and that is sawdust compressed. All our dry kilns in the country where we dry our wood uses wood sawdust to heat those rather than buy propane or fuel oil. A lot of factories in the rural areas are using wood waste also.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Would the speaker yield for a question?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Surely. Be glad to.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It is my understanding that in the natural forests of the United States, owned by the United States, we grow about 40 billion board feet of new growth a year.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. We have about 20 billion board feet of new death a year.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That's right.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It's my understanding the Forest Service is only removing about 2 billion, not 20 billion, but 2 billion board feet a year. Is that not a potential plus for it, and is it also not true that this Congress prohibited any new development in that area?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That's one of the problems. Wood waste has great potential. I also have a company in my district that has built a wonderful wood waste boiler. It burns cleaner that natural gas and will burn even green wood, and it burns it cleanly. But the Democrats passed a bill that prohibits wood waste from public land from being utilized. We are not allowed to produce, which makes no public sense.

I don't know who got the theory that letting every tree grow makes sense. When you thin a forest, it grows much faster, which takes CO_2 out of the air. The biggest place to get rid of carbon in the air is plant life for us. And tree growth. Because you lock the carbon up. The log we cut down is carbon. We take it and put a roof on our house or floor in our house or windows in our house or furniture in our house. That is carbon.

□ 1800

You lock the carbon up. So we have taken it out of the air. Well, by not pruning the forest, your forest becomes like a jungle. It grows very slow, and it dies naturally, which turns to CO_2. As it dies naturally, it turns to CO_2 and emits into the air, just the same as we do when we breathe and when we burn something. So nature itself puts CO_2 back in the air.

But biomass is kind of a sleeper. I think it can do a lot. And if we could unlock the National Forests, if we could start marketing an appropriate amount from the National Forests. You know, 40 percent of America is owned by the government. I don't think people realize that. Almost 50 percent of America is owned by some level of government, when you include counties and State governments.

My State owns about 5 million acres in Pennsylvania. Most States don't have that much forest land. But the whole northern part of Pennsylvania is heavily owned, some by the Federal Government, much by the State, and a lot of that is not marketed adequately either. But when you market a forest adequately, when you prune it adequate, it is sort of like a garden. You prune the old out and you leave the young grow, and it is very healthy for the environment. It is much better for wildlife, and it is certainly better for clean air.

Geothermal, a good form of energy, but it is expensive installation. Wind, solar.

Now, here is the problem we face. How did we get here? I am going to tell you who I blame. I blame Congress. But who influenced Congress? Congress has pressure. Well, there is an organization. I made this statement the other day that Hugo Chavez and the Shah of Iran don't need lobbyists to keep us as a customer. The Democrats and the environmentalists continue to lock up domestic reserves, and that forces us to send billions of dollars over there to buy their oil.

Now, the Sierra Club is number one. They are against oil shale development, they are against coal liquefaction, they are against offshore energy production that I talked about a minute ago.

You have got Greenpeace. They want to phase out all fossil fuels. That means from here up, 86 percent of what we are using today has to go away. That is Greenpeace.

Environmental Defense says power plant smokestacks are public health energy number one. Folks, that is 51 percent of our electricity.

League of Conservation Voters. Coal to liquids. Most of us believe that coal to liquids or coal to gas is our future because we are the Saudi Arabia of coal. And when we learn how to do it, if carbon is the issue, I think we can could learn how to sequester the carbon, right along with the ability to make liquids from coal. Then we wouldn't be buying oil from other countries. We would be using the liquids made from our coal.

Defenders of Wilderness. It says every coastal State is put in harm's way when oil rigs go up in our coastal waters. Well, you know, folks, every country in America produces energy out there and has the rigs out there.

Next Wednesday, we are going to offer this Congress the first real chance we have for production. We are going to be offering offshore production. We are going to have legislation, an amendment to the Interior Committee, that will remove this. In the Interior Committee every year there is legislation that locks up, that says we cannot spend a dollar to lease the Outer Continental Shelf. That is 200 miles offshore.

We are going to remove that from 50 miles out. Now, 50 miles is giving a big cushion. A lot of countries do 20. Some do 25. Most don't do 50. We are going to give 50. Eleven miles is sight, so after 11 miles, it is four times the sight line, more than that, so there will be nothing anybody can see. And every person in the energy business, MMS, that is the minerals and mine management people who manage this program, said that the most environmentally sensitive way to produce energy is offshore. It improves the fishing. It doesn't hurt it. You are not disturbing wildlife. You are not disturbing anything. So offshore energy is our most environmentally friendly way to harvest energy and use it.

So we are going to give this Congress a chance next Wednesday, not the whole Congress, but just the Interior Subcommittee, to remove that moratorium. Then we will have to maintain it in full committee if we win and then maintain it on the floor, and then we will have to deal with the Senate, which is always our tremendous challenge.

So as we go down these, we have these groups, Natural Resource Defense, coal mining. They are opposed to coal mining. They want coal. That is 50 percent of our electric grid.

Center for Biological Diversity. Oil and gas drilling on public lands has devastating effects.

Folks, it is a new era. You talked about technology. We have new technology. We know how to do it right. You drill a 6 inch hole in the ground. With gas, you just let gas out. With oil, you pump out oil. It does not have to be an environmental disaster.

Then Friends of the Earth, the other one, the eighth one, liquid coal is dirty and a costly fuel.

Folks, these eight groups, Sierra Club, Greenpeace, Environmental Defense, League of Conservation Voters, Defenders of Wilderness, Natural Resource Defense Council, Center for Biological Diversity, and Friends of the Earth, those are the people you need to thank for the energy of America being locked up. It is their influence on Congress that has prevented us from a providing energy for America. They are wrong, folks. They need to lose that argument. We need to show them that we can produce energy.

Now, as far as the world is concerned, you know, when it was $2 for gas and $10 for oil, maybe they were right. We should use their's. I remember that argument. Folks, at $125 to $130 a barrel, at $12.50 for natural gas, I think it is time to use ours.

What is the other benefit of using ours? When we produce American energy, the landowner makes money, whether it is the government or a private person. The promoter of the well makes money. The pipeline guy makes money. The driller makes money. The hydrofracking people make money. The processing station, whether it is gas or the refineries for oil, make money. Millions of dollars of wealth are created. Billions of dollars of wealth created. Hundreds of thousands of people have wonderful jobs and can maintain a family and home. So producing our own energy will put a lot of Americans to work, especially in rural America where I live.

Now, they claim, and when you hear all the talk, it is the bottom three that are ready to take over, with geothermal, wind and solar. If we double wind and solar in the next 5 years, we are less than three-quarters of one percent of our energy. We are all for wind. We are all for solar. We are all for geothermal. I led the Hydrogen Caucus 10 years ago. But, folks, we are not there yet.

Now, what can keep us going? Here is what the Energy Department has in their chart. From this middle line towards me is history. That is where we have been. From that middle line out is where the Energy Department thinks we are going to be.

To listen to many people, you would think we are ready. We have been holding back wind and we have been holding back solar and we have been holding back geothermal. We have been holding back hydrogen. We have been holding back electric cars. Folks, nobody is holding anything back. It has to compete. We have spent billions on every one of the new energies. But their projection is that not much is going to change.

I don't quite agree with their chart, because I look for coal to decrease. This administration has not been friendly to coal. This Congress has not been friendly to coal. There have been 50 coal plants turned down in the last 6 months in this country. They will all become natural gas plants. And when you have a power plant and you switch to natural gas, this is going to widen.

Really, that is one of the reasons that we have expensive natural gas in America. Twelve years ago, we didn't use natural gas to make electricity. Only 8 percent of our electricity was made with natural gas. Today, 23 percent of our electricity is made with natural gas, and it has put tremendous pressure on natural gas.

Clean, green natural gas is the fuel that we use to make ethanol, it is the fuel we will use to make hydrogen. It is the fuel we will use as the bridge. A third of our auto fleet could be on clean, green natural gas if it was less expensive.

So I look at natural gas as the savior for us to get us to the new generations of fuels. But in the meantime, we are going to need a lot of oil. We are going to need coal. We are going to need nuclear. The energy bill in 05 gave incentives. It took 10 years to get a permit for a nuclear plant. We now force that to be done in 4. So they say 4 years to build one. So I say with delays and problems, we can build a nuclear plant in 10 years. There are 50 on the drawing board and there are three or four ready to go, and that is because of the 05 Energy Act. But we need all of those 50 on line by 2030 to remain 20 percent of the grid, because electric use is going up so fast.

Folks, the energy problem in America is because of the environmental groups we have decided to stop producing fossil fuels, forcing us to be 66 percent dependent on foreign and forcing us to cause part of the world shortage of petroleum and gas because we don't produce. So I find it very frustrating that here we are today with the highest prices.

One more thing on natural gas. Natural gas is the one fuel that is not a world price. Neither is coal. When oil is $120 a barrel, it is that all around the world. But we have had the highest natural gas prices in America for 8 years.

What does that do to us? That affects the petrochemical companies, the polymers and the plastic companies and the fertilizer companies that use huge amounts. They use it as an ingredient. Polymers and plastic, 45 percent of the cost of making it is natural gas. Fifty-five percent of the cost of petrochemical is natural gas. From 50 to 70 percent of fertilizer cost is natural gas.

Half of our fertilizer plants have left in the last 3 years. We have lost 300,000 polymer plastic jobs in the last 3 years. A great percentage of the petrochemical industry has moved offshore.

Just to show you, our largest chemical company is Dow Chemical. They spoke out the other day about natural gas prices. In 02, they spent $8 billion to purchase natural gas. This year, they will spend $32 billion for natural gas. That is a 400 percent increase.

Now, here are the numbers that are scary. In 02, 60 percent of their revenue and jobs were in America. Today, 34 percent of their revenue and jobs are in America. Where are they? They are in foreign countries, where natural gas is a fraction of what it is here.

Many of the plants I have mentioned, polymers, plastic, steel, aluminum, those plants are moving everywhere because of energy prices. They are building every kind of a plant you can think of down in South America in a place called Trinidad, about a day-and-a-half by ship to here. My prediction is if we don't deal with natural gas prices, bricks and glass, heavy bulky commodities will be produced in Trinidad and be on our shores within a day-and-a-half.

Folks, that is not the America I believe in. If America is going to compete, we have to get gas prices under control. We have to get oil prices under control. We have to have energy that is affordable for Americans to heat their homes. We have to have energy prices that are affordable so companies will want to be here and produce the jobs here. I believe for the first time in the history of America we have to fight to compete with our competitors like China and India. They are huge. They are growing fast. They are building their own energy future.

China will be producing oil 50 miles off the coast of Cuba and 50 miles off the Florida coast, while we prohibit it. Does that make sense? I don't think so. They are going to be working. China, Canada and Spain will all have contracts to produce energy in waters that should be ours, off our coast, because we don't produce there and because it is an equal distance from Cuba.

It is time for this Congress, it is time for this administration, to lead. Recently the President has spoken out three times on offshore. He has never supported offshore production. But he said we should be offshore and onshore producing more energy.

I wrote him a letter 2 weeks ago and put a release out today that says the following: ''Mr. President, I commend you for speaking about offshore production of energy. But it seems like if you would lead by removing the presidential moratorium, that is yours, and urging Congress to remove their moratorium so we can start the process.'' It will take years to get out there. We have to get in a 5-year plan, we have to do the leases, we have to do the environmental impact statements, and then they have to go out and build the platforms and the pipelines and drill. It takes a long time.

Every day we wait we endanger the economic future of America. I think we are almost past the point. We need energy production in America today. Not next year. Today. We need to unlock what this Congress and three presidents have locked up. We need to produce our energy. We need to conserve. We need to use the innovation that my friend talked about a little bit ago.

We need it to do everything we can to produce every form of energy that is available. We need wind, we need solar, and we need to use less. We need to use it more wisely. But, folks, the day is today. We cannot solve this problem with just conservation. We have to produce energy.

I believe if we opened up the Outer Continental Shelf, we would take what we call the fear factor out of the market and we would get Wall Street out of the marketplace and we could drop energy prices 20 to 25 percent. The only other thing you and I can do is to use less and find alternatives. Folks, it is a crisis in America.

I want to thank my friend from Utah and my friend from California who have joined us for the opportunity to share some time with them today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has done a great job in explaining the reality of the situation that we have and the reality of what our future can be if we are willing to take to the field right now and do it. So we are fine.

What we hope to do when we do a comprehensive bill is actually provide 12 steps that will fit what Mr. PETERSON was talking about and the three goals: Increasing our conservation, increasing our production and increasing our innovation.

□ 1815

Those 12 steps are very simple.

First is increasing American natural gas. As Mr. PETERSON just told you, we could heat 100 homes for the next 30 years with the natural gas we have available but not yet developed in this country alone.

Step two, increase American oil resources that we have in this country. We have increased the amount of oil we import seven times since the 1970s, and we decreased our exploration and production of American oil in the 1970s because of American policies, government policies. And the only thing we need to do to increase that so we can recover American oil supply is change American government policies.

Step three, look at coal, American coal. We have 200 to 300 years' worth of coal undeveloped, unsecured in this country.

Step four, develop American oil shale. 70 percent of all the oil shale in the world is in three western States in the United States, where there is more undeveloped oil than underneath the entire country of Saudi Arabia.

Step five, increase affordable and clean nuclear fuel. Since the 1970s, we have had no new nuclear power plant built, while our friends in France in that same time period have built 58 plants. That has to be part of a future solution.

Step six, we have to invest more in renewable sources of energy: Sunlight, wind, rain, tide, geothermal heat. All of those have to be increased. Right now, only about 7 percent of the total energy consumption comes from renewables. We are not going to solve the problem by this source alone; but if we could increase that, double it to 15 percent, 16 percent, 17 percent, we would

go a long way toward doing that. And part of the way of doing that is government policy again. When we try to improve our solar and wind power plants, if we would simply extend the investment tax credits by another 5 years we could start moving forward dramatically today in that particular area.

Step seven, greater efficiency and conservation, and especially giving incentives for the government to do that, for individuals, business, as well as government. And the reason I actually put business in there, they are already doing it. The U.S. steel industry today uses 45 percent less energy to produce 1 ton of steel. The U.S. forest and paper industry today uses 21 percent less energy to produce 1 ton of paper. We have the technology to do that. What the American government needs to do is to provide rewards for individuals and the government to do the same thing that the business community has taken on as a means of being profitable.

Step eight, we increase our gasoline refinement capacity. We all know we produce in the United States about 17 million barrels of oil a day, but our consumption need is 21 million barrels of oil today. And we all know we haven't built a new refinery since 1976; and only 23 years ago we had 324 operating refineries, today we have 148 operating refineries. And for those who are operating, they are still only marginal because the market does not bear them. What we have to have is increasing supply of American oil going to American refineries; we need, and this bill calls for, an additional 10 new refineries immediately built on property owned by the Department of Energy to do that part.

Step nine, to adopt common sense regulatory relief. Department of Interior suggests that we have about 80 billion barrels of recoverable oil and natural gas that are locked away because of regulatory controls that Congress has put on those areas. Our need for standards don't have to be sold out, but they need desperately to be reformed simply so we can make decisions faster, because we need relief now, not sometime in the future. That time was long ago. We need it now.

Step ten, we have to improve our transmission and energy infrastructure. We have 5 million miles of electrical distribution lines; we have 1 million miles of natural gas pipelines, and they are incredibly outdated and they do not supply America's needs. We have to improve those. If we are going to improve them with ethanol and we are starting to unload ethanol, we have to have blending terminals. We don't have it. Department of Interior has right now been tasked with trying to develop energy corridors for the future, and there are people trying to stop them from at least identifying where we will have energy corridors for the future. That cannot be. We must identify them, and they must be useable.

Step 11, we have to restore our domestic energy workforce. I hate to say this, but there are 90 percent fewer petroleum engineers and geoscientists who are graduating now than 20 years ago. Unfortunately, our workforce for the future and how we develop technology to innovate is simply not there. We have to provide some incentives, some rewards, some scholarships to develop that workforce. It has to be part of our program.

Finally, step 12, we have to tap American innovation to develop our new energy technologies. And I mentioned how we did that, the same way we have in history: We prepare and provide rewards for people in America who can solve our problems.

Now, as I said, one of the things my party is willing to do is move forward directly on this. Just like Roy Hobbs in The Natural realized sitting there listening to a lecture on the psychology of defeat does not produce a solution. Getting out on the field produces a solution. And what the Republican party wants to do is to get out on the field and make it happen, do the work now. And this comprehensive bill is one of those that have to take place.

We are ready to move forward with an attitude that it can be solved, it must be solved, and we have the capacity to do it. And our goal will be to become energy independent and energy secure now, not in the future, but now, in our lifetime.

I keep coming up here every day looking up at the top of this building with a quote by Daniel Webster up there which simply reads and tries to exhort to us: Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We have the capacity and the ability to do something worthy to be remembered, and the Republican party wants to get on the playing field to do that. That is our goal, that is our destiny. The American people deserve it. And we can't wait; we have to do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6124. An act to provide for the continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. First, I would like to identify myself with the remarks that I have just heard from my two colleagues, and congratulate them on presenting to the people the hard facts that have not been faced in this country for over 30 years. And those hard facts are some of the basic reasons that we are in trouble today.

Mr. Speaker, I will preface my remarks tonight, and what I have to say tonight I would like to say totally is in parallel with the spirit of what was just said. But I preface my remarks to underscore, just as my colleagues would underscore their commitment.

While I adamantly reject the man-made global warming theory, I am committed to a clean and healthy environment, to purifying the air, to purifying our water and our soil, all of this for the sake of the people of this planet, especially the children of this planet, and especially my three children, Christian, Tristan, and Anika, and all the children of the world who we hope will receive a world that we hand them that will be a better world, a healthier world. And I have no doubt that unless we thwart the onslaught of the nonsense being foisted upon humankind in the name of man-made global warming, our next generation will be deprived of freedom, prosperity, and a healthy environment.

The radical environmental crusade behind the man-made global warming theory may well be well motivated. Motives and good intentions, however, do not count. What counts are facts. And when it comes to the facts about so-called man-made global warming, the public has been denied an honest debate.

Only 18 months ago, the refrain, ''Case Closed, Global Warming is Real,'' was repeated as if a mantra of some religious sect. It was pounded into the public's consciousness over the airwaves, in print, and even at congressional hearings. This was obviously a brazen attempt to end open discussion and to silence differing views by dismissing the need to take seriously contrary arguments by anyone, no matter how impressive his or her credentials might be, if that person happened to doubt global warming.

Just a short time ago, the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, the OISM, released the names of some 31,000 scientists who signed a petition rejecting the claims of human-caused global warming. Of the 31,072 Americans who signed, 9,021 had Ph.D.s; many of the 31,000 signers currently work in climatology, meteorology, atmospheric, environmental, and geophysical studies, astronomical studies, as well as the biological fields that directly relate to the climate change controversy. And note, of the 31,000 signatories, these signers are American scientists.

There are many prominent scientists throughout the world who are stepping up to expose the well-financed propaganda campaign behind the man-made global warming theory. But the views of these American scientists and those

of so many scholars and scientists throughout the world don't count. The debate is over. It has been declared over. Al Gore has his Nobel Prize, and the film An Inconvenient Truth has its Academy Award. So shut up, case is closed.

So what is this theory that now is so accepted that no more debate is needed or even tolerated?

Man-made global warming is a disturbing theory that the Earth began a warming cycle 150 years ago that differed greatly from all the other warming and cooling cycles in the Earth's primordial past. And over the life of this planet over the millions of years, there have been many, many such situations of warming and cooling, sometimes lasting 10 years, sometimes lasting hundreds of thousands of years, glaciers that went back and forth.

This warming cycle that we are now talking about and we are being told that it is unlike the warming cycle of all of those past warming and cooling cycles, this one we are told is tied directly to mankind's use of fossil fuels, as of course compared to all the other warming and cooling cycles even before mankind was present on the planet.

Basically, they are saying that our use of fossil fuels, again, basically oil and coal, are causing the Earth's temperature to change; and they are blaming oil and coal, which happen to be fuels that have powered our industries and made modern civilization possible. Fossil fuels, we are told, are rapidly increasing the level of so-called greenhouse gases in our atmosphere, the most prevalent of these greenhouse gases being CO_2, carbon dioxide. This increase in CO_2 we are told causes the warming cycle we are now supposedly experiencing.

This man-made warming cycle, according to the theory, is rapidly approaching a tipping point when the world's temperature will abruptly jump and accelerate with dire consequences, perhaps apocalyptic consequences, for the entire planet. Well, that is basically the global warming theory.

For skeptics of this hypothesis, the consequences of accepting this theory are far more dire than any of the predicted rise in temperature predictions: We will live with the consequences of the social engineering being touted as necessary to prevent man-made global warming.

□ 1830

It's a package. Accept the man-made global warming theory, and one is expected to accept the controls, regulations, taxation, international planning and enforcement, mandated lifestyle changes, the lowering of expectations, the limiting of consumer choice, and personal as well as family sacrifices that are necessary to save the planet from, well, from us.

It really takes a lot to frighten people into accepting such personal restrictive mandates that would result from implementing a global warming based agenda. People's lives will be changed if we accept this agenda as being real, and if we cave in to this onslaught of propaganda. People's lives will change, but it won't be a change for the better.

For example, jets are considered some of the worst CO_2 polluters, according to the theory. So, how will our lives be different when low-priced airfares are eliminated? Let me repeat that. Low-priced airfares to be eliminated. How will that affect our lives? And how about the restricting the number of flights, themselves? How will that affect our lives?

Oh, I guess we never thought about that. Well, we never thought about that because those clamoring for us to accept the man-made global warming agenda never mentioned the price that we have to pay, not just in dollars, but in the freedom that we have today to make such choices in our lives, choices, for example, when and how many times we should travel with our families and where we should travel.

What we do know about the man-made global warming fanatics is that they don't want us using our cars. They've hidden the fact about the airplane restrictions, but we do know they don't like us in our private cars. Private automobiles will be on the way out. They want us to be regulated into public transportation, and basically, we will have gone out of our cars and have limited air travel.

But don't worry. Don't worry about it because the rich and high government officials will still have private jets, Suburbans and limousines, because they will just buy carbon credits, which Al Gore will arrange for them, and he'll arrange it for them at a tidy profit for himself, of course.

Global warming and global warming predictions appear to be designed to strike fear into the hearts of those malcontents, those of us malcontents who won't willingly accept these mandates and these changes in our lifestyle that will be demanded of us. And who, for example, among us, and we know that there will be people who just won't accept the idea that we have to have higher food prices; or they won't accept the fact that we need less meat in our diet.

That's right. Man-made global warming fanatics want us to change our diet in a big way, not just low price airfare tickets, but our diet.

A 2006 report to the United Nations entitled Livestock's Long Shadow focuses right on the hind parts of cows. Livestock, the report claims, accounts for 18 percent of the gases that supposedly cause the Earth's climate to change, the warming of the Earth's climate. Cows are greenhouse gas-causing machines, according to this report.

Fuel for fertilizer and meat production and transportation, as well as the clearing of fields for grazing, produced 9 percent of the globe's CO_2 emissions, according to the report.

Cows produce ammonia, causing acid rain. And if that's not bad enough, all these numbers that I just mentioned are projected, in this report, are projected in the report's computer models that they will double by the year 2050. So not only is it bad today to eat meat, it's going to be so much worse by 2050, we've got to act now to get meat out of the diet.

Not only are they going to cut our personal transportation, but we can't even stay at home and have a barbecue. Heck, they're not even going to let us have a hamburger.

I'd point out that before the introduction of cattle to the United States, millions upon millions of buffalo dominated the great plains of America. They were so thick that you could not see where the herd began or where it ended. One can only assume that the anti-meat, man-made global warming crowd must believe that buffalo farts have some social redeeming value that's better than the flatulence emitted by cattle.

I have to be very careful about such jokes. I was making light of this supposition at a hearing about a year ago. And I suggested, in jest, that perhaps dinosaur flatulence changed the climate back in those ancient days. Well, it was reported, widely reported as if I was serious, which demonstrates something that we should all understand about the global warming debate.

The global warming debate has been totally dishonest. Anyone who could suggest that I was saying that as a serious matter was either a fool, or was intentionally portraying something that they knew was not to be true.

Yes, what we have here, of course, is steely-eyed fanaticism by those on the other side of this debate, and maybe they can't understand humor when they see it or hear it. Yes, this is an absurd theory to be talking about animal flatulence when we're talking about the future of the planet and the restrictions, massive restrictions on our way of life.

This would be absurd, but the deeper that one looks into this global warming juggernaut, the weirder this movement becomes, and the more denial in it is evident.

Ten years ago, for example, alarmists predicted that by now we would be clearly plagued by surging temperatures. In testimony before Congress 20 years ago, NASA's global warming guru, James Hanson, predicted CO_2 levels would shoot up the global temperatures by more than a third of a degree Celsius during the 1990s.

Well, we were warned that we'd soon be seeing rising sea levels. And you've all seen all of these predictions, rising sea levels, perhaps even our cities under water, drought and famine and increase in tropical diseases. Yeah, an increase in tropical diseases. Of course the only increase in tropical diseases we've seen can be directly traced to the success of environmental extremists in banning DDT, which has resulted in millions of Third World children dying of malaria, something else that they were wrong about.

So what about Hanson's and others predictions of imminent global overheating?

Well, forget case closed. The question needs to be answered. And the answer is that Hanson's and the other predictions have turned out to be dramatically wrong. Temperatures during this last decade rose only one-third of the predicted jump, a modest 0.11-degree change.

Remember, Mr. Hanson has been so arrogant over the years that he has insisted that his opinions be emblazoned on government documents as the official position of NASA, rather than acknowledging that existing other opinions may be worthy of consideration. And now, we are finding out that the predictions made by Mr. Hanson, who doesn't want any other people's opinions even to be considered as part of an official NASA presentation, that this, Mr. Hanson and other self-anointed elitists have been wrong, dead wrong in their predictions of what should be happening right now.

Over the years, we've been led to expect an increased number of even more powerful hurricanes, for example. There would also be drought and melting ice caps. My beautiful Sierra Nevada mountains in California were due to heat up, dry up, brown up and burn, burn, burn, and we've been told this for almost 20 years now.

During the entire Clinton administration, scientists produced study after study predicting the horrific impact of the unstoppable onslaught of man-made global warming, which we were all led to believe by those studies would be overwhelming us right now.

Of course, if there was even a hint that the conclusion of their research wouldn't back up the man-made global warming theory, the scientists and researchers wouldn't get one red cent from the Federal research pool during the Clinton and Gore administration.

In a September 2005 article from Discovery magazine, Dr. William Gray, now emeritus professor of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University and, more importantly, the former president of the American Meteorological Association, said that he had paid a price for his skepticism of man-made global warming. Quote, ''I had NOAA money for 30 years, for 30 some years,'' Dr. Gray said. ''And then, when the Clinton administration came in,'' and this is still part of the quote, ''and Gore started directing some of the environmental stuff, I was cut off. I couldn't get any money, any NOAA money. They turned down 13 straight proposals from me.''

Here's from one of America's great, eminent meteorologists, and the Clinton administration just kept turning him down because he had expressed some skepticism about whether man-made global warming was a reality. Dr. Gray made the mistake of being a skeptic about global warming. And however he was skeptic about that, that made him wrong with the Clinton administration.

But he was right about hurricanes which were being blamed on global warming. Remember, we were told that global warming was going to cause more hurricanes. And Dr. Gray, one of the great meteorologists, said there's no reliable data available to indicate increased hurricane frequency or intensity in any of the globe's seven tropical cyclone basins.''

So, with that type of skepticism, no matter what his credentials were, no matter how preeminent a scientist and respected scientist he was, he couldn't get a grant during the Clinton/Gore administration. So Dr. Gray was cut off. The predictors of gloom and doom were left to shout out their paranoid nonsense every time a hurricane was detected.

And just recently, one of those shouters, Tom Knutsen, research meteorologist for the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration, that's NOAA, that's the ones who ended up not being able to give Dr. Gray any research grants, this gentleman, Mr. Knutsen, who was, during that time when Dr. Gray said there wasn't a relationship, he was a hurricane alarmist, suggesting there would be more and more hurricanes because of global warming, has now published a study in the Journal of Native Geoscience admitting that he was wrong.

For the record, he now says his studies indicate that warming is not to blame for more hurricanes, and that warmer temperatures, if they do come, will actually reduce the number of hurricanes in the Atlantic. He unequivocally stated that his most recent finding argues against this notion that we've already seen a dramatic increase in Atlantic hurricane activity resulting from greenhouse warming gases.

So here is a scientist with integrity. Dr. Gray, of course, was punished. He couldn't even get a research grant. But here we have a scientist who did get the grant and made wrong conclusions, but now he's stepping forward because he has integrity, to admit that he was wrong and now he has openly changed his mind.

Unfortunately, such scientific integrity did not always rise to the occasion. Perhaps it's because scientists saw the raw power exercised during the Clinton/Gore administration, which may well revisit us in the next administration if we don't watch out.

But there was raw power being exercised. Al Gore's first act as Vice President was to insist that William Harper be fired as the chief scientist at the Department of Energy. Why? Because he had uttered some words indicating that he was open minded about the man-made global warming theory, just like Dr. Gray.

Well, anybody who talks about that way, off with his head. No more position for you. That was back in 1993, the first year of the Clinton-Gore administration. So for over a decade, all we got was a drum beat of one-sided research setting the stage for a false claim of scientific consensus that we heard 18 months ago. Case closed. Case closed.

□ 1845

The argument is over. Global warming is real.

How many times did we hear that? Let us remember that refrain and how false it was and how dishonest it was.

Unfortunately, for all of those scientists who went along with the scheme back in the 1990s, now over a decade later there is a big problem. Contrary to what all of those scientists living on their Federal research grants predicted, the world hasn't been getting warmer. In fact, for the last 7 years when we were told there would be this dramatic increase in temperature, there has been no warming at all. Last year was colder, not hotter. Snow levels were high, temperatures have been low, and there are fewer hurricanes.

Furthermore, while there is some melting in the Arctic, which we hear about over and over and over again about the melting in the Arctic, which we need to sort of compensate that and balance that off with the fact that there is an actual ice buildup in the Antarctic, which is almost never stated during those global-warming's-real-the-Arctic-is-melting. What is happening, of course, in the Arctic is probably based—I can't say for certain; we need studies on this—but is probably based on ocean currents. But it is not CO_2-related global warming; otherwise, it would be a global impact on both ends of the planet.

After hearing about the extinction of the polar bear again and again, and it has been drummed into our heads, the polar bear—all of the things about the Arctic out there, showing the poor polar bears. A few weeks ago, we were treated to the spectacle of our government placing polar bears on the Endangered Species List even though almost every article about placing the polar bears on the Endangered Species List contained a caveat that the number of polar bears is actually expanding, and with some of the species of polar bears, it's a dramatic expansion.

There are more, not fewer, polar bears. Let me repeat that so everyone knows. There are more polar bears. Yet we are, because of the onslaught of this global warming nonsense that has colored people's vision by words rather than reality, we put the polar bear on the Endangered Species List even though their numbers are expanding. Unfortunately, the debate is over and the case is closed. So explaining the emerging obvious differences between reality and the theory need not be addressed.

Maybe that's why they kept saying ''case closed'' because the observable data that was going on was in such contrast to the predictions that were being made, this was the time they had to declare the case was closed or we would basically be able to see with our very eyes the contradiction in what they had predicted.

So what we need to do is to close our eyes, close our eyes and pretend that there are fewer polar bears. That's the way to do it. That's the way we should make policy, according to the scaremongers. But the case is not closed. The gnomes of climate theory are now coming up with self-serving explanations and verbal maneuvers.

The first attempt to cover their tracks has been slow but ever so clever. The words ''climate change'' have now replaced the words ''global warming.'' Now, if we accept this, no matter what happens with the global weather pattern, whether it be cooler or hotter for 4 years or 5 years, could be cooler, could be hotter, it will still be presented by the global warming crowd as further verification of human-caused change. Thus, they can claim credit that no matter what happens, no matter what happens in the climate, their predictions are correct because it's climate change now and not global warming, even though for over a decade and a half that was drummed into us that they were so certain that it was going to be global warming.

Well, if we accept this shift of words, we know that we will be in a position now of being unable to intellectually say, well, there's not global warming like you predicted, so we actually are going to oppose and reject the oppressive policies that you are advocating to deal with the issue that you are describing.

But if they use the words ''climate change,'' how are we going to counteract their policy recommendations when now whatever happens to the climate, they can justify it based on climate change? Sorry, fellows. Do you really think the world and the United States is filled with morons? I mean, bait-and-switch is an old game, and we've seen it in car salesmen; and car salesmen, I might add, are paragons of virtue compared to this global warming crowd.

We just need to ask ourselves if a salesman keeps giving a strong pitch and claims something that later is found to be totally wrong, when does one stop trusting him? If he starts playing word games rather than admitting an error, isn't it reasonable to stop trusting him? If his prediction is that, well, this car is going to get 50 miles to the gallon and it only gets 5 miles to the gallon, isn't that really when we should stop trusting that used car salesmen?

Well, yes, Al Gore and Company, we need to let Al Gore and Company know that we have noticed that they are now using the words ''climate change'' instead of ''global warming.'' And they're not just sort of slipping it in. They are trying to, but we've noticed, and that has important meaning.

In and of itself that is an admission that they were wrong for over a decade in claiming that there would be global warming. Now it's climate change. Every time they use the word, it indicates they were wrong or they were lying before about how absolutely sure they were about what their predictions were and about what all of the statistics and what all of the research indicated. They were either lying or they were wrong. And every time they use the words ''climate change,'' it should reinforce us in understanding they were wrong or they were lying.

Perhaps instead of word games, they need to explain why what is happening in the real world today doesn't match what they all said was going to happen based on their case-closed, man-made global warming is real. Okay. They must realize that someone is bound to notice that last winter was a really cold winter. I mean, it was a cold winter and it has been unusually chilly. And now chilly weather seems to be the norm, and where we've not yet had a full analysis of last year's winter, full winter, and we are looking forward to seeing exactly what a full study of the temperature ranges around the world had for us last winter. According to the global warming crowd, we should have seen a dramatic increase in the temperatures last winter. We will see.

We are now seeing, of course, a beehive of activity. Those federally funded scientists who we mentioned are trying to save a modicum of credibility by readjusting their computers and coming up with some explanations that will keep the man-made global warming theory from being totally rejected but at the same time trying to explain away the current dichotomy between what they said would happen and then what is actually happening.

Some scientists have simply adjusted their computer models and are now claiming that the warming isn't going to happen now, it's going to happen 10 to 15 years from now. Oh. So we can keep giving them their research grants for the next 10 to 15 years and then something else may happen.

In fact, a much-detailed report is now predicting that the temperature of the sea around Europe and North America will slightly cool off in the next decade and the Pacific will be the same in its temperature. One recent article about the shift in scientific position heralded it's a ''10-year timeout'' for global warming. Well, however, we are warned, however, that after that 10 years, the global warming will start again.

You see, they don't ever have to admit their original theories were wrong. We had one scientist at NOAA who stood up and had the integrity to say, I was wrong. I applaud him for it. These other scientists, we need to take note that they seem to be incapable of suggesting that perhaps the research grants that they took during the Clinton administration had skewed their vision of what the reality was in terms of climate and the world.

To understand all of this nonsense, we need to seriously examine the basic assumptions of this gang of global alarmists who have been pushing this paranoid theory.

They believe excess amounts of man-made CO_2 are being deposited into the air and that this is what causes the greenhouse effect that warms the atmosphere. The carbon footprint that we hear about is referring to the amount of CO_2 released by any specific activity. The CO_2 causes the planet to warm, as we are told, until it reaches that darn tipping point when all hell breaks loose. That's what we're being told. That is the concept that every other extrapolation is based on. But it's wrong. It's dead wrong. It's absolutely wrong. It's based on CO_2 and its impact on the temperature of the planet.

Yet what we find more and more evidence of is that the rise in CO_2 in the past came after the rise in global temperatures. Not before. The increases that there have been in CO_2 on the earth and in the earth's history happened after the earth had warmed, and the scientists are trying to tell us it was the other way around. The reality has been observed in ice cores by prominent scientists, yet this fundamental challenge to the validity of the man-made global warming theory has gone unanswered by those who are screaming that this case is closed and that all discussion is off.

So let's talk about that. Why aren't these scientists like Mr. Hansen and others willing to debate the CO_2 issue? Why is it instead that they simply call names of people who are trying to ask questions and are skeptical about their theories? Well, they just keep repeating ''case closed'' or attacking not what the presentation of the ideas being presented, but instead attack, for example, myself in some nonsensical way as if I believe dinosaur farts changed the world's climate. That is about as dishonest a debate as you can have, yet we are told the issue of climate change now, global warming, is so important to the future of the world. Well, okay. Let's talk about the CO_2. Let's have a debate on that issue.

To cite one expert's findings, and we will just leave that for the record, Tom Scheffelin of the California Air Resources Board stated on November 5, 2007, that ''CO_2 levels track temperature changes between 300 to 1,000 years after the temperature has changed. CO_2 has no direct role in global warming; rather, it responds to biological activity which responds to climate changes.''

So what causes this warming in the first place? If it is not the CO_2, all of these people were telling us that it is the CO_2 that's caused the temperature to change and now we're in for it because the levels of CO_2 are going up. Well, what did cause the temperatures to change if it wasn't CO_2?

Well, the best explanation I have heard is activity on the sun, and that would explain why we see parallel temperature trends as those trends that are on earth; we see those same trends going on on Mars and Jupiter. Are these people trying to tell us that they've got a problem with some sort of CO_2 on Jupiter and Mars as they

have their changes in the climate that sort of parallel what's going on in the earth? Well, Mars and Jupiter have something in common with us. They're part of our planetary system, and if something is happening on the sun, it will affect them as well as us.

So that, too, is an argument, by the way, that's totally being ignored by the alarmists. After all, what new controls or new taxes or new regulations will they be able to foist on us if it's determined that the sun and not our sports cars are causing the problem of a warmer weather, if there is warmer weather.

□ 1900

The fact is that man-made global warming and the community that supports man-made global warming are jumping through hoops, bending over backwards, struggling to find one glint of new information to cover for their arrogant attempt to stampede humankind into Draconian policies.

The government-financed man-made global warming propaganda campaign has been, and continues to be, a cacophony of gibberish presented as scientific explanation. I've already given specifics as to what needs to be discussed, and instead, they ignore any type of specific challenge and go to personal attacks.

And their explanations, for example, are left to people like Al Gore, and, let's face it, Al Gore is having a little trouble right now in telling us why his predictions have been wrong.

The CO_2 premise has been based that the whole global warming theory is wrong. Al Gore needs to confront that and argue his case. The methodology, by the way, that has determined ''global warming'' has been wrong. The observations have been wrong, and let me add, the attempt to shut down the debate has been wrong.

Now, I remember Al Gore labeling me as a Stalinist. He used the word ''Stalinist'' to refer to me, because when I chaired the Subcommittee on Research and Science in the House, I insisted that both sides be presented and that expert witnesses be expected to address each other's points and contentions. To him, that's Stalinism, and I would suggest that the propaganda campaign of the man-made global warming alarmists has much more in common with Stalinism than does insisting that both sides of the issue be heard at a congressional hearing. One has to really believe that he or she has a corner on the truth to make such a complaint that Stalinism is having both sides presented and addressing each other's points.

Of course, Al Gore's documentary, ''An Inconvenient Truth,'' as suggested by its own title is to be taken as the truth. Well, I won't go into the numerous debatable points and outright errors of that film, but something far worse is uncovered than just the errors of his film. In the pseudoscience and scientific documentary—yes, there were in that documentary, ''An Inconvenient Truth,'' there are numerous film segments of climate and environmental incidents, sort of like National Geographic footage, to add credibility to the alleged scientific points that supposedly were being documented.

Specifically, the film portrays a dramatic cracking and breaking away of a huge portion of the polar icecap. The scene is awesome and somewhat overwhelming and leaves the audience with the feeling that they've witnessed a massive historic occurrence.

Unfortunately, it's all fake. This is not grand, firsthand photographic evidence. It is not National Geographic footage of a huge breaking away of a portion of the icecap. Instead, what the audience is looking at is a great example of special effects. It's not the icecap. It's Styrofoam that you're seeing. That's right, Styrofoam, Styrofoam special effects trying to fool us into thinking we're seeing something happening in the icecap. By the way, isn't Styrofoam an oil-based product? Isn't there some sort of a carbon footprint there?

Well, Mr. Gore has not commented on this depiction. Maybe it is inconvenient for him to comment because it may hurt his credibility. After all, it is not getting warmer, as he predicted, so maybe he has based his theories on a Styrofoam model that doesn't work.

The first time I met Al Gore was in my first term back in 1989–1990. Al Gore, then a United States Senator, marched into the Science Committee room, followed by a platoon of cameras and reporters. He sat in front of our committee demanding that President Bush—that's George W's dad—declare an ozone emergency. And he waved a report in his hand as evidence that there was an ozone hole opening up over the northeast of the United States.

A few days later, the report touted by Senator Gore was found to have been based on faulty data, data collected by one so-called researcher, flying in a single-engine Piper cub with limited technology and no expertise. The emergency declaration the senator called for would have had severe negative economic consequences on the people who live in the northeast part of the United States.

Now, does anyone detect a pattern here? Such scare tactics, Chicken Little-ism, based on false information, of course, isn't new. We have many past examples of this nonsense being portrayed as science.

In 1957, the FDA recalled 3 million pounds of cranberries. I remember as a young person that my mother took the cranberries off the table for Thanksgiving and Christmas and told me because they cause cancer. Well, a few years later, of course, it was admitted it was a total mistake; sorry, it was a mistake. Of course, a tremendous price was paid by a large number of our farmers who went broke.

Then, of course, there was the scare over cyclamate used in everyday items like soda, jams, ice cream. It was very sweet and extremely low in calories. Cyclamate generated enormous profits because it was a product of research by our industry, but then in the early 1970s, the FDA banned cyclamate as a cancer hazard. Well, come to find out, the rats in their study had been force fed the equivalent of 350 cans of soda a day, and only eight of the 240 rats that they crammed all this soda in got sick. It was a faulty test, and eventually, after years, the truth finally prevailed, and it was officially recognized that cyclamate does not cause cancer. Canada, by the way, never banned cyclamate. Our northern buddies, I guess, couldn't get themselves to force feed those rats.

Well, the FDA did take back its negative finding; however, great damage was done. This episode had serious consequences. It was the cyclamate ban that led to the introduction of high fructose corn syrup, with the obesity and the health problems that have come with high fructose corn syrup. So, yes, another scare tactic, another American industry decimated, another rotten theory with unintended consequences foisted upon us.

The next example of fear mongering with pseudo science came on February 26, 1989. On that evening, February 26, 1989, Americans tuned in to ''60 Minutes'' and heard Ed Bradley say, ''The most potent cancer-causing agent in our food supply is a substance sprayed on apples to keep them on the trees . . . '' And he goes on to say basically that the children are being put at risk by eating these apples that have alar on them, and that story snowballed out of control. Meryl Streep testified before Congress with all this basically pseudo-scientific nonsense. Parents ended up tossing apples out the window. Schools removed applesauce from the cafeteria, replacing of course the applesauce with more safe and nutritious substances like ice cream and pudding.

There was only one small problem. Alar, which is what was on the apples, didn't cause cancer, and the study that was released was based on bad science. Twenty-thousand apple growers in the United States, of course, suffered enormous financial harm because of this, and of course, when the public was so frightened, the alarmism was noted that it was a very successful tool and people could be scared into accepting policy if we just scared them. People saw that when they saw what a stampede happened because of this one story on alar.

So then comes Three Mile Island, the Three Mile Island incident, the so-called nuclear disaster which ended any expansion of nuclear energy in America. Three Mile Island is the prime example of how devastating pseudo-science scare tactics can be, even if there is no substance to the hysteria. In this case, our country is now heavily dependent on foreign oil, while France has developed a thriving

nuclear infrastructure. The French have learned how to reprocess uranium. We have learned how to buy more energy from abroad.

Just remember, Three Mile Island is a nuclear plant where an operational mishap, in which no one was hurt or put in danger, was portrayed as a deadly accident putting millions of people and their lives in jeopardy. Well, no one has yet to show me that one person's life was shortened by the Three Mile Island incident.

Coupled with Jane Fonda's movie called ''The China Syndrome,'' which had just been released, the Three Mile Island incident was a major disaster, a major public relations disaster for the nuclear industry. It was used to terrify the American people into rejecting nuclear energy as a means of producing clean, reliable, domestically fueled electric energy.

Ironically, nuclear power is probably the most effective means of producing power with no carbon footprint, no CO_2. Yet the radical environmentalists still block any attempt to expand the use of nuclear energy, even as we expand our dependency on foreign oil, on oil that is produced by people who hate us. Again, it was a total con job and has had a horrible impact.

And what about that ozone hole over the Antarctic? We were told it would continue to grow and grow and it would take decades to get it under control. Boyce Rensberger, director of the Knight Fellowship at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, points to evidence that the ozone concentration is a cyclical event, expanding and contracting the ozone throughout the eons of time. It's just part of a natural cycle according to this scientist from MIT.

So here is a scientist from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology telling us the current ozone depletion is simply part of a recurring cycle, not the result of chlorofluorocarbons, as we were told. In layman terms, he's telling us that the gigantic expense of shifting away from aerosol was a waste for America. We're talking about billions of dollars here. The ozone hole closed on its own. It was just part of a cycle. If it wasn't, it would be much different than it is today.

Then there is acid rain, of course. Who can forget the frightening threats that acid rain posed to us just 20 years ago? Acid rain was supposed to decimate our forests, destroy the fresh water bodies, and erode our buildings and sidewalks. Well, whatever happened to acid rain? Well, that theory, too, proved to be an extreme stretch of the truth.

President Reagan was pummeled without mercy for his unwillingness to take monstrously costly action aimed at thwarting acid rain. He insisted on waiting for an in-depth study to be completed, and he was vilified for his insistence on legitimate scientific verification.

Well, a 10-year study by the National Acid Precipitation Assessment Project was submitted to Congress in 1990. It minimized the human impact of acidity of water in the northwest and the northeast of the United States. The issue then died quickly and quietly, and no one ever apologized to Ronald Reagan. We haven't heard about acid rain. If they were right, we should have been hearing about it all this time.

Instead, of course we've been hearing about something else which is much easier to scare people with, global warming. And of course, the last one before global warming that I'd like to mention is the most pitiful of all. Yes, an alarmist scheme which made the cover of Time magazine 30 years ago.

Just 3 decades ago, scientists and politicians were frantic about global cooling. We were told the Earth was entering a new ice age. Unfortunately for the scare mongers, the temperature did not plummet and the oceans did not freeze. In fact, it was getting a bit warmer, and during the 1980s and 1990s it did get a little bit warmer. There was an up-and-down cycle. It happens in the Earth, has always happened.

Well, some of those people, some of those scientists and others who were talking about global warming, well, they've changed their words, and of course, you guessed it, global cooling became global warming. Almost overnight global cooling was rejected, and then there became global warming, and now, of course, global warming is changing to climate change.

□ 1915

So, the scare tactics are nothing new; it's a tried and true method. They've seen it ever since Alar, how people can be stampeded, and then policies can be foisted off on people. Unfortunately, the long-term consequences will be very damaging, very, very damaging for the next generation, just as the instances that I've just described have been damaging for our country. Here, we don't have nuclear energy to help us through this crisis, and we've been left at the mercy of Arab producers of oil, many of whom don't like us and don't like our way of life.

Of course, our kids are being lied to in a big way to make sure they will be able to be fooled in the future, to prepare them to make the sacrifices that are necessary. Well, I often ask students from my district, from southern California, who come here to visit whether they think that 45 years ago, when I went to high school in southern California, whether or not at that time the air was cleaner or dirtier than it is now. A huge percentage of the students from southern California, young kids who I see from my district, in particular, believe that the air quality 45 years ago in southern California was dramatically better than it is today. When I tell them that what they believe is 100 percent wrong, that the air is dramatically cleaner today in southern California, you can see the frustration in their eyes; they have been lied to in a big way.

The big lie their generation has been fed is that the environment is going the wrong way and that they have to give up their freedom, that we have to give up our national sovereignty, and that they have to give up their expectations of certain things in their life because the future is bleak because everything about the environment—the air, the water, the land—are all getting worse when, in fact, there has been tremendous progress made.

And let me tip my hat to the environmentalists on this, and that is, yes, there has been regulation, that some of the cleaning, perhaps most of the cleaning that we've experienced we've seen as a result of the fact that government and liberal Democrats who push some of these reforms got them through and has helped clean the air, the water and the land. And for anyone not to admit that I think would be disingenuous on our part.

But the fact is that our children are now being told that this man-made global warming is going to devastate the whole planet. They might as well not look forward to anything at all unless they buy into all of this agenda, and all of the controls that are being advocated and the bringing down, basically, of their expectations of their life, no travel as much as you—you don't expect low air fares like your parents had. No. Unfortunately, it doesn't get much worse than that when you're telling young people to be that pessimistic.

Dr. John Christy, a professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Alabama at Huntsville, wrote recently, ''I remember as a college student at the first Earth Day being told it was a certainty that by the year 2000 the world would be starving and out of energy.'' Dr. Christy goes on to say, ''Similar pronouncements made today about catastrophes due to human-induced climate change sound all too familiar and are all too exaggerated for me, as someone who actually produces and analyzes climate information.''

We are told that polar bears are dying, but of course most populations of polar bears are thriving. We are told that polar ice caps are melting, but the Antarctic ice is actually growing. Hurricane Katrina was supposed to be only the first of many horrendous hurricanes to hit the United States within a few years, all caused by, of course, the warming of the climate, which is, of course, brought on by the CO_2 emissions that we've had from the use of fossil fuels, never mind the fact that a hurricane of equal force to Katrina had actually hit the area 100 years before when there was a lot less CO_2 in the air. And now, of course, since Katrina, totally contrary to the predictions, there hasn't been another strong hurricane season since Katrina, which totally is in contrast to the rhetoric that we heard 2 years ago. But of course we're told, never mind, the case is closed, you can't argue about it anymore.

An honest debate is long overdue, yet we see an attempt to shut down the debate. So what are the issues which need to be addressed in an honest debate? I mentioned a few already. First and foremost, my colleague in the other Chamber, JIM INHOFE, has pointed out that man-made global warming theory, especially the part concerning CO_2 and the so-called ''tipping point,'' is all based on computer models. And computer models are often changed to fit the theory. So let's take a look at the facts, get off of the computer models, and take a look at the facts. Does increased CO_2 come from warming, or is it the other way around? By the way, what I'm told is that the solar activity heats the ocean water somewhat; and cooler ocean water absorbs CO_2, warmer ocean water means that there will be more CO_2 in the air. And if that's not the case, let's debate it, let's find out.

Let's examine the issue of warming itself. The man-made global warming advocates claim that there is a 1.3 degree rise in global temperature since 1850. Yet it's widely known, and right in the hearings on the Science Committee they bring in their charts. Here's the thing in 1850. And here you see up here it's 1.5 degrees warmer now, 150 years later, than it was in 1850.

Well, it is widely known that 1850 marked the end of a 500-year decline in the Earth's temperatures known as the ''Mini Ice Age.'' So if one uses 1850 as a low point, as a baseline, isn't that totally dishonestly magnifying the importance of a 1.3 degree rise in temperature? Right? We're starting from the lowest base. And, by the way, again, that needs to be addressed. I've asked this question numerous times. Global warming alarmists never will confront any of the basic scientific challenges to what they're saying and instead go to ad homonym attacks. Well, people can mention that they think somebody's looney, that's fine, that's all right, as long as we couple it with here is where we disagree, and let's talk about where we disagree. Instead, we've heard, he's looney, case closed. Don't talk about it, shut up, and accept what we have to say.

So, what about the process that collected and analyzed the data which we now are being told supports and proves the man-made global warming theory? The Select Committee on Economic Affairs under the British Parliament had much to say about the methodology about the much-heralded U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or the IPCC, on which much of the man-made global warming theory has been resting on their supposed findings. And the Parliament Commission in Britain said, ''We have some concerns,'' the parliamentary committee reported, ''about the objectivity of the IPCC process, with some of its emissions scenarios and summary documentation apparently influenced by political considerations.'' Shortly after this criticism, Edward Wegman from George Mason University found several problems with the statistical method and peer review process of the IPCC.

At this time, I will place my remaining remarks in the RECORD and I would hope that my colleagues or anyone listening who would like to read this would look into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the rest of this presentation.

With that said, I appreciate the Chair granting me this hour to talk directly to my colleagues and to the American people, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Then, a February 2008 report by Kesten Green and J. Scott Armstrong for the National Center for Policy Analysis found glaring problems in the IPCC's 2007 report.

At a minimum, the IPCC ignored just under half of widely accepted forecasting principles. At worst, they violated over ¾ of those principles. Sterling Burnett of the Washington Times probably sums it up the best: ''Several assessments of the IPCC's work have shown the techniques and methods used to derive its climate predictions are fundamentally flawed.'' How are we supposed to take them seriously in the face of such lunacy? This isn't science. It's comedy.

The National Policy Center was similarly distressed. Its reports on the IPCC found unreliable data and forecasting models, as well as politically motivated forecasters. Peer reviewers of the study were few in number and often had ties to the original authors of the IPCC study. Any academic will tell you that is unacceptable. But nevertheless we are told to sit down and shut up, case closed, game over.

And Al Gore's movie isn't the only example of docudrama presented as gospel truth. As recent as May 5 of this year, the public was treated to yet another example of intentionally distorted visions. I am referring to an NBC program that included a view of the North Pole and the melting of the ice caps. As the reporter speaks, the camera pans over the ice as penguins cling to a small ice patch in the middle of the water. Touches your heart, doesn't it? Well, there is a problem. There are no penguins at the North Pole. Penguins live exclusively in Antarctica, that is the South Pole. But maybe we should give NBC the benefit of the doubt, maybe the penguins moved north. After all, climate change is happening in the South Pole too, except that there the ice is growing, not shrinking. Hmm. Well, that's why we call it ''climate change'' and not ''global warming,'' I suppose. I might add that NBC has removed the scene from its online video feed.

Carbon dioxide is, in fact, like the penguins. It's being falsely pictured. It is being portrayed as a pollutant; in fact, it makes things grow, and it is not toxic to humans. After all, we exhale it with every breath. In the distant past the earth had much more CO_2 in the air, perhaps as a result of volcanoes, but at that time we had abundant animal life, dinosaurs and lots of plants for them to eat. CO_2 is today pumped into greenhouses to make tomatoes grow bigger and better. Nevertheless, we are now presented with such loony ideas like sequestration or carbon credits that only enrich the alarmists. This is only possible with a public that has been frightened into accepting totally false information about CO_2. Let me state that I do support efforts that reduce pollution, particulates that do have a negative impact on the environment and human health. I support technologies that reduce these materials. If we are to have a debate on saving the environment, that is what we should be focusing on.

Mr. Speaker, this old world has had many cycles of warming and cooling, probably the result of solar activity, perhaps in the distant past volcanoes, the ice caps on Mars and Jupiter go back and forth, just as glaciers have gone back and forth. But such a powerful and mysterious force as the weather can be frightening. We need not be frightened, hoodwinked into giving authority to our own government, much less the U.N. or a global power—the power to control our lives in the name of man-made global warming, or climate change, or whatever they want to call it. Let us not let the alarmists take this country down the wrong path. Let's let the children of this country and planet have the freedom and prosperity we enjoyed, and not give it away to hucksters who would frighten us into giving up our birthright in the name of saving the planet. Sounds noble, but it's just a trick, a hoax. The greatest hoax of all.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2 p.m.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. EHLERS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 1:30 p.m. through June 9 on account of an illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. BALDWIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 12.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 12.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 3, 2008 she

presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1195. To amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 9, 2008, at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6948. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, detailing an unauthorized retransfer of U.S.-granted defense articles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6949. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6950. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6951. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6952. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6953. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6954. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6955. A letter from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007, through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6956. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6957. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's Report on Final Action as a result of Audits in respect to the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6958. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6959. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6960. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6961. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Semiannual Management Report to Congress for October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, and the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6962. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6963. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6964. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007, through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6965. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's strategic plan for fiscal years 2008 through 2013 in compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6966. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6967. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6968. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6969. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6970. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report of audits and investigations conducted during fiscal years 2006 and 2007, pursuant to Section 8(G)(h)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. App. 3; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6971. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's semi-annual report on the activities of the Inspector General for October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6972. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the 2007 Annual Report of the National Credit Union Administration, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1756; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6973. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6974. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6975. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6976. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6977. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008 and the Management Response for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6978. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the semiannual

report on activities of the Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2007, through March 31, 2008 and the Management Response for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6979. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Kingsmill Resort Fireworks Display, James River, Williamsburg, VA. [USCG-2008-0238] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6980. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Displays, Anacostia River, Washington, DC [Docket No. USCG-2008-0338] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6981. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Hatteras Boat Parade and Firework Display, Trent River, New Bern, NC [USCG-2008-0309] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6982. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: HOVENSA Refinery, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands [Docket No. USCG-2008-0284, formerly COTP San Juan 05-007] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6983. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Cleveland Harbor, Dock 32, Cleveland, OH [USCG-2008-0329] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6984. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Escorted Vessels in Captain of the Port Zone Jacksonville, Florida [Docket No. USCG-2008-0203] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6985. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Anacostia River, Washington, DC [Docket No. USCG-2008-0114] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6986. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tank Level or Pressure Monitoring Devices on Single-Hull Tank Ships and Single-Hull Tank Barges Carrying Oil or Oil Residue as Cargo [USCG-2001-9046] (RIN: 1625-AB12) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6987. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA [Docket No. USCG-2008-0277] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6988. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Delaware River, Big Timber Creek, Westville, NJ [Docket No. USCG-2008-0278] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6989. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Fourth of July Fireworks Celebration Charles River, Boston, MA. [USCG-2008-0319] received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6990. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Sacramento River, Sacramento, CA, Event — Sacramento International Triathlon [Docket No. USCG-2008-0317] received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6991. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Illinois Waterway, Joliet, IL 8K Run [USCG-2008-0267] received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6992. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Charles River, Boston, MA, Larry Kessler 5K Run [USCG-2008-0258] received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6993. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Sacramento River, Sacramento, CA, Event — Grand Opening Celebration [Docket No. USCG-2008-0223] received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6994. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Upper Mississippi River, Rock Island, IL, Quad City Marathon [USCG-2008-0037] received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6995. A letter from the Chief Counsel, EDA, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Economic Development Administration Reauthorization Act of 2004 Implementation; Regulatory Revision [Docket No.: 05072910-6229-06] (RIN: 0610-AA63) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Financial Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4179. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish an appeal and redress process for individuals wrongly delayed or prohibited from boarding a flight, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 110–686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5909. A bill to amend the Aviation and Transportation Security Act to prohibit advance notice to certain individuals, including security screeners, of covert testing of security screening procedures for the purpose of enhancing transportation security at airports, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5982. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security, for purposes of transportation security, to conduct a study on how airports can transition to uniform, standards-based, and interoperable biometric identifier systems for airport workers with unescorted access to secure or sterile areas of an airport, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4749. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office for Bombing Prevention, to address terrorist explosive threats, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 6003. A bill to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Air Force to use Civil Air Patrol personnel and resources to support homeland security missions; with amendments (Rept. 110–691 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5680. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Native Americans, and for others purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3682. A bill to designate certain Federal lands in Riverside County, California, as wilderness, to designate certain river segments in Riverside County as a wild, scenic, or recreational river, to adjust the boundary of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3022. A bill to designate the John Krebs Wilderness in the State of California, to add certain land to the Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Park Wilderness, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2632. A bill to establish the Sabinoso Wilderness Area in San Miguel County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5938. A bill to amend title 18,

United States Code, to provide secret service protection to former Vice Presidents, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5060. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow athletes admitted as nonimmigrants described in section 101(a)(15)(P) of such Act to renew their period of authorized admission in 5-year increments (Rept. 110–697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5569. A bill to extend for 5 years the EB–5 regional center pilot program (Rept. 110–698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4080. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a separate nonimmigrant classification for fashion models; with an amendment (Rept. 110–699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5593. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make technical amendments to certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, enacted by the Congressional Review Act (Rept. 110–700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1333. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than June 13, 2008.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 6191. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive certain requirements for naturalization for American Samoan United States nationals to become United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 6192. A bill to make payments by the Department of Homeland Security to a State contingent on a State providing the Federal Bureau of Investigation with certain statistics, to require Federal agencies, departments, and courts to provide such statistics to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to publish such statistics; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DICKS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 6193. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop and administer policies, procedures, and programs to promote the implementation of the Controlled Unclassified Information Framework applicable to unclassified information that is homeland security information, terrorism information, weapons of mass destruction information and other information within the scope of the information sharing environment established under section 1016 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 485), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for the furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 6195. A bill to authorize the Korean War Veterans Association to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia near the Korean War Memorial on the Mall to honor members of the Armed Forces who have served in Korea since July 28, 1953; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6196. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of individuals receiving a heart transplant; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6197. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7095 Highway 57 in Counce, Tennessee, as the ''Pickwick Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 6198. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1700 Cleveland Avenue in Kansas City, Missouri, as the ''Reverend Earl Abel Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 6199. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 245 North Main Street in New City, New York, as the ''Kenneth Peter Zebrowski Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 6200. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for a study of the Long Path Trail, a system of trails and potential trails running from Fort Lee, New Jersey, to the Adirondacks in New York, to determine whether to add the trail to the National Trails System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 6201. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to eligible States for the purpose of reducing the student-to-school nurse ratio in public secondary schools, elementary schools, and kindergarten; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 6202. A bill to promote the well-being of animals held for commercial use by providing such animals protection from cruelty and abuse; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 6203. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure sufficient resources and increase efforts for research at the National Institutes of Health relating to Alzheimer's disease, to authorize an education and outreach program to promote public awareness and risk reduction with respect to Alzheimer's disease (with particular emphasis on education and outreach in Hispanic populations), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 6204. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SUTTON (for herself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HARE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 6205. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to require the payment of monthly special pay for members of the uniformed services whose service on active duty is extended by a stop-loss order or similar mechanism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should sign the Declaration of the Oslo Conference on Cluster Munitions and future instruments banning cluster munitions that cause unacceptable harm to civilians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PITTS):

H.J. Res. 93. A joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HODES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KIND, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr.

RAHALL, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HARE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. BONO MACK):

H. Res. 1242. A resolution honoring the life, musical accomplishments, and contributions of Louis Jordan on the 100th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H. Res. 1243. A resolution recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PORTER):

H. Res. 1244. A resolution resolving to address the costly obesity epidemic by identifying opportunities to increase access to and promotion of nutrition, physical activity, and health care in all of Congress's work; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 1245. A resolution urging the international community to provide the United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur with essential tactical and utility helicopters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. DINGELL):

H. Res. 1246. A resolution congratulating the Detroit Red Wings for winning the 2008 Stanley Cup Hockey Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 1247. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''American Eagle Day'', and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the American bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH (for himself, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. RENZI, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SHULER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 1248. A resolution recognizing the service of the USS Farenholt and her men who served our Nation with valor and bravery in the South Pacific during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. HARE):

H. Res. 1249. A resolution urging the Government of the Republic of Iraq to recognize the right of the State of Israel to exist and to establish diplomatic relations with Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BURGESS):

H. Res. 1250. A resolution honoring the Texas Air National Guard 147th Fighter Wing at Ellington Field for protecting the ports, industries, and people of Southeast Texas upon the retirement of its F-16s and its redesignation as the 147th Reconnaissance Wing; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 96: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 138: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 139: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 154: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 245: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 303: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 432: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 506: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 552: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 659: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 822: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 998: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1023: Mr. LATTA, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 1035: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1093: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 1108: Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 1134: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1178: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1192: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1193: Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. LEE, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1232: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 1474: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1518: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1536: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1540: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1552: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1610: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1621: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1647: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 1655: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
H.R. 1665: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1691: Mr. KIRK and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1738: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1748: Mr. WOLF and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1755: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1921: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1940: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1941: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1983: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1992: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 2047: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 2060: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 2116: Mr. CARSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 2164: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 2192: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2210: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2231: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HODES, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2266: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 2329: Mr. ROSS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 2407: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2549: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2620: Mr. SPRATT.
H.R. 2762: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2820: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2821: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 2880: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2892: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2922: Ms. WATERS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 2926: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2991: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 3024: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3088: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3098: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3140: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3175: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 3186: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3187: Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3212: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3257: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 3331: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 3404: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3439: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3440: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 3457: Mr. CULBERSON, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 3471: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3544: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 3547: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3660: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3770: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3815: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 3914: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 3934: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 3990: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3995: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 4048: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 4107: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4113: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 4199: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 4218: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4236: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 4544: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4736: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of

Maryland, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4836: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 4900: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 5038: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 5155: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 5157: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 5174: Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 5223: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 5265: Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 5266: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 5446: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 5469: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 5488: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 5546: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 5550: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5559: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 5560: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 5564: Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 5603: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 5611: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 5626: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 5632: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 5636: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 5637: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 5646: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 5677: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 5698: Mr. WELLER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5721: Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 5734: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5746: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5748: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 5759: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 5768: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5772: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5774: Ms. SOLIS and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 5775: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 5805: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 5816: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 5825: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 5842: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 5843: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 5846: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5853: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 5866: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5873: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5882: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 5892: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 5898: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 5901: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5914: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5925: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 5935: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 5943: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 5949: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 5954: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 5960: Mr. HARE and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5984: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 5990: Mr. ROSS and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 6003: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 6023: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6025: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 6026: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 6029: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 6039: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 6064: Ms. CASTOR, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 6073: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 6076: Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 6085: Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HERGER, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 6091: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 6092: Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 6093: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 6098: Mr. DENT and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 6105: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 6107: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6108: Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 6123: Mr. AKIN and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 6135: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 6136: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 6137: Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 6138: Mr. CANNON, Mr. HERGER, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 6139: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 6146: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 6161: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 6165: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 6180: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 6187: Mr. DICKS and Ms. LEE.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. SCALISE.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. WU and Mr. ELLISON.

H.J. Res. 89: Mr. RENZI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. MELANCON.

H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. HILL.

H. Con. Res. 247: Ms. ESHOO.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 296: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. DENT and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 336: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. LATHAM.

H. Con. Res. 338: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 342: Mr. WELLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. SNYDER.

H. Con. Res. 352: Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 362: Mr. HARE, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SHULER.

H. Con. Res. 364: Mr. CARSON and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 367: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. WU, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 102: Mr. MCHUGH.

H. Res. 123: Mr. HARE.

H. Res. 212: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 241: Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 322: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 672: Mr. KIND, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 758: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 844: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WU, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. HARE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 881: Mr. ROSS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H. Res. 900: Mr. CARSON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WATT, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 977: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 1008: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 1027: Mr. STEARNS.

H. Res. 1051: Mr. BUYER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DREIER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BOREN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H. Res. 1064: Mr. BURGESS.

H. Res. 1128: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 1160: Mr. EHLERS.

H. Res. 1161: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 1177: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 1179: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 1191: Mr. KIRK and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 1198: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H. Res. 1202: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. LUCAS.

H. Res. 1204: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 1217: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 1219: Mr. WAMP, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. FALLIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SALI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. POE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. HELLER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 1227: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 1237: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HOLT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is required to include a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives that are included in the manager's amendment to H.R. 6003, the ''Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008.''

The Amendment No. ____, to be offered by Mr. OBERSTAR or his designee, to H.R. 6003 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.