

Mr. Speaker, what is happening to this young man is an injustice. Lt. Pantano has served this Nation in great honor. My personal experiences with him and his family convince me that he is a dedicated family man and a man who loves his corps and his country; but I am not the only one who believes he is innocent.

I have read excerpts of pieces from the Washington Times and respected journalist Mona Charen defending Lt. Pantano. I have received letters and e-mails from Vietnam veterans who sympathize with him and ask that I do something to help him. They know what it is like to be in a battle with an unconventional enemy. One second can make the difference between life and death.

I have read excerpts from his fitness report in which his superiors praise his leadership and talent. In that report, his superior officer evaluated "accomplished infantry leader. His actions during the fighting in Fallujah and Al Zaidon highlighted a solid understanding of tactics and ability to anticipate the enemy. Leads from the front always and balances his aggressive style with true concern for the welfare of his Marines. Exceptional communication skills for a Second Lt. Organized, aggressive, focused and driven. Ready for increased responsibility. Retain, promote, and assign to challenging assignments."

Mr. Speaker, that came 2 months after the sergeant reported him for murder.

Mr. Speaker, Lt. Pantano by all accounts is an exceptional Marine. On Monday, April 25, there will be an Article 32 hearing to determine whether or not Lt. Pantano will face a court-martial for a murder trial. If convicted by a court-martial, Lt. Pantano can be subject to the death penalty for an action he took in self-defense on the battlefield.

I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that on Monday Lt. Pantano will be cleared of all charges because I am confident that he did his duty as any Marine officer should when faced with the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 167 to support Lt. Pantano as he faces trial. I hope that my colleagues in the House will take some time to read my resolution and look into this situation for themselves. Lt. Pantano's mother, a wonderful lady whom I have spoken to by telephone on several occasions, also has a Web site that I encourage people to visit. The address is www.defendthedefenders.org.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking the Good Lord to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families and to please be with Lt. Pantano on Monday, April 25 and may he be exonerated of these charges for doing his duty to protect America. God bless him and God bless America.

SMART ENERGY POLICIES, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6, which the House passed earlier today, is called the Energy Policy Act of 2005. But the only real policies to be found in this immoral legislation are tax breaks for polluters, swollen gasoline prices, and continued reliance on fossil fuels of the past. This legislation fails to even mention climate change or global warming which scientists of all stripes acknowledge is caused at least in part by high levels of carbon dioxide emissions from automobiles.

It fails to correct the matter of MTBE, a gasoline additive that has leaked into the Earth and tarnished our drinking water, except, however, to waive liabilities for MTBE providers.

Most significant of all, Mr. Speaker, this legislation fails to truly address America's reliance on Middle East oil. Of the 21 million barrels consumed by the United States each day, 14 million barrels are imported, making Middle East oil the United States' main source of energy. Much of this oil is imported from countries that do not share America's commitment to democracy and our commitment to human rights, countries like Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Venezuela.

It is obvious in this energy bill that those who claim that drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska will cure our Nation's energy policy do not know much about how oil is produced. Drilling in ANWR will do little to reduce our current dependence on foreign oil because it will take a full decade to process what little oil may be there in the first place. That does not sound like a comprehensive energy strategy to me.

By continuing to purchase Middle East oil by the boatload, we are failing to take advantage of life-changing renewable energy technologies while continuing to promote our national insecurity by providing billions of dollars each year to repressive regimes.

The oil dollars that go to oppressive Middle East regimes do not, of course, help the poor people in these countries. Instead, they line the already thick pockets of the fat-cat ruling elite. In this way, U.S. policies actually discourage democracy in the Middle East because we continue to help maintain the economic gap between the rich and the poor.

In truth, this failure to reduce our dependence on Middle East oil along with President Bush's supremely misguided invasion of Iraq have combined to make Americans less secure, not more secure.

The Bush administration has falsely labeled the war in Iraq, much like the latest energy bill, as the essence of protecting our national security, when in fact both contribute to our lack of security.

Already more than 1,500 American soldiers and tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians have been killed in this war, not to mention the more than 12,000 troops who have been gravely wounded. Hardly the stuff of a national security.

Let us never forget that the invasion of Iraq was a war of choice against a country that never posed a threat to the United States and never possessed relationships with international terrorist groups like al Qaeda.

President Bush claims that things are going well in Iraq, demonstrated by the fact that 150,000 Iraqi soldiers "have been adequately trained." But if 150,000 Iraqi soldiers have been trained, then why do 150,000 American soldiers remain in the country? Why do our troops continue to die for a war that was a mistake from the very beginning?

If President Bush continues to support a misguided war that is draining our national resources, and if the Republicans will not work to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, how can they possibly claim to be securing America against the threat of terrorism? Clearly, much more needs to be done to make America secure.

Mr. Speaker, I will soon reintroduce the SMART Security resolution, legislation to secure America for the future by preventing the threat of terrorism; reducing nuclear stock piles; eliminating the possible use of nuclear weapons through diplomatic means; and establishing a new Apollo Project to secure America's energy independence.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this effort to truly secure America for the future.

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

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

There was no objection.

SERIOUS ENERGY PROBLEMS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, America has a serious problem with energy prices. If you just peruse today's Wall Street Journal and New York Times, you will see the airlines are reporting record losses in great part despite efficiencies, despite concessions

by labor because of an increase in fuel prices. You see that General Motors has had a huge drop-off in the purchase of their lucrative SUVs and other larger vehicles that consume more gas, Ford similarly.

We find this in small businesses across America; it has been embedded in everything. And now we are beginning to hear that there are stirrings of inflation beyond the price of oil and gas. This is a serious problem; and, unfortunately, this body, the House of Representatives, to its discredit did not adopt a serious or effective proposal to begin to address this problem in either the short or the long term.

Short term, American consumers need relief from high gas prices. They are being gouged at the pump by Big Oil and the OPEC cartel.

Now, I have asked President Bush numerous times, written to him and asked him, he is a big fan of rule of law, international trade agreements, the WTO, all of those things. I am not a big fan. But he says he believes in rules-based trade.

Well, the OPEC cartel is violating the rules of the World Trade Organization. Seven of the OPEC nations are members. They are clearly colluding to restrict production and drive up the price of oil to make a profit. That is clearly prohibited by the WTO. But the President and his trade representative have failed to take any action against the OPEC companies.

Then we have price gouging by Big Oil. Last quarter saw record profits for most of the industry, \$8 billion in one quarter for Exxon Mobile. Their cash reserves have doubled to over \$20 billion in 1 year, money extracted from Americans 5 cents a gallon at a time or more at the pump by piggybacking on the cartel activities of OPEC, and Big Oil is getting away with it.

This administration is not doing anything to rein in Big Oil. They merge, close refineries, and then blame a shortage of refineries on environmental laws when they have been closed because of mergers to drive up the profits of the oil industry.

We should reinstate a windfall profit tax on the industry. We should break up a number of these huge companies and begin to get some true competition again in that industry.

□ 1715

We cannot continue to bleed this much money. Every day, Americans are bleeding money at the pump, which is ultimately going to spill over into a tremendous problem for our economy, especially if we look at the failing trade policies of this administration.

Then there is energy efficiency, new technologies, energy independence. These are things that seem very foreign to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and to the old oil men who are running this country down at the White House and at an undisclosed location.

Energy efficiency, this bill makes sort of a passing chuckle and nod at en-

ergy efficiency. It spends 20 times as much money subsidizing the oil, coal and gas industry. Wait a minute, were we not just talking about the fact they had record profits last quarter? Yes, they do have record profits and they are extracting that from American consumers, but they want their hands in both pockets. They do not want to just take money out of your wallet, they want to take money from taxpayers, too.

So there is \$8 billion in this bill, supposedly to help with energy problems. Unfortunately, 95 percent of it is subsidies to the wildly profitable oil, coal and gas industry, which will provide no help to American consumers; and a mere 5 percent is a nod toward the idea perhaps America could develop new sources of energy, perhaps America could become more efficient, perhaps America could become energy independent, but that is only worth 5 percent of what they are putting into the bill.

Just think what it would be like to have an energy-independent America relying upon homegrown sources of energy and new technologies and new efficiencies, and how that would insulate us from these problems around the world. But that is not a vision that is shared by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They have delivered us today something that would not have been a very enlightened energy policy in 1955, but is just pathetic in the 21st century, considering the threats to our economy and to our national security.

Unfortunately, they prevailed today, but hopefully, in the future, we can do better by the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMEMORATING THE BATTLE OF SAN JACINTO

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate an historical event in the Lone Star State's grand, glorious heritage. On March 2, 1836, Texas declared independence from the dictatorship of Mexico. On March 6, the Alamo fell with the loss of 187 defenders, all volunteers, William Barrett Travis, Davy Crockett, and Jim Bowie.

Now, I am going to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the rest of the story and why this day is so important to Texas.

Less than 60 days after the fall of the Alamo, on this day years ago, an 18-minute battle took place on the murky banks of the San Jacinto River where it meets Buffalo Bayou in southeast Texas. History forever changed. Texas' independence from Mexico was secured, and Texas became a country for 9 years.

After the Alamo fell, the Texas army moved rapidly east, being chased by three invading armies from Mexico. The Texans had been joined by settlers fleeing the advance of the tyrant Santa Anna, who was burning Texas settlements. The armies reached a marshy lowland where General Sam Houston decided it was time to turn and fight the enemy.

In a letter Sam Houston wrote to a friend on the morning of April 19, he said, "The odds are greatly against us, but the troops are in fine spirits and now is the time for action. We go to conquer" for Texas and they did.

Most battles, Mr. Speaker, in our history start at sunrise, but the Texans were not waiting for another day. So General Sam's army of frontiersmen, shopkeepers, lawyers, ranchers and former slaves, all volunteers, in various types of odd attire, began mustering at high noon. They did not look like an army, but they all had the boldness and bravery and brazen courage to fight for Texas and for freedom.

The Battle of San Jacinto started at 4 o'clock on the afternoon of April 21, 1836. The Texan army consisted of approximately 800 volunteers under the command of General Sam Houston. The Mexican army consisted of approximately 2,000 professional, experienced soldiers under the command of Mexican President and General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna. Santa Anna's army of hardened veterans had not yet been defeated in battle and even a few years before had defeated the French invasion of Mexico.

The battle began when the Texans, advancing in a single column, attacked the Mexican camp. They were fatigued, they were filthy, famished and fuming, but Houston was mounted on his white stallion leading the army. Armed with tomahawks, Bowie knives and long rifles, they went forward across the open marshy plain of southeast Texas. A Georgian Huguenot, a Kentucky colonel, and a Scotch-Irishman from Tennessee led the march across the tall grass and down upon a Mexican camp engaged in their afternoon siestas.

The pace was set by two unlikely characters that played field music as they marched. There was a German named Frederick Lemsky on the fife and a free black that, by all accounts, his name was Dick the Drummer. Two other musicians volunteered, but none of the foursome knew any marching music. They were only familiar with the popular music of the day. Therefore, Sam Houston, with a smile, had