

In the Resources Committee, I tried to change that. An amendment I offered would not have barred oil shale development. Instead, it would have said that before we leap again, we should take a look and have a clear idea of where we are apt to land. Under my amendment, the Department of the Interior would be told to prepare regulations for a new oil shale leasing program—and to get them finished “promptly” after finishing the analysis required by NEPA and the regular process for developing new federal regulations.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership of the Resources Committee opposed my amendment, and so it was not adopted. The result is that that part of the House bill was much uglier than it should have been.

The oil shale part of the conference report, while not necessarily a thing of real beauty, is definitely better. It calls for a programmatic environmental impact statement as the first step, and requires issuance of final regulations for a new commercial leasing program only after that statement has been completed. Further, it requires the Interior Department to consult with the Governor of Colorado (and the governors of other relevant states) and other interested parties in order to determine the level of support for development of oil shale (or tar sands) resources, and provides that leasing will then occur only if there is sufficient interest and support. This is a much better way to proceed than through the kind of crash program called for in the House-passed bill.

And, while I think the need for a new oil shale task force or a new office within DOE is doubtful at best, the conference report’s provisions related to experimental leases are sensible and worthwhile.

There were a few good things in the House bill that I am glad are retained in the conference report—after all, in a 1,725-page bill, there are bound to be some good provisions, but in this case they are far outweighed by the bad.

For example, I support most of the provisions developed by the Science Committee, and I commend Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member GORDON for their bipartisan approach.

In particular, I’m pleased that the Science Committee bill included generous authorization levels for renewable energy and energy efficiency R&D. As Co-chair of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus, this funding is very important to me.

I am also pleased that the conference report includes the Clean Green School Bus Act, a bill that Chairman BOEHLERT and I drafted that authorizes grants to help school districts replace aging diesel vehicles with clean, alternative fuel buses. H.R. 6 also includes provisions from legislation I introduced on distributed power, which would direct the Secretary of Energy to develop and implement a strategy for research, development, and demonstration of distributed power energy systems.

Unfortunately, though, as a whole this conference report—like the bills we’ve debated twice before—basically retains the status quo and does little to provide solutions to the real energy problems facing this country.

This conference report provides oil and gas companies massive forgiveness of royalty payments. It exempts industry from requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act when they inject harmful chemicals into the ground during

drilling. It exempts oil and gas construction sites from storm water runoff regulations under the Clean Water Act. It authorizes up to \$1.5 billion in new subsidies to the oil industry for ultra-deep oil drilling and exploration. It establishes an exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act for oil and gas development activities.

Of the bill’s total \$14.6 billion in tax incentives, \$9.3 billion (or 64 percent) is for traditional energy sources such as oil, natural gas, and nuclear power. The oil and gas industries are getting these massive subsidies from the taxpayer at the same time that their profits have never been higher. Meanwhile, renewables and energy efficiency technologies are allocated \$5.3 billion, or just 26 percent of the total incentives in the bill.

And then there are all the things the bill would not do. It would not increase vehicle fuel economy standards, which have been frozen since 1996. Raising CAFE standards is the single biggest step we can take to reduce oil consumption, since about half of the oil used in the U.S. goes into the gas tanks of our passenger vehicles.

This conference report avoids the whole question of mandatory action on climate change, excluding even the toothless Senate-passed resolution that recognized the need for immediate action by Congress to implement mandatory caps on greenhouse gas emissions.

It also does not include the Renewable Portfolio Standard, RPS, part of the Senate-passed bill, which would require utilities to generate 10 percent of their power from renewable sources by 2020. Colorado is uniquely positioned to take advantage of alternative energy opportunities, such as wind and sun. Colorado’s voters approved Amendment 37 last year, a state RPS, which is making a difference in our energy supply.

But a Federal RPS would yield numerous rewards in the long-term for the whole country, including increased energy independence and security, economic development opportunities in depressed communities, maintaining a competitive advantage internationally, protecting our environment, and helping our farmers develop long-term income sources. The absence of an RPS in this conference report is a serious setback for forward-thinking energy policy.

Most importantly, according to analyses conducted by the Department of Energy’s Energy Information Administration, this energy bill will neither lower gas prices nor reduce U.S. dependence on foreign oil, with foreign imports predicted to increase from 58 percent to 68 percent in the next 20 years. Coloradans on average are already on average \$2.25 for a gallon of regular gas. This bill will do nothing to bring those prices down.

I don’t always agree with President Bush. But I think he is absolutely right about one thing—at \$55 a barrel, we don’t need incentives to oil and gas companies to explore. Instead, we need a strategy to wean our Nation from its dependence on fossil fuels, especially foreign oil.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we need a plan in place to increase our energy security. Thirteen percent of the twenty million barrels of oil we consume each day comes from the Persian Gulf. In fact, fully 30 percent of the world’s oil supply comes from this same volatile and politically unstable region of the world. Yet with only 3 percent of the world’s known

oil reserves, we are not in a position to solve our energy vulnerability by drilling at home.

This bill does nothing to tackle this fundamental problem. For every step it takes to move us away from our oil/carbon-based economy, it takes two in the opposite direction. I only wish my colleagues in the House could understand that a vision of a clean energy future is not radical science fiction but is instead based on science and technology that exists today. Given the magnitude of the crisis ahead, we can surely put more public investment behind new energy sources that will free us from our dependence on oil.

Earlier this year, President Bush spoke at the opening of the Abraham Lincoln Museum in Springfield, Illinois and attempted to draw parallels between his goal of expanding freedom in the world and Lincoln’s effort to expand freedom in the U.S. I have some questions about that comparison, but I do think it is good to consider Lincoln’s example when we debate public policy.

In fact, I wish President Bush and the Republicans would draw a few more parallels to Lincoln in their approach to energy policy—because, as that greatest of Republican Presidents said, “The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. Our present is piled high with difficulties. We must think anew and act anew—then we will save our country.”

And while we are not engaged in a civil war, our excessive dependence on fossil energy is a pressing matter of national security. We have an energy security crisis. We need to think anew to devise an energy security strategy that will give future generations of Americans an economy less dependent on oil and fossil fuels.

Unfortunately, too much of this bill reflects not just a failure but an absolute refusal to think anew. Provision after provision reflects a stubborn insistence on old ideas—more tax subsidies, more royalty giveaways, more restrictions on public participation, more limits on environmental reviews—and a hostility to the search for new approaches.

Maybe we could have afforded such a mistake in the past. But now the stakes are too high—because, as I said, energy policy isn’t just an economic issue, it’s a national security issue. America’s dependence on imported oil poses a risk to our homeland security and economic well-being.

Unfortunately, this conference report does not think anew and is not adequate to the challenges of this stormy present. For that reason, I cannot vote for it.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2005

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, despite the President’s oversell, this bill does nothing to improve our energy independence and does little to provide for a cleaner environment. The bill does nothing to lower gasoline prices, which are at an all-time high.

This bill is a corporate giveaway to the largest multinational oil companies, coal, utility

and other energy companies, who stand to receive a windfall of \$14.5 billion in tax breaks over 10 years. Taxpayers are going to subsidize billions in loan guarantees to these industries, so the energy industry can be free to fail without having to face little financial risk. That is a sweet deal.

With oil selling at \$60 a barrel, this bill provides royalty-free drilling rights to the multinational oil companies to drill on public lands. This is making a sweet deal even sweeter. When the American consumer fills his or her car with gasoline selling over \$2.30 a gallon, they will be secure in knowing that the record profits they are paying for big oil are being subsidized further at the expense of their tax dollars. Taxpayers are being asked to donate more than \$14 billion in tax breaks, most of them to the oil and gas companies, the utilities, the nuclear industry and the coal industry. That is sweet on top of a sweeter deal for Big Oil. The renewable energy and energy efficiency industries are left with little.

The bill preempts the ability of state and local governments to block the siting of Liquefied Natural Gas terminal in densely populated urban areas. It will weaken environmental protections with new loopholes for the oil and gas industry. It will allow the process of hydraulic fracturing, which involves injecting diesel fuel into groundwater supplied and exempt other industry practices from the Clean Water Act, exemptions and the National Environmental Policy Act.

This bill will authorize exploratory efforts to prepare for oil and gas drilling off the Outer Continental Shelf, including areas that are currently closed to drilling. One area that I am pleased to report is that the bill does ban drilling in the Great Lakes.

This exercise is an unfortunate one. It is short on helping the nation's energy needs and long on subsidizing the oil and gas, nuclear, utility, and coal industries. Americans pay more than their fair share to support the record profit margins of the energy industry and now they are being asked to subsidize those record profits even more. This is a bad deal for American consumers. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the passage of this bill.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2005

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the offshore drilling provisions included in this bill.

I am categorically opposed to this bill because of provisions which would increase pressure for oil drilling in the protected waters off Florida's coast. It would also give billions of dollars in tax breaks and other giveaways to traditional fossil-fuel producers.

Included in this bill is a requirement to conduct an offshore inventory of oil and gas reserves. An expensive and environmentally damaging inventory in the protected waters of the Gulf is likely to increase pressure to lift the drilling moratorium off Florida's coast.

Another provision is a reduction in royalty payments for deep gas wells leased in the

Gulf of Mexico. Any giveaway to the oil companies to reduce their costs will cause an increase in production. This will cause more exploration.

Florida is a beautiful state with miles of coastline. The Sunshine State economy depends heavily on tourism and the environment is the key factor in Florida's attractiveness to tourists. The tourism industry has an economic impact of \$57 billion on Florida's economy. Not inconsequential is the 770 miles of gulf coastline and 5,095 of gulf tidal shoreline, and the hundreds of miles of beaches.

Florida's coastline is a treasure not just for Floridians, but all Americans and the rest of the world. For years Florida's delegation has worked together to protect our coastline and natural resources. Even conducting an inventory of resources in the Gulf of Mexico will begin to destroy the efforts we have made as a state to preserve our sensitive lands. As long as there are rigs in the area, the potential for devastation to Florida's beaches persists. Florida's beaches are not something we can afford to compromise. This decision goes against everything that Floridians have worked for over so many years. Certainly, the people of Florida do not support this ill-advised decision.

The impact of offshore drilling threatens irreversible scarring to the landscape, affecting thousands of species, each critical to the ecosystem. The great weather, pristine beaches, and marine wildlife are the number one draws to our fine state. By moving forward with even a resources inventory, you risk a multi-billion dollar industry for only a few barrels of oil.

JOHN L. PROCOPE AND THE POWER OF THE BLACK PRESS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John L. Procope, who was my friend and an extraordinary African-American businessman, entrepreneur, and role model. His passing earlier this month is a source of great sadness to a community of colleagues and friends who will greatly miss him. I know that Riverside Church, where he is being memorialized this morning, is filled with many tears, but with many more memories.

When the Black newspaper, the Amsterdam News, faced financial troubles and was threatened with closure, John L. Procope stepped forward to ensure that the African-American community in New York continued to have a voice and reliable source of information on the day's news. Knowing the important and significance of the Amsterdam News and other Black newspapers, John ensured that there would continually be a voice for a community that had so long been limited in its advocacy, expression, and information.

For generations, the Black press had been the communication hub of the Black community. It had been the voice for the community to its leaders and to each other. It connected the individuals of the community to one another and told the news and events of the day from their perspectives. The Black press questioned and challenged the system of segregation, highlighted and pointed out the social,

political and economic inequalities of the community, and disputed and countered the official positions on issues of race and class. The Black press has historically been the pipeline of the concerns and issues of the Harlem community and other Black communities throughout the nation. It remains the compelling, focused, and thoughtful voice of the community and its residents, and it works against financial challenges, to maintain that role.

John recognized this important role of the black press as a voice to and of the community. He knew that for the community to flourish the press would have to remain strong. So, when John and his fellow investors saw the Amsterdam News faltering, they came to its rescue and the rescue of the community. John invested in and resurrected the paper. He ensured and maintained its role in Harlem and in Black communities throughout New York City. He continued the paper's important role as advocate, informer, and champion of the Black community.

The newspaper nonetheless was not John's only legacy. He ventured his business and economic skills into other arenas to become a successful entrepreneur and a powerful role model. He showed generations of African-Americans that to be successful, you had to be committed and dedicated, and that being successful did not mean forgetting your roots and your community.

I submit for the RECORD two articles from the July 26, 2005 edition of the *CaribNews* praising John's dedication and commitment to Harlem and the Black community. He will be missed in this community for all that he has done, but he may rest peacefully knowing that he has sowed the seeds for generations of progress.

[From the *CaribNews*; July 26, 2005]

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JOHN PROCOPE

John L. Procope, an entrepreneur and former publisher of The New York Amsterdam News, died on Friday, July 15. He was 82 and lived in Queens. The cause was complications from pneumonia.

Mr. Procope, a graduate of Morgan State University, was a marketing and advertising executive at several companies before he joined a consortium that bought The Amsterdam News in 1971. He was one of six co-owners of the newspaper when he succeeded Clarence B. Jones as publisher in 1974.

Mr. Procope earned his bachelor's degree in business from Morgan State University, attended business school at New York University and began his career in advertising. A native New Yorker, he was a former president of the National Newspaper Publishers Association. He was also a president of the Harlem Business Alliance and served as a trustee of Howard University for 15 years.

The Amsterdam News was founded by James Henry Anderson in 1909. W.E.B. Du Bois, Adam Clayton Powell and Malcolm X are among the famous black Americans who have written for the newspaper. Mr. Procope made waves in the Black community when he denounced the looting that took place after the 1977 blackout in New York by publishing a blistering editorial charging an apparent vacuum of leadership in the Black communities. Subsequently, he was appointed chairman of an Emergency Aid Commission which disbursed about \$3 million to grants to businesses hurt by the looting.

Mr. Procope left the newspaper in 1982 to focus on E. G. Bowman, an insurance company that had been founded by his wife, Ernesta G. Procope, that was one of the first major African-American-owned businesses