

American generations and as co-founder of Cappies, a high school critics and awards program. He also wrote three musicals—"MaKiddo," "Stopsandal.com." and "Anasazi"—and co-wrote with Newport two books of satire, "Fools on the Hill" (1992) and "Sixteen Scandals" (2002).

"He packed several lifetimes into his 60 years," Newport said.

William Arthur Strauss was born in Chicago and spent most of his childhood in Burlingame, Calif., in the San Francisco area. He was a Capitol page in 1963, during his junior year in high school, and graduated from Harvard University in 1969. He received a law degree from Harvard Law School and a master's degree from Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, both in 1973, but knew from his first semester in law school that he did not want to practice law. The summer his classmates took the bar exam, he and his wife were on a 40-day honeymoon trip across Africa.

The couple moved to Washington in 1973, and Mr. Strauss took a position as a policy aide for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now Health and Human Services). He moved the next year to the Presidential Clemency Board, where he directed a research team writing a report on the impact of the Vietnam War on the draft-eligible generation.

A year later, he and Larry Baskir co-wrote "Chance and Circumstance" (1978), a book about the Vietnam-era draft. Their second book, "Reconciliation After Vietnam" (1987), was said to have influenced President Jimmy Carter to issue a blanket pardon to draft resisters.

Mr. Strauss worked at the Department of Energy from 1977 to 1979 and then was offered the position of general counsel of the Selective Service System. Political objections derailed the offer: Someone pointed out that in the preface to "Chance and Circumstance," he had admitted helping a classmate eat enough to be too heavy for the draft.

The day Mr. Strauss heard about his rejection, he learned of an opening as a committee staffer with Percy. When Republicans took control of the Senate a year later, in 1980, Mr. Strauss became chief counsel and staff director of the Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes.

He had grown up listening to political satirists Tom Lehrer and Stan Freberg and had written a few political poems in college, but making a living with Capitol Steps was, in Mr. Strauss's words, "a big entrepreneurial leap."

He would never lack for material, however—from Sen. Gary Hart and "Monkey Business" to Vice President Dick Cheney ("The Angina Monologues"). In the late 1980s, he perfected his backwards talk routine, "Lirty Dies," just in time for President Bill Clinton ("Clinton's Libido Loco") and Monica Lewinsky ("My Mama Told Me: You'd Better Sleep Around").

Made up mostly of Republicans, with a few Democrats and independents—"to spread the blame a bit," Newport said—the troupe, at Mr. Strauss's insistence, has always tried to be equal-opportunity satirists. "Generally people wanted to be in the show," he said, even when they were the ones being spoofed.

As Capitol Steps was taking up more of his time, Mr. Strauss was exploring American history through the cycle of generations. With co-author Neil Howe, he wrote "Generations" (1991), "13th Gen" (1993), "The Fourth Turning: An American Prophecy" (1998), "Millennials Rising" (1999), "Millennials Go to College" (2003) and "Millennials and the Pop Culture" (2005).

In 1999, Mr. Strauss received a diagnosis of an aggressive strain of pancreatic cancer.

The diagnosis prompted him to form the high school Critics and Awards Program, known as Cappies. "I decided this would be my calling, performing less and concentrating on starting this program," he said.

Cappies arranges for high school students to attend and review each other's shows, with top reviews published in local newspapers. Sixty Washington-area schools are involved with the program, as well as 17 additional schools in the United States and Canada. Top Cappies winners perform shows at the Kennedy Center, and student creative teams, under Mr. Strauss's oversight, have written two musicals. The most recent, "Senioritis," has been made into a movie that is to be released in March.

"He had so many different projects in the air," said Judy Bowns, his Cappies colleague for nine years, "and the amazing thing is that they were completed with a standard of excellence that was mind-boggling."

Survivors include his wife of 34 years, Janie Strauss of McLean; four children, Melanie Yee and Rebecca Strauss of McLean, Victoria Hays of Fairfax County and Eric Strauss of Reston; and one granddaughter.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 2007

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this reckless energy policy, which will do absolutely nothing to make us energy independent, or lower energy costs. This bill sets us on a dangerous path and ties our hands in a regulatory mess to ensure that we cannot produce domestic energy.

Like my colleagues, I believe we should find solutions to address the growing demand for energy. The biggest concern facing the farmers and ranchers of this country is increased input costs from higher fuel prices and fertilizer. The U.S. fertilizer industry relies upon natural gas as the fundamental feedstock for the production of nitrogen fertilizer. The rest of the U.S. farm sector also depends on significant amounts of natural gas for food processing, irrigation, crop drying, heating farm buildings and homes, the production of crop protection chemicals, and, let's not forget, ethanol biofuel production. In addition to the farm sector, the forest products industry relies more on natural gas than any other fossil fuel, and energy amounts to the third largest manufacturing cost for the industry.

Unbelievably, this legislation contains no new energy supplies in it and does nothing to relieve the burdens of increased costs on producers who provide the food and fiber for American consumers. It seems that the majority's plan to move toward energy independence includes limiting domestic energy production and imposing new government mandates that will prove to be costly and burdensome to the American people.

This legislation would dramatically expand the Renewable Fuels Standard RFS, by increasing it to 36 billion gallons by 2022. This initiative is extremely ambitious and could be achieved by tapping all sectors of agriculture including plant and wood waste, vegetable oil, and animal fat and waste which would result in the production of 21 billion gallons of cel-

lulosic ethanol. While I am in favor of finding new markets for agriculture products, what good is finding new markets for agriculture commodities when the cost of production is too much for our farmers and ranchers?

We should develop a policy that is technology neutral and allows the market to develop new sources of renewable energy. The RFS provisions create an unrealistic mandate for advanced biofuels technology that doesn't yet exist and creates hurdles for the development of second generation biofuels by placing restrictions on alternative fuels, renewable fuel plant production, and, most important, limits the harvesting of our homegrown feedstocks. These restrictions will undoubtedly lead to a consumer tax to help bridge the gap in production that will occur if this policy is put into place.

Even with the advancement of cellulosic ethanol, the expansion of the RFS would still require 15 billion gallons of renewable fuel to come from the only current commercially available option: grain ethanol.

Last year, 20 percent of the U.S. corn crop was used for ethanol production and that amount is expected to rise significantly over the next few years. With feed stocks meeting most of our renewable fuel initiatives, the livestock sector is facing significantly higher feed costs. Corn and soybeans' most valuable market has always been, and will continue to be, the livestock producers. We must ensure that there are not unintended economic distortions to either grain or livestock producers as a result of these sectors prospering from other markets.

The benefits of reduced reliance on foreign energy sources, stable energy prices, and new markets for agricultural products should not be replaced with a risk of adding even more increased input costs for livestock producers and creating even higher food prices for consumers.

In addition to the above mentioned concerns, I'm also deeply disappointed that the Renewable Fuels Standard would essentially shut out one of the largest potential sources of feedstock for renewable fuel, forest biomass. In total, forests have the potential to sustainably produce 370 million tons of biomass for energy every year. This is approximately two and one-half times the amount of forest biomass we currently consume in traditional forest products. This amount of forest biomass could produce 24 billion gallons of ethanol per year, according to very conservative estimates. This could supplement, not replace, existing forest products markets.

Unfortunately, H.R. 6 would not allow forest biomass grown on public lands to be used to meet the Renewable Fuel Standard, unless the biomass was removed near buildings, public infrastructure, or areas people inhabit regularly. This greatly reduces the opportunity for any substantial market in the energy sector for the byproducts of hazardous fuels reduction. These markets could help lower the costs of reducing wildfire risks and improving forest health on public lands. With the restrictions in H.R. 6, very little of these byproducts could be used to meet the Standard. Currently, we have serious issues in our public forests, with over 90 million acres at risk of wildfire, insects, and diseases. H.R. 6 would do nothing to help address these concerns.

Additionally, H.R. 6 stipulates that, with respect to private forests, only forest biomass

removed from “tree plantations” or biomass that is considered slash or brush can be used to meet the renewable fuel standard. It would also exclude any biomass taken from old growth forests, forests in the later stages of development, or forests that are considered “ecological communities” as defined by State Natural Heritage Programs.

With these restrictions, this Renewable Fuels Standard discourages efforts to reduce wildfire risk, control insects and disease in forests, improve forest health and wildlife habitat, and create market opportunities for family forest owners. There is also a tremendous opportunity to utilize existing forest products industry infrastructure to produce renewable fuels. H.R. 6 would do little to encourage that development.

A renewable fuels producer would likely look at all these restrictions on forest biomass and decide not to bother with forestry materials. If we are to come anywhere close to meeting the RFS mandates in H.R. 6, we must have a substantial amount of forest biomass as a feedstock. I'm deeply concerned that we will not be able to meet these mandates with the restrictions in H.R. 6 on the use of forest biomass.

This energy policy, set in place by the Democrat majority, exemplifies the Democrat motto through and through: tax and spend. This bill imposes \$21 billion in tax increases. The other side will tell you that these tax increases will not affect the average hardworking American, only the “big, evil oil companies.” Nothing could be farther from the truth. The taxes contained in this bill will impede new domestic oil and gas production, will discourage investment in new refinery capacity, and will make it more expensive for domestic energy companies to operate in the U.S. than their foreign competitors, making the price at the pump rise even higher.

Let's make no mistake: an increased tax doesn't just hurt energy companies, it hurts every American—individual, farm, or company—that consumes energy. Increased taxes on energy companies are passed to consumers. Every American will see these increased costs on their energy bill. This body shouldn't pass legislation that further raises energy prices for consumers.

What is even more disturbing is that these increased costs will be felt by some of our Nation's most poor. On average, the Nation's working poor spends approximately 13 to 30 percent of their yearly income on energy costs. This average is already too high, and sadly this legislation will only dramatically increase the amount of money these workers will have to spend on energy costs. I have heard those on the other side of the aisle say that we must all shoulder the cost to produce clean energy. Well, the costs of the clean energy in the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) alone, as estimated by just one of Virginia's many electric utilities, will increase \$200 million for its retail customers. By shifting to renewable energy sources, that are not as available or as cost effective as traditional sources, we will see a rise in energy prices across the board and this will be hardest felt by working people who cannot afford to shoulder any more costs.

While this bill is said to be focused on new energy technologies, it fails to address some of our most promising domestic alternative and renewable energy supplies that could be

cost effective for American consumers. Coal is one of our Nation's most abundant resources, yet the development of coal-to-liquid technologies is ignored in this bill. Furthermore, this legislation does nothing to encourage the construction of new nuclear facilities.

Proponents of this legislation will tout how green this bill is; however, if my colleagues really want to promote green energy they should encourage the production of more nuclear sites, which provide CO₂ emission-free energy. The rest of the world is far outpacing the U.S. in its commitment to clean nuclear energy. We generate only 20 percent of our energy from this clean energy, when other countries can generate about 80 percent of their electricity needs through nuclear. It is a travesty that in over 1,000 pages this legislation does not once mention or encourage the construction of clean and reliable nuclear plants. Nuclear energy is the most reliable and advanced of any renewable energy technology, and if we are serious about encouraging CO₂-free energy use, we must support nuclear energy.

This legislation does nothing to address the energy concerns of our country; and it does nothing to relieve agricultural producers of their increasing input costs. This legislation only makes the situation worse and it is the product of a flawed process that does not have bipartisan support.

This bill is a dangerous policy for our country. If we really want to make our country energy independent, this Congress must pass an energy bill that contains energy. This bill does not. I urge my colleagues to reject this awful bill, let's start over, and work to find real solutions to the energy needs of our Nation.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 2007

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Energy Independence and Security Act—a major step towards securing a new, clean energy policy for America.

Last November the American people told Congress that they wanted a new direction in our Nation's energy policy. Today we have the opportunity to vote for a bill that the overwhelming majority of our constituents agree is the most significant Federal energy legislation in nearly 30 years—a bill that helps our country deal with the current energy crisis, prepare for the energy realities of the future, and address the impending climate crisis.

The Energy Independence and Security Act contains an increase in fuel economy standards for cars and trucks. Raising CAFE standards will also reduce America's dependence on foreign oil by 1.1 million gallons per day, cut emissions almost 27 million tons per year, and save Minnesota families up to \$1000 every year.

The Energy Independence and Security Act sets landmark energy efficiency standards for appliances, lighting, and buildings. As a result, American consumers and companies will save billions of dollars in unnecessary energy costs, while decreasing their burden on the planet.

And the Energy Independence and Security Act makes a commitment to the fuels of the future, by replacing Middle East crude with Midwest crops.

By supporting this legislation we can make the first big step towards a more secure and more environmentally sustainable America. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation, and to continue working to overcome the obstructionism of the President for additional, needed reforms for our country and our planet.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 1173, during consideration of H. Con. Res. 254, recognizing and celebrating the centennial of Oklahoma statehood I incorrectly voted “nay”, when I intended to vote “Yea”.

SCAPPOOSE-VERNONIA SCHOOL

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 2007

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, in early December, the Pacific Northwest coast experienced severe storms. The storms caused devastating damage that isolated towns, left citizens without housing, transportation, communications, water, heat or electricity, and tragically caused loss of life. One city in my district, Vernonia, was particularly hard hit. The elementary, middle and high school were all severely damaged. Because of the damage, Vernonia students in grades 6–12 are now going to school in the nearby community of Scappoose. Although the storm recovery continues, and will continue for some time, I wanted to share with my colleagues the following communication from Scappoose High School Principal Sue Hays reporting on the first day of Scappoose-Vernonia school. Her message is one of communities coming together, neighbors and families helping each other. Simply put, Oregonians at their best.

I will continue to do all I can to assist Oregon communities and families recover from the storms, but I wanted my colleagues in the House to know that the compassionate, proud, and hardy Oregon spirit shines on. Here is Principal Hays' message:

“Dear Scappoose Families,

I wanted to let you know how our first day of Scappoose-Vernonia School was. It was a great day, a very emotional day as the Vernonia students arrived in seven buses. Their teachers greeted them at the cafeteria doors with open arms. Every comment from the Vernonia staff to students was so heart felt. Questions about how is your family? How is your house? Are you ok? And . . . “we are so glad you are here . . . we have missed you” was repeated with each child. Many hugs took place as if these students had not seen each other for a lifetime! It was a very emotional moment for some of us.

We managed to feed all 300 students that showed up in record time, and then the