

FISCAL YEAR 2008 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2007

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous session:			
Revenues .....	n.a.	n.a.	2,050,796
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	1,450,532	1,390,018	n.a.
Appropriation legislation .....	0	419,862	n.a.
Offsetting receipts .....	-575,635	-575,635	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous session .....	874,897	1,234,245	2,050,796
Enacted this session:			
U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28) <sup>1</sup> .....	1	42	-335
An act to extend the authorities of the Andean Trade Preference Act until February 29, 2008 (P.L. 110-42) .....	0	0	-41
A bill to provide for the extension of Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA) and the Abstinence Education Program through the end of fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes (P.L. 110-48) .....	96	99	0
A joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes (P.L. 110-52) .....	0	0	-2
Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-53) .....	0	-425	0
Total, enacted this session .....	97	-284	-378
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs .....	547,255	532,903	0
Total Current Level 1,2 .....	1,422,249	1,766,864	2,050,418
Total Budget Resolution 3 .....	2,496,125	2,469,736	2,015,841
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements 4 .....	-606	-49,990	n.a.
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(d)(1)(E) 5 .....	-145,162	-65,754	n.a.
Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	2,350,357	2,353,992	2,015,841
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	34,577
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	928,108	587,128	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2008-2012:			
House Current Level .....	n.a.	n.a.	11,313,523
House Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	11,137,671
Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	11,137,671
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	175,852
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Note.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

1. Pursuant to section 204(b) of S. Con. Res. 21 the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2008, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28) .....	605	48,639	n.a.

2. Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

3. Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in S. Con. Res. 21, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Resolution Levels .....	2,496,028	2,469,636	2,015,858
Revisions:			
To reflect the difference between the assumed and actual nonemergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2007 (section 207(f)) .....	1	1	-17
For extension of the Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA) program (section 320(c)) .....	96	99	0
Revised Resolution Levels .....	2,496,125	2,469,736	2,015,841

4. S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$606 million in budget authority and \$49,990 million in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110-28 (see footnote 1 above), budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.

5. Section 207(d)(1)(E) of S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$145,162 million in budget authority and \$65,754 million in outlays for overseas deployment and related activities. Pending action by the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on the Budget has directed that these amounts be excluded from the budget resolution aggregates in the current level report.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

REAUTHORIZATION OF NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, with all the various important issues that we have been debating on the floor, we should remember one very important issue dealing with education of our children that will be considered here in the House very soon, and, most specifically, that deals with the reauthorization of NCLB, No Child Left Behind.

So I come to the floor tonight to address some of the concerns and problems with NCLB and offer a possible solution. That solution, by the way, is the legislation I have submitted, H.R. 3177, the LEARN Act, the Local Education Authority Returns Now, allowing States and parents and local communities to regain control of their edu-

cation and not have it be here in Washington, DC.

As we're all aware, NCLB is really simply a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act, that's ESEA, from the 1960s. What I've done is I've looked back over the past reauthorizations of ESEA, and I've noticed a very troubling trend. With every single reauthorization, new problems are always found for America's schools, and with every new problem, the solution is always more Federal involvement.

You know, all the way back in 1983, almost a quarter of a century ago, a famous report came out. It was called, "A Nation at Risk," and it said that America had fallen dangerously behind the rest of the world in education; but, today, new studies are saying much the same thing.

According to the National Center for Education Science, in 2003 U.S. fourth graders were outperformed by their peers in eleven other countries, includ-

ing four Asian countries and seven European countries. U.S. eighth graders were outperformed by their peers in nine countries, including five Asian and four European.

Yet, today, as a percentage of GDP after NCLB, we are still spending more money on education now than at any time in U.S. history. We have increased the paperwork, the requirements for the teachers, more taxpayer dollars, increased administration's burden; but we've decreased the flexibility for the teachers and the power in the classroom.

So let me just present two charts, and I would like to thank the work of Dr. Anthony Davies of the Donahue Graduate School of Business of Duquesne University, to make this point. If we look at this chart, the chart shows noninstructional spending and instructional spending in our schools. The top is eighth graders. The bottom is fourth graders.

The first chart is noninstructional spending. That is the spending that we use for the buildings, the transportation and the like. You would think that with all these reforms that we have done, that with the increase in spending, you would see an increase in performance. Well, what does the chart actually show? Well, the top chart, again, is eighth graders, and what it's showing is, as you see at the left-hand side of the chart, \$3,000 per pupil; on the far side of the chart, \$6,500 per pupil. But the performance of the students stays basically the same, regardless of how the dollars coming from Washington are spent.

The next color, the red dots, are fourth graders, exactly the same thing. Regardless of whether we're spending around \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000 or \$6,000, the instructional value of those dollars coming out of these programs, the numbers stay essentially the same.

The next chart you look at confirms the same point. This is instructional spending. These are the dollars that actually make their way into the classroom. This is for the books. This is for the teachers. This is what you really think of when you think of education. Same thing: top is eighth graders, bottom is fourth graders. It starts at \$2,500 and goes up to \$7,500. You would think that with these reforms of NCLB, you would think that with additional dollars going into the classrooms you would see an increase actually in the performance for these grades. But what do we actually see on the chart?

Well, for the top, the eighth graders, starting at \$2,500, up to \$5,000, up to \$7,500, the numbers for them for the performance on these scores, under the NAEP score standards, and that's the national standards of assessments for kids, the numbers are even right across the chart. Likewise, on the bottom part of this chart, that's the fourth graders, the red little squares. Again, we're looking in the same dollar values, \$2,500 up to \$7,500, middle it's around \$5,000. How do we look at the NAEP scores? How do they change? Basically, not at all. It's in a range here of between 420 and 480 for all those students regardless of the spending of the dollars.

So the point of these two charts, and, again, I appreciate the work of Anthony Davies for compiling this information, is to show that throughout history the Federal Government looks to say that there's a problem with Americans' education. We say we're going to be the solution for our children in this country, and the solution is going to be what? Well, last time it was NCLB, No Child Left Behind, and now it's going to potentially be a reauthorization of that. I suggest no.

And I would conclude by saying that the solution is not more work on the Federal level, but more control by the parent and the local school board for the raising of their own children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### THE ENERGY FUTURE OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that's not talked about enough in Washington, and on a warm sunny afternoon, where it's not real hot, it's not cold, not a lot of energy's being used. Not a lot of Americans are talking about energy, but it should be on the minds of Americans.

I was disappointed last night as we listened collectively to the Presidential debate. Now, the candidates don't get to talk about what they want to talk about unless they squeeze it in on the side. They get to answer the questions; and last night, not one question was asked about the energy future of America.

We've been a very successful Nation. We've been the leader of the world because we have had cheap, affordable energy. That has all changed. We now have expensive energy, and we have short supplies on every hand.

When I talk to the biggest employers in America, when I talk to the people that I know understand this country and the manufacture of goods and the process of goods and trade around the world, I say, should energy be a top issue? And they said, it is for us. To remain an employer in America, energy is our number one challenge.

Just to give you an example, Dow Chemical, the largest chemical company in the world, located in America, thousands of good jobs in America, their costs of energy went from \$8 billion on natural gas alone in 5 years to \$22 billion. That's almost tripling the costs of their major use of energy, natural gas.

Now, we have some energy bills moving, and we would hope that they would increase supply because when you increase supply, you decrease prices. A lot of us have struggled to understand the energy markets, but this is how I understand it in basic terms. They are not set by energy companies. They're set by Wall Street traders who look at availability of that form of energy, and they run the price up or down by the hour.

In the last few days, oil prices have been rising a dollar-something per day, and I checked about 1 o'clock and oil was approaching \$77 a barrel, almost the highest price ever, and had been increasing hourly all week. So the price of energy is not set by the sellers of energy. It's set by the Wall Street traders on their view of the availability and the affordability.

Now, the bills before us, we'll look at them a little bit, I find somewhat disappointing. They cut off production from the Roan Plateau, a huge clean natural gas field in Colorado that was set aside as the Naval Oil Shale Reserve in 1976 because of its energy-rich resources. This means that nine trillion feet of natural gas, more than all the natural gas in the OCS bill that was passed last year, will be put off limits.

The Roan Plateau had already gone through all the NEPA studies. Now, those are yearlong studies that say whether it's environmentally appropriate to produce it. They passed that test.

This provision was not in the original Resources Committee bill and had been added at the request, we think, of leadership because it wasn't in the original bill. This bill will make it harder to produce energy from Alaska's natural petroleum reserve which was set aside in 1923 to help America meet our energy needs in the long term. Additions of tens of trillions of cubic feet of natural gas and millions and millions of barrels of oil in Alaska's natural petroleum reserve which would have increased the likelihood of the construction of the gas pipeline that could bring 4 to 6 billion cubic feet of clean green natural gas from Alaska every day has not yet been built.

The bill effectively repeals language that I put in the energy bill in 2005 that took out redundant NEPAs. NEPA is a comprehensive, complicated study that you have to go through to make your environmental assessments.

Now, what was happening in the West, where a lot of our energy is, NEPA studies were being used redundantly. In other words, you have a study for your original plot. You have a study for the road. Each of these studies takes a year. You have a study for each well location. You have a study for everything you were going to do. And so I had people who said they had leased land 6 and 7 years prior and still hadn't been able to drill a hole in the ground and produce the energy for America.

So we did a simple amendment that said you do a NEPA, you do it on all of those things collectively and you go ahead and proceed. Well, the bill we have moving now takes away those redundant NEPAs and allows them to go back to multiple NEPAs. The provision alone adds red tape that will stop 18 percent of the future on-shore natural gas production and oil and hurt those least able to pay their energy bill.

The bill doubles the time it takes to get government approval for offshore