

There was no objection.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY
LEADER

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it may come as a surprise to the minority leader and her liberal followers in this Chamber to learn that when I am back in the 4th District of Kentucky I am not asked why I support the majority leader. I am asked why the liberal Democrats insist on obstructing progress in the House.

My constituents want to know why the so-called progressive party opposes legislation to create jobs, to lower the cost of health care, to secure our borders, to fortify our military and to strengthen Social Security for future generations. And now my constituents want to know why the liberal Democrats will not let the majority leader appear before the ethics committee to clear his name.

It appears to my constituents that the liberals are afraid the majority leader, a man who does not stand in violation of any law, will clear his name. And then what happens? The minority leader and her followers will have to explain why they wasted America's time assassinating the character of the majority leader rather than working in Congress to help our country.

I think the answer is already clear.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY
LEADER

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 weeks, Democratic leaders have been speaking out of both sides of their mouths. They have leveled charges against the majority leader, yet at the same time they will not allow the ethics committee to convene and explore the facts. If they are serious about our ethics process in this institution, why will they not let the ethics committee organize so that it can conduct its business?

Time and time again the ethics committee chairman has offered to end the Democratic logjam. This is the same old, tired, petty, partisan politics of the past. A Democrat leader is quoted as saying this issue will cost Republican seats in next year's election, petty, partisan politics.

There is only one conclusion that can be drawn from the activities of the Democrat leaders, they would rather have an issue than a solution. It is sad and it is cynical.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to an open, fair and expedient ethics process and are willing to work with Democrats productively. I challenge all Members of this body to ask their leaders to act responsibly.

Let us allow the ethics committee to proceed with their appropriate work. Stop the petty, partisan, political tactics. Let us work together and honor our constituents' trust.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY
LEADER

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of complaints about rules changes by Democrats. As a freshman, as a former judge and chief justice, I am still in the process of making assessments. When I hear allegations for or against either side, I am looking to figure out, is there evidence to support or dispel the allegations.

In this case, the allegations about the rules changes, you have to take a look at. In the first place, there have been ethical allegations made about the majority leader, Mr. DELAY, and the complaint about the rules changes.

Well, we look at the rules. First of all, allowing someone to know what they are charged with in advance seems pretty reasonable. Allowing someone to hire their own attorney sounds pretty reasonable. Going from 90 days to 45 days seemed a little short, and then we hear Chairman HASTINGS say, We will go and I will give you an automatic extension back to 90.

You look at the evidence, the fact that there was a RICO lawsuit filed against the majority leader that was dismissed with prejudice because there was nothing there, you have a DA that has been trying to indict him for years unsuccessfully.

There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, justice delayed is justice denied. It appears now that this is all about denying justice to DELAY.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY
LEADER

(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, for the past 6 weeks Democrats have attacked the character, leadership and intentions of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Although Democrats continue to smear the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), they forget that they are responsible for preventing the ethics committee from investigating the charges directed at the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Since the beginning of the 109th Congress, House Democrats have refused to allow the ethics committee to meet to address this issue. Four ethics committee Republicans have pledged that as soon as the Democrats permit the ethics committee to function again, they will vote to form an investigative subcommittee to review various allega-

tions concerning travel and other actions by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Majority Leader DELAY has said all along that he wants to appear before the ethics committee to address the recent accusations. Unfortunately, Democrats prefer to attack his character for political purposes rather than officially investigate these allegations.

Democrats should stop playing politics with the House ethics committee and should give the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the opportunity to defend himself through the congressional ethics process.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. We will never forget September the 11.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY
LEADER

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, we are now 4 months into the 109th Congress and Republicans have passed bankruptcy reform, repealed the death tax, adjusted class action lawsuits to help victims, enacted border security to keep out terrorists, passed a budget and wartime funding, strengthened job training for millions and passed the highway bill. Meanwhile, the House Democrats have not proposed an agenda, but instead have remained negative, obstructive and focused on partisan attacks.

I rise today to support the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), not because he has proven to be an effective leader, but because he has been a victim of political game-playing and a relentless media, a media not focused on policies that have helped millions of Americans lead better lives, but instead focused on tabloid attacks on our leader.

Time and time again, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has requested to appear in front of the ethics committee. He has requested this opportunity to prove his innocence and put an end to these meritless accusations, accusations that are based upon nothing but pure partisan rhetoric.

Democrats' attack on the Republican majority leader is nothing but a coordinated agenda to stop an effective leader from accomplishing the people's business.

Ethics is an issue that should not be taken lightly. The committee in Congress should not be used as a partisan tool. We need to get back to debating the principles to make America a better place.

IN SUPPORT OF THE MAJORITY
LEADER

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from Washington, and the gentleman from Washington

(Mr. HASTINGS) the chairman of the ethics committee, for his efforts to resolve the regrettable impasse that has prevented the committee from organizing. He has made a thoughtful and good-faith attempt to clear up any misunderstanding and resolve any perceived concerns.

But this was rejected out of hand by our friends on the other side of the aisle. Why? Because their concerns are neither real nor substantive. They want the committee to be in limbo. They are creating an issue for political purposes without any positive ideas about how to resolve the very serious challenges facing our Nation. Negativity and political attacks are their only strategy.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Let us move forward constructively and stop abusing our ethics process for purely political gain.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REMEMBERING EARTH DAY

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 35th anniversary of the first Earth Day, which is considered the birth of the modern environmental movement in this country. In the 3½ decades since, it was first celebrated in 1970, Earth Day has become a day for reflection, a day for education, and a day for action. It provides an annual benchmark by which we can measure our progress as stewards of our planet.

That stewardship is about more than preserving pristine wilderness and endangered species. Our economic and national security are also at stake. The biggest impediment to sound environmental policies in the United States comes from those who see environmentalism as competing with our economic prosperity and our national security.

The energy bill that was just considered by the House was advertised by its supporters as providing security for America by reducing our dependence on foreign sources of fossil fuels. It does this through \$8 billion in tax breaks to encourage domestic production.

Unfortunately, 95 percent of the tax subsidies benefit the oil, gas, coal and nuclear industries, while only 5 percent are directed towards wind, solar and other renewable sources. In my opinion, the energy bill is a short-sighted response to two of the central strategic challenges confronting our country, beginning the transition to a post-fossil-fuel economy and reducing the emission of greenhouse gases that every

reputable scientist knows are contributing to global warming.

We cannot drill our way to energy independence. We cannot burn our way to a cleaner environment. We cannot go on behaving as if time and resources are on our side.

Rather than making America more secure, the energy bill does the opposite. Both economically and in terms of our national security, the policies enshrined in this bill will make us profoundly weaker.

In doing so, we have shied away from the challenge of developing new ways of powering our lives by unleashing the driving force behind America economic competitiveness, technological innovation mixed with entrepreneurship.

□ 1700

And while America sits on the sidelines, our competitors in Europe and Asia are developing technologies that will enable them to reduce fuel consumption and lower emissions of greenhouse gases. Rather than American entrepreneurs driving these changes, it is our competitors who prosper.

In just one graphic example, there are 6-month waiting lists to buy Japanese hybrids while American car makers fall further and further behind.

In addition to environmental and economic considerations, there are equally compelling national security reasons to confront the scarcity and costs of oil, the challenge of global warming and environmental degradation. Imagine the increased strength, independence, and security that would come to an America that could tell the oil-producing nations, we do not need your oil, we do not want your oil, we can do better. And imagine the risk to America if we negligent the sobering evidence of global warming.

Last year the Pentagon's Office of Net Assessment issued a report on the national security aspects of climate change. The report evaluated one scenario in which the Earth's climate rose by 5 degrees in North America over a 15-year period between 2005 and 2020. The consequences of such a rapid temperature increase were myriad and catastrophic: drought, fire, storms and sea levels that rose around the world, flooding heavily populated coastal regions.

Unfortunately, the administration has failed to provide leadership or vision on this issue. Senior level positions at the National Security Council and in the Department of Defense dealing with the security threat of environmental degradation have been downgraded or eliminated. From the President on down, this administration has had a contempt for science that is at odds with its policy or belief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Nation should be marshaling its talents and resources for a new Manhattan Project to make practical solar, wind, and wave energy, we have instead opted to subsidize the extraction of every last barrel of oil and ton of coal that we can get our hands on.

Even as we have driven up the financial burden on our children through reckless fiscal policies, we are imperiling their very existence through willful neglect of our responsibilities to the environment. I can only hope that we will not have to tell our grandchildren, to paraphrase the words of Kurt Vonnegut, We could have saved the Earth, but we were too darned cheap.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 6, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF LT. ILARIO PANTANO

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. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at length on the floor about Second Lt. Ilario Pantano, a Marine who served this Nation bravely in both gulf wars.

During his service in Iraq last year, Lt. Pantano was faced with a very difficult decision that caused him to make a split-second decision to defend his life. He felt threatened by the actions of two insurgents under his watch, and in an act of self-defense he had to resort to force. Two and a half months later, a sergeant under his command who never even saw the shooting accused him of murder. Lt. Pantano now faces two counts of murder.