

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party of this country is dedicated to coming to Washington, DC, and serving the people who believe that America's greatest days lie in our future. But there is also incumbent within that promise the opportunity to present new and better ideas that will help this country to deal with the things that lay ahead of us.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS from Texas offered an amendment that would have doubled the tax credit for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease from 50 cents a gallon to \$1 a gallon. This comes as a result of Mr. BURGESS' working firsthand with people within his district who are trying to solve problems of not only air pollution, but also to take things that might normally be dumped into a recycle bin that ends up going somewhere to sit in a landfill.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Congressman BURGESS deserves the respect of this House for new and better ideas that will help make sure that America is facing the problems that lie ahead of us and to make sure that we have answers for it.

I congratulate Congressman BURGESS for bringing these ideas forward, and I hope we will continue to have other Members of this body do the same.

---

#### FOXES NEEDED TO GUARD HEN-HOUSE SPEAKER

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, taxpayer funded luxury travel is not accorded to our brave men and women serving the cause of liberty. However, the new Democrat leadership believes they deserve just that.

While the previous Speaker of the House was afforded the use of a military aircraft as a security precaution following 9/11, it didn't include the amenities being sought by the current Democrat Speaker, room for 42 passengers, a crew of 16, state-of-the-art entertainment and communications and a private bedroom. Nonetheless, that which was good enough for prior leadership is apparently just not good enough for the new leadership.

Just a few months ago, Speaker PELOSI told the American people that Democrats were committed to a new direction in the way our government does business. At a cost of \$15,000 an hour it should go without saying that this is certainly a new direction, one which frankly disgusts all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, spending watchdogs should be part of the new Democrat majority's budget, and they should be watching themselves. This has been a disgrace.

---

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Cau-

cus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 139) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 139

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—

Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Gonzalez, Mrs. Davis of California.

(2) COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Ms.

Royal-Allard, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Delahunt.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

#### ADVANCED FUELS INFRASTRUCTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 133

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any

amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since this is the first time we are adopting a rule that will allow Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to vote in the Committee of the Whole, does the rule allow for a separate vote on any question once the Committee rises?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Rule XVIII contemplates automatic, immediate review in the House of certain recorded votes in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. As a point of clarification on the inquiry, so any question may be put to a separate vote once the Committee rises?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6(h) of rule XVIII, both affirmative and negative decisions of the Committee of the Whole may be reviewed in the House under circumstances in which votes cast by Delegates were decisive in Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Under what circumstances will a separate vote not be allowed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will not automatically rise for such an immediate review in the case where votes cast by Delegates were not decisive.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. When a vote is not decisive, but a question put loses, is there any opportunity for any Member, certified Member of the House, to ask for a separate vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6(h) of rule XVIII, immediate review in the House occurs automatically when recorded votes cast by Delegates were decisive, without regard to whether the question was adopted or rejected. In ordinary proceedings of the house on the ultimate report of the Committee of the Whole, the House considers only matters reported to it by the Committee of the Whole, which would not include propositions rejected in Committee. Simply put, an amendment rejected in the Committee of the Whole is not reported back to the House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. On any question put?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not if it is rejected in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 133 provides for consideration of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, under an open rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order the Committee on Science and Technology amendment in the nature of a substitute, now printed in the bill, as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be considered for amendment by section with each section considered as read.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule and the underlying bill. As this Congress is well aware, our country faces a pressing need to chart a new energy future. In the crisis of global warming, it is real, it is urgent, and it requires our immediate action.

Furthermore, there is a growing recognition that our reliance on fossil fuels and foreign sources of energy threatens our economic future and our international security.

□ 1030

We as a Nation must seize opportunities, not miss them, to be a world leader and promote our own domestic economy, to take steps similar to what Brazil has done and has successfully demonstrated with the reliance on increasing access to biofuels.

Today, the Chair of our Science and Technology Committee, the Member from Tennessee, Chairman GORDON, with the assistance of the ranking member, the Representative from Texas, Mr. HALL, are providing us with an opportunity to take a concrete step forward to increase the use and the supply of alternative renewable fuels through research and development.

These alternatives provide hope for reducing our impact on global warming

while giving a boost to our local and national economies. The particular beneficiaries of success in building capacity for biofuels will be our rural economies, Mr. Speaker.

We have a potential, if we embrace it, in facing the challenge we face with energy, to revitalize our rural economies. What this bill will do is a number of things. It will fund research to make renewable biofuels more compatible with existing infrastructure. One of the practical problems that we face in making biofuels generally available is infrastructure challenges.

Right now, the low sulfur fuels that are potentially available can do damage to the basic pumps and tanks that are in the 160,000 gas stations across this country. Ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel has just 3 percent of the sulfur in traditional diesel. But current technology does not allow for the easy testing to ensure that this standard is met.

This is the second area where the bill will help, by establishing clear national standards for testing that will allow verification about what the sulfur content is in our biofuels. New low-cost testing methods will give rise to consumer confidence and create the possibility for greater demand.

To that end, this bill will make alternative fuel compatibility information more available to the public. You know, the expansion of biofuels is going to mean additional revenue options for local farmers, like those in my State of Vermont, and a cleaner environment with less dependence on foreign oil.

As gas prices rise, we are further reminded that we are held hostage by a single source of fuel that threatens our economy, constrains our foreign policy, and does damage to our environment. The most basic level, the budgets of our seniors and our schools, our farms, and our families are strained by high energy prices.

All of the time we are exporting dollars to import energy, we are depriving our local economies of job creation potential. This legislation takes small but very specific steps that will bring us closer to a readily available source of fuel that is local and can have tremendous potential for our local economies.

We are moving in a new direction. Our first step in this Congress, the 110th Congress, last month was when we stood up to Big Oil and we rescinded tax cuts that went to an industry that had been enjoying record profits, and instead put that money into research and opportunities for alternative renewable energy sources.

Many of us come from States that have been taking steps to focus on energy independence and clean energy sources. My own State of Vermont has established a utility called Efficiency Vermont that actually makes benefits for Vermonters by finding ways to use less energy, keeping money in our pockets.

We have created a clean energy fund, something in effect that we are on a

start to do with the legislation we passed in the 6-for-06. We established appliance efficiency standards that when implemented can save Vermonters and other citizens from States that have joined us millions of dollars in energy costs.

You know, in addition to just the very practical steps this legislation is taking, having government assist in coming up with standards to measure what biofuel content is, having government help come up with research money so that we can add additives to these low sulfur, less polluting fuels, helping our small businesses, the mom and pop convenience stores that have gas pumps, and would face an expense of \$30,000 to \$200,000 to retrofit or to replace existing facilities in order to be able to dispense the new fuels that our private market is producing, this is a concrete step where government is helping on the energy front, helping small business by assisting and coming up with practical low-cost ways to make it easy to dispense this fuel and get it to the consumer.

These are steps where the government is acting as a partner with industry, a partner with our small businesses and doing some things that require the practical and efficient application of resources of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is also another element to this bill that I think is very important for the 110th Congress. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation, presented by the Science and Technology Committee. I want to quote some remarks that Chairman GORDON made at the outset. What he said, when he took the reins of that committee as the new chairman was this: "I made a promise that this would be a committee of good ideas and a committee of consensus. We are here to solve problems. In fact, the entire Congress is here to solve problems."

Mr. GORDON and his committee, with the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas, have presented to us a bill that has broad bipartisan support. Why? Because it is practical. It does something concrete. It recognizes we have an energy crisis that requires action, and it has found constructive ways to address that.

The committee allowed the process to be open for new ideas, inviting Members to present amendments. The chairman then came before the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, and asked for an open rule so as to permit Members of this body who may have amendments that will strengthen or improve this legislation to have those considered by the full Congress.

So what this bill does is two things: one, it presents us with a practical step that we can take that helps continue to move us in the right direction on energy independence, on reducing global warming, and on building our local economies.

Second, it is a model of how we can work together, the presentation of

good ideas in a bipartisan piece of legislation in an open rule where other Members are invited to present relevant and thought-out ideas that may improve this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I rise to express my appreciation to my friend from Hartland, Vermont, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I congratulate Science Committee Chairman BART GORDON and Ranking Member RALPH HALL on their efforts; and I applaud my colleague, the Rules Committee Chair, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

I extend my congratulations to my colleague, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for granting such a fair and judicious rule. I am very proud to stand here extending that congratulations to my friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, in his January 24, 2007, State of the Union address, President Bush called for the increased use of renewable and alternative motor fuels. As the 110th Congress begins, alternative fuels and advanced technology vehicles have already received a good deal of attention, especially in discussions over U.S. energy security. The rising cost of oil, the country's dependence on foreign oil, the debate over global warming, and the concern with air emissions have led to a heightened interest in developing clean and alternative energy sources and facilitating their use by the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Congress is in the forefront of this research and our effort to look for alternative energy sources.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 547 is a good bill that authorizes \$10 million for the Environmental Protection Agency to launch a research and development program aimed at making alternative fuels more compatible with the Nation's existing petroleum-based fuel infrastructure.

It also directs the EPA to develop portable, inexpensive, and accurate methods for fuel suppliers to test the sulfur content of diesel fuels. While biofuels such as ethanol are regarded as clean-burning alternatives to fossil fuels, it is clear that they can corrode or compromise pipes and storage tanks designed for petroleum products.

Now, unfortunately, retailers themselves often bear the cost of solving this problem and revitalizing the old infrastructure. This bill tasks the EPA with testing additive and other technologies to ease such problems. With new findings we will be able to mobilize the infrastructure necessary to distribute and dispense alternative fuels. With so much emphasis being placed on the development of these alternative

fuels, it is only fitting that we develop the infrastructure that is necessary for us to handle those new alternative sources of energy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very important to point out that in the 109th Congress legislation that is virtually identical to this, H.R. 547, was introduced to help facilitate the marketing of alternative fuels to consumers. In fact, the provisions of H.R. 547 are, as I said, virtually identical to section 15 of H.R. 6203, which was introduced last year.

Now, H.R. 6203, the Alternative Research and Energy Research and Development Act, was sponsored by our colleague from Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that that legislation which is virtually identical to this was passed under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. It was passed unanimously.

Democrats and Republicans in the last Congress came together on the 29th of September, clearly a time where there was a lot of division, and yet we came together on this very important piece of legislation designed to help us find ways in which we can deal with the infrastructure challenges of putting new alternative sources of energy into the hands of consumers in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I applaud this open rule. I commend Chairwoman SLAUGHTER for her first attempt at beginning to open up this legislative process to all Members. Frankly, I was wondering exactly when it would happen. However, I feel it is necessary to point out, as I have said before, that this almost exact same bill did pass under what is known as suspension of the rules. I know that that is an inside baseball, an inside baseball issue here, Mr. Speaker.

Suspension of the rules means that there is little or no controversy to an issue. It is required to have a two-thirds supermajority vote with 20 minutes of debate on each side. So that is the way this legislation passed the last time. I mean, I think it is very safe to say that consideration of this measure, H.R. 547, could have been very appropriately provided for under suspension of the rules, or even as was requested by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Mr. HALL. In his discussion with Chairman GORDON, the discussion was, why do we not bring this under unanimous consent?

I made the same proposal yesterday in the Rules Committee. I understand that the new majority does in fact want to have an opportunity to point out that we are going to be considering an issue under an open rule. I commend them for that. I am just saying that it is very, very easy to bring a non-controversial issue that will likely have unanimous support at the end of the day under an open rule.

Now, while I think that the research and development of clean alternative energy sources is highly critical to our Nation, I hope that in the future, in the

future that we can save productive, yet noncontroversial, bills for consideration under the provision known as suspension of the rules, or under unanimous consent agreements which we easily could have propounded.

I hope that we can grant open rules. I hope that we can grant open rules to pieces of legislation that are very crucial and frankly where there is disagreement, where we can see what James Madison envisioned as that clash of ideas, because that is really when the open amendment process is very, very worthwhile and we can engage in extensive and vigorous debate. I know we are going to have amendments that are going to be considered on the floor today.

□ 1045

I suspect that most of them will be passed, and I suspect that there will be bipartisan passage of those amendments. And so when I am talking about the future and open rules, I hope that when we do deal with that Madisonian clash of ideas, we are able to do it under an open amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the Rules Committee there were seven amendments that were offered by Members, which did require protection, point-of-order protection, which, as we all know, is something that the Rules Committee can do. One amendment would have doubled the tax credit for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease. Now this is an issue that came forward by Dr. MIKE BURGESS from Texas, and I know my colleague on the Rules Committee from Dallas, Mr. SESSIONS, is going to be talking about this amendment.

This is a very, very creative way which will help us address this issue of alternative sources, and it is being done privately. And the notion of providing a tax incentive to deal with the utilization of restaurant grease for biodiesel is, as I said, a very, very interesting and innovative concept, and we could have allowed it to be considered during the debate here on the floor. But to my disappointment, these amendments were not made in order.

As I said, the Rules Committee does have the power to do this. And I would say that as we look at this new-found openness and opportunity for debate, I hope very much that when we have creative amendments like this that could be considered, the Rules Committee would do what the Rules Committee often has done in the past, and can do, and that is waive points of order so that a creative idea like this can come forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am overjoyed to be here in strong support of this open rule. And as I said, I look forward to many, many more open rules as we deal with controversial questions that the American people want us to address in the future. The Democrats pledged regular order and a transparent and fair legislative process, and I am very glad, I am very happy and

very grateful to see it beginning at this point.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, just before I yield to the next speaker on our side, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for his support for this open rule. As he knows, and I think the Members of this body know, the Chair of the Rules Committee, the Member from New York, is completely committed to fair debate.

And also, what we have seen is that there has been vigorous debate on the legislation that has already come before this body, resulting in votes of passage that included substantial support from the other party. So we have had a significant increase in the level of bipartisan support for the legislation that this body has passed.

Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL have presented to us a bill that will be considered by the body, that has broad bipartisan support. They had an open amendment process in effect in their committee.

Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and the Rules Committee, with the support of the Member from California, presenting this bill once again on an open rule process. This side is committed to fair debate, and the Rules Committee will act in ways that are consistent with that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding me time. He has quickly become an excellent contributor to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Federal energy policy has been lagging behind forward-looking States like California. It is now time for the Federal Government to lead America's transformation to a clean energy economy.

Here in Congress, we must enact smart policies that demonstrate a serious commitment to changing the way this Nation produces and consumes energy.

In the House, we took an important first step as part of the 100-hours agenda when we repealed \$14 billion in subsidies and incentives for oil companies, and redirected that money to a clean energy fund.

That legislation sent a clear and strong signal to our constituents and to industry. I can tell you that businesses, universities and research institutions in my hometown of Sacramento are enthusiastic about helping America move forward on clean energy technologies.

One of those technologies, biofuels, has tremendous potential to decrease our dependence on foreign oil, and if we are serious about incorporating alternative fuels into the economy, we need to ensure that our infrastructure is compatible with them.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 547 because it is a commonsense next step on

biofuels. Chairman GORDON's legislation will allow for research and development to ensure that alternative fuels, such as E-85, biodiesel and advanced biofuels can be handled by our gas stations and pipelines. This is a smart investment because it makes a lot more sense to modify the existing infrastructure than to rebuild it.

I hope all my colleagues will be able to support this important legislation. But this is just a first step. We know that. Congress must continue to send signals that we are serious about transitioning to a clean energy economy. That means supporting the range of technologies, including clean alternative sources of energy such as wind, solar, geothermal and biomass, as well as energy-efficient technologies for buildings and transportation.

Congress and the administration should not pick winners and losers. There will be no magic bullet. When it comes to research and development, we must hedge our bets.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the 110th Congress to move toward a clean energy economy effectively and expeditiously. This is the most important domestic priority for Congress and a generational challenge for the Nation. There is absolutely no time to waste.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 5 minutes to our very hardworking member of the Rules Committee, my friend from Dallas, Mr. SESSIONS.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate noncontroversial legislation that will help to develop markets for biofuels and ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel through research and development.

And I am very, very pleased, and I appreciate the majority's decision to suspend its policy of a closed rule without regular order. I hope that this will not prove to be a unique circumstance, and one in which we will continue to see more open rules like the one which this legislation is being considered today.

However, I also believe that we are missing an important opportunity to improve this legislation by offering an additional provision to be considered that was offered yesterday in the Rules Committee by our colleague, Dr. Michael Burgess from Texas.

Congressman BURGESS' amendment would have doubled the tax credit for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease from 50 cents a gallon to \$1 a gallon, thereby encouraging its further use and production. This incentive would encourage the marketplace to reduce petroleum use and the pollutant associated with removing this grease without removing arable land from food production.

Mr. Speaker, this technology works. This technology is something that we need to do more of. But, this amendment is not germane; it requires pro-

tection from a point of order, which is what the Rules Committee's job is all about. Unfortunately, yesterday, the Rules Committee voted it down along party lines with every Democrat on the committee voting to prevent this amendment from getting the protection that it would need to be considered by the House. Said another way, good ideas don't necessarily pass in the Rules Committee.

This amendment would allow the House to consider new and innovative ways to achieve our goal of energy independence in a responsible way. And I am disappointed that my Democrat colleagues on the committee prevented us from debating that and passing that in the bill today.

I support Congressman BURGESS through his thoughtful legislation to provide incentives for the free market to create new, responsible and leading-edge solutions to end our dependency on foreign sources of energy.

I hope, despite the setback that he will likely encounter today, that Congressman BURGESS will continue to offer his amendments in the future, and I also hope that he will continue to come up to the Rules Committee to make sure his ideas, thoughts, are well understood and communicated.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is open for business. That should mean that the best thoughts and ideas that may or may not have been considered throughout the process of going through regular order would be permissible in the Rules Committee. Good ideas should find the light of day upstairs in the Rules Committee, and it is my hope that the majority will continue to allow not only an open process, but will perhaps allow itself to engage in these ideas for the betterment of people who want us to make sure that we work not only in a bipartisan way, but solve, through creativity, the problems of this great Nation.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding me the time to speak on this open rule, and I congratulate him for managing his first rule in this body.

And I should say that after listening to the previous speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), I have a bad case of whiplash, first, because when his party was in the majority, he routinely supported closed rules and, second, because when his party was in the majority, I can't recall a time when he supported waiving germaneness rules for a Democratic amendment.

Now, having said that, I want to tell my colleagues that the gentleman from Vermont is part of an extraordinary new group of Members who are helping to change the culture in Washington. And I thank him for bringing forward this open rule. These new Members, the "majority makers," as the majority

leader likes to call them, were elected to this body because they stand for change. They stand for openness, transparency and honesty.

They spoke truth to power during the 2006 elections, Mr. Speaker, and they are here to do what is in the best interests of their constituents and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, with this open rule, the gentleman from Vermont is carrying forward the promise these new Members made to the voters.

Now, some of us who have been around here for a while and lived under the previous Republican leadership may have forgotten what an open rule looks like. I thought it was extinct, except on appropriations bills. But the rule that we are considering today is open, and that means that any germane amendment offered by any Member, Democrat or Republican, can be debated and voted on by this body. It is the way a deliberative body should act.

Now let me assure my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is not the only open rule that you will see in this Congress. This is the return of the House of Representatives as a deliberative body.

And I am also pleased to note that with this open rule we have equaled, in 1 month, the number of open rules provided by the previous Republican majority on nonappropriations bills in the 2 years of the 109th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this new majority has moved in such a fashion, and I am proud that we were able to organize this House and, at the same time, pass meaningful legislation that will affect everyday Americans across this great Nation. A higher minimum wage, stem cell research, reduction in student loan interest rates, an increase in Pell Grants, ethics reform to clean up the culture of corruption that existed in the previous Congress, these are just a few of the accomplishments of this new majority in just 1 month.

Now we are moving on to the next phase, Mr. Speaker. Most of the House committees are organized, and they are beginning to hold hearings and they are producing legislation. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Judiciary Committee recently held markups. The Ways and Means Committee and Financial Services Committee are scheduling markups as we speak. Legislation these committees produce will come to the Rules Committee, and we look forward to trying to bring that legislation to the floor in a more open and honest fashion than we experienced in the previous Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the 110th Congress is a new Congress, but it is also a different Congress, and I am pleased to be able to serve with new Members like Mr. WELCH of Vermont, who is managing this open rule; KATHY CASTOR; MIKE ARCURI; BETTY SUTTON; along with DENNIS CARDOZA, who is also new to the Rules Committee. These Members are ushering in a new era in helping

shape this new direction for the House of Representatives.

So I want to thank my friend from Vermont for the time. I congratulated him on this open rule, his first, but certainly not his last.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding me the time and for his able leadership on this rule.

□ 1100

I rise in full support of the rule on H.R. 547.

As a new Member of the House Rules Committee, I am very pleased that we were able to have an open rule so quickly in the 110th Congress. This rule will allow an open and honest debate on one of the most important issues facing our country: energy independence.

H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, addresses an extremely important, however often overlooked, component to our emerging domestic biofuels industry: pipeline and storage infrastructure.

When ethanol and other biofuel additives are mixed with traditional fuels, it can cause disruptions to the pipeline infrastructure through corrosion and contamination, even clogging. These small obstacles should not be impediments to the full development of the biofuels industry, but they are still issues that must be addressed in order to move forward.

This important legislation we are considering today would authorize funds to EPA and the Department of Energy to develop a program for alternative bio-based fuels and low-sulfur diesel fuels to be more compatible with existing infrastructure used to store and deliver petroleum-based fuels to the point of final sale.

In California's San Joaquin Valley, we are watching the development and progression of our domestic biofuel industry with a particularly close eye. We have some of the most fertile agricultural land in the country. My district alone grows over 200 different kinds of crops, contributing over \$5 billion of the \$30 billion agriculture industry of our State.

But as we are blessed with our soil, we are similarly blessed and cursed by our geography. The steep mountains on both sides of the valley create a trap for air which in turn creates some of the worst air quality problems in the entire Nation. We are currently in a severe ozone non-attainment area and quickly moving towards an extreme level for both ozone and particulate matter. Limited emissions from ethanol blends and other biofuels have the potential to contribute to our increasingly dangerous air quality levels.

My colleague Ms. ANNA ESHOO and I will be offering an amendment during

general debate on H.R. 547 to expand the current areas of research covered under this legislation to include strategies to minimize potential impacts of volatile emissions from biofuels. Our amendment exemplifies the importance of this open rule. Neither Ms. ESHOO nor I sit on the Science Committee; however, through this open rule, we are able to weigh in on important legislation on behalf of our constituents.

While I realize that the bill may have passed by unanimous consent last year, clearly numerous Members are interested in offering amendments, and I am pleased that our leadership has provided this opportunity to Members on both sides of the aisle.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this open rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I congratulate my colleague Mr. CARDOZA on his very thoughtful statement and want to say that I am very pleased that he and my other California colleague, Ms. ESHOO, are looking forward, through this open amendment process, to offering their proposal. He stated very correctly that neither of them serve as members of the Science Committee, but by virtue of having an open amendment process, they will have an opportunity to participate. So I join him in stating that I hope very much that as we look at issues where we see great controversy in the future that we will be able to have Members participate in a way that Members will be able to participate today on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and friend from Vermont for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would just like to respond to something that my colleague from Texas said just a few moments ago with respect to good ideas in the Rules Committee. I happen to agree with him. I think that the proposal was a very good idea, and it is something that certainly I would think very strongly about supporting. However, I voted against it because I felt that there were questions of both germanderness and also I felt that by not going through the committee process, it would somehow make it less likely that that bill would pass, and that was the reason that I voted against it. It had absolutely nothing to do with a partisan issue, but more because I feel it is a good idea and it would stand a better chance of passage by working through the committee process. So I think it is important that we point out here that the Rules Committee is, in fact, a committee that recognizes good ideas and supports good ideas; and simply because we disagree about issues does not mean we do not support good ideas on our side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of an open rule on this bill, and

I am pleased that my colleagues on the Rules Committee, including those on the other side of the aisle, voted unanimously to approve this rule. That level of support speaks volumes about the importance of bringing the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure bill to the floor of this Chamber for consideration.

During Science Committee Chairman GORDON's remarks before the Rules Committee yesterday, he pointed out an issue that requires our utmost attention if we as a Nation ever hope to truly address our Nation's addiction to oil. The issue is that cellulosic ethanol and other biofuels are highly corrosive and not compatible with the fuel distribution infrastructure currently in place to transport them in our country.

Biofuels are the wave of the future. Continued domestic production and use of biofuels will reduce air emissions, diversify our energy supply, and decrease our dependence on foreign oil. A classic trifecta, if you will.

Unfortunately, this transportation barrier imposes increased cost burdens and could slow the transition we hope to make away from fossil fuels. The Advanced Fuels Infrastructure bill takes a giant first step in the right direction to address the biofuel infrastructure problem by tasking the Environmental Protection Agency to develop additives, blendstocks, technologies, and other methods to make biofuels less corrosive.

Members of my staff joke that I am hooked on talking about cellulosic ethanol. I am more than hooked. I think I would say I am addicted. No pun intended. But the truth be known, I would rather be addicted to some type of energy that is produced domestically rather than a foreign or fossil fuel that is produced somewhere else other than in this country. And so are many of my colleagues in this Chamber. Like me, they understand the substantial benefits that biofuels like ethanol will provide for our Nation's growing energy demand.

We in Congress and our counterparts at the State level also realize the role which government has to play in developing cost-effective methods of producing these fuels. Last December my home State of New York awarded \$14.8 million to build and operate a cellulosic biomass-to-ethanol demonstration plant in Rochester, New York. A professor at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, was recently awarded a \$10 million grant to upgrade Cornell's industrial biotechnology laboratories and improve researchers' abilities to liberate sugars from woody biomass and convert them into biofuels. In addition, the Biorefinery in New York Project is about to embark upon a \$20.6 million public-private partnership to demonstrate commercial-scale cellulosic ethanol production in Lyonsdale, New York. Half of that \$20.6 million is private investment from a Texas-based energy company that will be pumped directly into the New York State economy. For too long

New York State has been exporting money out of state to meet our energy needs. Now we are importing those dollars back.

The President's fiscal year 2008 budget request includes many misdirected funding cuts; however, it does include a \$292 million grant for research and development programs to promote biofuels, most notably the wide-scale production of cellulosic ethanol. This figure is more than double the fiscal year 2006 appropriation of \$119 million. Cellulosic ethanol plants are starting to pop up all across Upstate New York and the rest of the Nation thanks to top-notch researchers.

I stand here today very proud to support this open rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And just to comment, this bill was originally introduced by the 109th Congress as H.R. 5658 and included in Congresswoman BIGGERT's comprehensive energy R&D bill, 6203, which was passed by the House under suspension of the rules. And I see no reason why this one couldn't have been handled that way. As a matter of fact, I am a cosponsor with the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee, BOB INGLIS, and with the chairman of the full committee, Chairman GORDON, and Mr. LAMPSON. Actually, at leadership's suggestion and working together with our leadership over here, I sent a letter to Chairman GORDON requesting that he bring this up on the floor under unanimous consent agreement. It could have easily been done and bypassed the Rules Committee.

It is easy to bring an open rule up when there is not any opposition to it. I hope they will follow this pattern for the rest of this session.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill and cellulosic ethanol is great from a global warming perspective because it simply recirculates carbon through the atmosphere. It doesn't add any additional carbon. It is simply that the plant takes it out of the atmosphere. They crush the plant, burn the fuel. It is a cycle. It doesn't add any net increase.

But I want to make sure Members understand this bill is just a beginning of what we need to do. Brazil is totally energy independent today because they have gone to an E-85 system. They burn fuel that is 85 percent ethanol. But I talked to the person in Brazil that made this happen, and he told me one clear lesson. If you don't do something to compel the oil and gas dis-

tribution system to put in E-85 pumps, they don't do it. Now, they in Brazil had to adopt some policies to compel the installation of these E-85 pumps because there is a competitive reason. The oil and gas industry doesn't want to put in these pumps to compete with their oil and gas. So this is a start to demonstrate why the use of cellulosic ethanol is very allowable in Brazil. They pump this stuff all over the country all the time. But we are going to need to take another step to get those E-85 pumps built to fuel our flex-fuel cars. This is a first step. There is more to come.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am just going to close the debate on this spectacular open rule myself; so I reserve the balance of my time at this juncture.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Advanced Fuel Infrastructure Research and Development Act, and I also thank my colleague from Vermont for his leadership on this open rule.

I have dedicated my entire career to developing new sources of energy, and I am pleased that we are making it easier to incorporate biofuels into our everyday lives. Current practices have taken us where we are today, but we need to expand our options to fight clean fuels and viable alternatives to conventional fuels. Diversification of our energy supply is the only way to rein in our country's increasing need to import oil from foreign countries.

The bill we are voting on today is a good step toward making biofuels, such as E-85 ethanol and biodiesel, easier and less expensive to access and use. This is a very good first step toward energy diversification, but we are on a long haul to sustainability.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from California if he is ready to close. I am the only remaining speaker on my side and will reserve my time until the gentleman is finished.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that my new friend from Hartland is prepared to close debate, I will do the same on our side.

I do so to simply say that I do rise in strong support of this open amendment process. I congratulate Mr. GORDON, I congratulate Mr. HALL, and the other Democrats and Republicans who have come together to do what we did in the last Congress, to pass this very important legislation which is designed to allow us to focus on the infrastructure challenges that we as a Nation will have to deal with as we pursue ethanol, biodiesel, all of the multifarious forms

that are alternative ways of our dealing with the energy needs of this country.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the Los Angeles Basin, part of it, along with other great colleagues of mine on both sides of the aisle. We have very serious environmental challenges there; air quality problems are very great, and doing what we can to encourage these alternative sources has been a priority for my Governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger, and for Republicans and Democrats alike.

One of the things that we like to argue is that Republicans and Democrats and Independents, everyone likes to breathe clean air. Everyone wants to have an opportunity to deal with the challenges that are out there, whether it is global warming or just the overall concern about environmental quality. It is very, very important for us to do that.

I believe that this is legislation that is going to pass, probably unanimously. I can't imagine anyone voting against it. I know that there are some thoughtful amendments that will come forward on this.

But I do want to also say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a new day. It a new day because we have seen a change, a change from what we have seen in the first several weeks of this Congress.

Now, I know that a number of people talked about the fact that we have had a vigorous discussion and debate over the issues that my friend from Massachusetts mentioned, the issues of college loans, stem cell research, the minimum wage increase. But we know that those are issues that enjoy broad bipartisan support among the American people. I was proud to have supported the stem cell research legislation, identical to what I voted for in the last Congress. There would have been no reason for me to oppose it.

But, frankly, I will say that as I looked at the other issues that were included in that 6 for '06 package, Mr. Speaker, I opposed them because they didn't allow for the kind of opportunity to improve the legislation that we are going to see today.

Now, again, it is hardly necessary, because this could have been done under suspension of the rules; and my challenge to my very distinguished colleagues is, as Mr. HALL said so eloquently, we don't need to simply have an open rule for the sake of an open rule on an issue that everyone agrees over. There is complete agreement on this issue. What we need to have is an open and vigorous debate when we have disagreement and, again, a clash of ideas, as James Madison envisaged it when he talked about the establishment of this great institution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I praise my colleagues for putting together this effort. I congratulate once again my colleague from New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, the

distinguished new Chair, the first woman to chair the Rules Committee. I congratulate Mr. McGOVERN, who so ably is carrying on his responsibility in the new majority on the Rules Committee. I look forward to working with my colleagues as we pursue our goals of making sure that we do the best thing for the American people, and that is to come together to address the very crucial public policy questions that confront us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his kind remarks about the Chair of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER. I also thank him, as we all do, for his support on both the open rule and the merits of this legislation.

The bottom line here is, we are all in it together. We know that we have major problems to solve. One of them is global warming and one is energy independence. This legislation is a practical step that was brought to us by the cooperation of both sides of the aisle on the Science and Technology Committee.

The Rules Committee is presenting an open rule. There will be more to come. Its commitment is to fair debate, and it is going to have to balance the responsibility of making decisions about how best to allow this body to debate clearly and directly the major issues that come before this Congress.

We can make progress by working together. It is our goal to continue to do so. That requires that the committees be given an opportunity to do their work. Amendments are going to be brought up in committees and recommended or rejected. That was done in this case. It is going to be the commitment of the Rules Committee to make the debate on all legislation that comes before this body as fair as it possibly can be.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important step. We have to give the American people some confidence that we can take concrete steps to move ahead, and that is legislation, day by day, week by week, month by month, year by year, where we are moving in the right direction.

What we have done on energy in less than a month is move away from an excessive and damaging reliance on fossil fuels by passing two pieces of legislation, if this passes, that move us in a new direction. That is the right thing for this country; it is the right thing for Republicans and Democrats to work together to achieve.

I urge a "yes" vote on this rule and on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 133 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 547.

□ 1123

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection, with Mr. McNULTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, energy is on everyone's mind these days. The price of fuel has been rising and awareness of the extent to which we are dependent upon foreign sources of oil has grown. At the same time, in an effort to reduce emissions of air pollution, we are also transitioning to cleaner fuels.

The good news is that we have developed and are continuing to develop alternative fuels and cleaner-burning versions of our current petroleum-based fuels. But we must ensure the availability of infrastructure and equipment for transporting, distributing and utilizing these new fuels at a reasonable cost.

For a number of reasons, biofuels such as ethanol and biodiesel are often incompatible with many components of the present-day infrastructure, forcing distributors and retailers to make heavy investments in new hardware if they want to carry these fuels. H.R. 547 initiates a program to research ways to mitigate many of these problems and make bio-based fuels more compatible with the country's petroleum-based infrastructure, thus avoiding the massive costs to the country of a whole new infrastructure.

The bill also initiates a program to develop less-expensive, easier-to-use testing methods and equipment for verifying the sulfur level of clean diesel fuels. Since infrastructure is used for various fuel products with sulfur content, ranging from 15 to 5,000 parts per million, there is a concern that distributors and retailers may sell fuel with sulfur beyond 15 parts per million limits of ULSD, ultra-low sulfur diesel. This simply gives retailers and distributors a way to ensure the quality and regulatory compliance of the fuels they sell.

To ensure consistent specifications throughout the fuels market, H.R. 547

instructs NIST to begin developing standards for biofuels as they would for conventional, petroleum-based fuels. There is also an authorization of \$10 million to carry out all programs within this bill.

Mr. GORDON secured numerous endorsements and support for this bill from groups as diverse as convenience store and truck-stop owners, petroleum marketers and retailers, the Renewable Fuels Association, API and the NRDC. Given the relatively small cost, the very specific concerns it addresses and the carefully negotiated language and endorsements, it would be a shame to make this bill something it is not by amending it with provisions that are outside the scope or purpose of this bill. I ask my colleagues to please consider this as they bring amendments forward.

H.R. 547 is a good idea, turned into a good, bipartisan piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill without making major substantive changes or additions.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, of course, in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. It is a good noncontroversial bill that was passed unanimously by the Republican-led Congress last session as part of a larger energy efficiency research and development bill. I am pleased that Chairman GORDON has indicated that we will be addressing other provisions of that bill in the coming weeks and months ahead.

Subcommittee Chairman LAMPSON has already described what this bill does, so I don't really need to go into that again. But I feel it is important to point out that this bill not only addresses our energy independence issues, but it also addresses clean energy issues by working to mitigate potential problems that can rise from transporting clean fuels, such as ethanol and ultra-low sulfur diesel. By doing this, it ensures that clean burning and alternative fuels can be a viable part of our Nation's transportation fuel mix.

Energy independence and clean coal are not just buzzwords that you hear thrown around these days. They are noble and necessary goals that we are one step closer to by the passing of this bill. This bill may be a small piece of the puzzle, but every piece is important and every piece is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time at this time, and I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I do have requests for time, if the gentleman pleases. I yield 3 minutes to Mr. WELLER, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friends

from Texas for this opportunity to speak during general debate.

I rise in support of the basic bill that is before us, H.R. 547. I voted for it last year when it passed the House unanimously, like all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and of course I stand in support of this legislation today. However, I believe we do need to make some minor improvements to the bill.

We have made a tremendous amount of progress. The energy bill of 2005 has caused hundreds of millions of dollars of new investment in biofuels production. In Illinois, in the State that I represent, we are anticipating up to 50 new ethanol and biodiesel plants, thanks to the energy bill.

When I talk to the local farmers that I represent in Illinois, they are pretty happy with \$4 prices of corn. When the energy bill was passed into law, the price of corn was about \$1.65 a bushel. So we are seeing the fact that rural America and small-town America, and rural Illinois and small-town Illinois were clearly the biggest winners in the energy bill.

But if you also care about energy independence, if you care about addressing the issue of climate change, we need to promote greater use of biofuels.

The basic bill makes progress when it comes to infrastructure, but we need to do more. You know, E-85, 85 percent blend ethanol fuels, offer part of that solution. As I drive or travel throughout the district I represent or my constituents travel throughout the district, many of them are looking to purchase E-85. They bought a flexible fuel vehicle; they want to contribute to our commitment for energy independence, they want to see investment in America rather than sending money overseas, so they want to buy E-85. And they question, why is it not available? Why do I have a hard time finding E-85 pumps at the gas stations that serve my community? And that is because there is a bureaucratic logjam in the certification process for the pumps, the infrastructure that is used for the installation of E-85.

I have an amendment which is germane to this bill that I am going to be offering. I believe it deserves bipartisanship support that I will be offering to this bill, this legislation to, of course, not only draw attention to this issue, but to help remove the logjam to the certification process.

We talk to some of the big distributors, some of the big operators, fuel stations across America; it is because of this issue that they have delayed or stalled installation of E-85. If you truly want to encourage the use of biofuels, if you believe that E-85 is part of that solution, if you believe that we need more installation of more infrastructure to distribute E-85 in America, then I ask that you support the amendment that I will be offering as we move through the processes of the bill.

Again, I support the basic bill. It is bipartisan legislation. I believe the

amendment, which I worked on with the former Speaker of the House, Speaker Hastert, as well as a bipartisan group of Members, is a good amendment that deserves bipartisan support.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct to state that the standing committees of the House are authorized under rule XX of the House rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's question should be addressed in the full House, not in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. TERRY. Are we allowed to ask parliamentary inquiries in the Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. In the discretion of the Chair, as they relate to the proceedings of the Committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct that the organization of the standing committees of the House were organized pursuant to previous enacted statutory laws?

The CHAIRMAN. Once again, that may be a proper inquiry to the House, but not to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TERRY. I understand. Then, Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct that the organization of the standing committees of the House were organized pursuant to previous enacted statutory laws?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state that inquiry to the full House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, since the House is sitting as the Committee of the Whole, are the Delegates and Resident Commissioner permitted to vote on all matters in the Committee of the Whole House?

The CHAIRMAN. Under clause 3(a) of rule III, the Delegates and Resident Commissioner possess the same powers and privileges as Members in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. So I am correct in understanding that there are only some instances, namely the case

of an adoption of an amendment, where a Member may request a revote in the full House. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that the special order under which it is proceeding (H. Res. 133) provides that any Member may request a separate vote in the House on amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the Science Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the Chair's indulgence, because this is the first time for a number of questions, and I appreciate the opportunity. If there is any question or if the amendment is defeated, is there any opportunity for a duly elected Member to request a revote in the full House?

The CHAIRMAN. Only on amendments that are adopted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute or on that substitute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It is my understanding that under the rules the House has adopted, that on any matter in which the votes of the Delegates are decisive in the vote taken in the Committee of the Whole, that those votes shall be retaken in the full House and that the Delegates and Resident Commissioner shall not be permitted to vote in the full House. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. On recorded votes, yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. How is the Chair going to determine if the votes of the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner are decisive?

The CHAIRMAN. The test for determining whether the votes of the Delegates and Resident Commissioner are decisive under 6(h) of rule XVIII is a "but for" test, that is, would the outcome have been different had the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner not voted. The absence of some Members is irrelevant to this determination.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair. If the Chair determines that the votes of the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner are not decisive, but a Member believes that in fact they are, is it appropriate for a Member to lodge a point of order against the Chair's determination?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's decision on a question of order is not subject to an appeal if the decision is one

that falls within the discretionary authority of the Chair. The Chair's count of the number rising to demand tellers, a recorded vote, or the yeas and nays is not subject to appeal, nor is the Chair's count of a quorum.

Likewise, the Chair's count of the votes of the Delegates and Resident Commissioner is not subject to appeal.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If the Chair determines that in fact the votes of the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner are not decisive, will the Chair include those numbers when reporting the tally of the vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Given that, then it is my understanding, is it correct that the number of individuals allowed to vote in the Committee of the Whole shall be 440, and the number in the full House shall be 435?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. So the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner may not vote in the full House; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Do the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner count for the purposes of establishing and maintaining a quorum of the Committee of the Whole House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If the Delegates and Resident Commissioner are allowed to vote on everything in the Committee of the Whole and they vote on procedural issues that may in fact affect the substantive nature of a bill, and if a procedural vote is lost within a decisive margin, is there a mechanism to have a separate vote in the full House on that procedural vote?

The CHAIRMAN. Under clause 6(h), an immediate vote in the House is contemplated under those circumstances, given a recorded vote.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. On that procedural vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair. Are the Delegates and Resident Commissioner permitted to vote on the question of the Committee rising?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman. I would like to commend my new colleague from Texas, the Chairman of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. LAMPSON for his great work on this bill, and also Chairman GORDON for his leadership on alternative fuels.

We rely on fuel everyday. While the market is awakening to its ability to sell alternative fuels like E85 or biodiesel blends many of these new fuels have compatibility issues with the existing delivery systems in place in America. Fuel depots, fuel pipelines, fuel trucks and local gas stations are not truly ready to ship, store, or sell these fuels to consumers.

These fuels can cause corrosion of tanks and pipelines, clog filters, and pose danger of thermal and oxidative instability. The cost of replacing or building new infrastructure is sometimes infeasible for fuel suppliers, frequently small business owners.

H.R. 547, The Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, meets the needs of fuel shippers and suppliers so they can use alternative fuels in existing infrastructure. It directs the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to research and develop new technologies and methods such as fuel additives, blend stocks, and easier tank reconditioning methods that would allow fuel retailers, shippers, and storers to use alternative fuels in existing infrastructure, significantly reducing costs both for businesses and consumers.

The bill also directs the DOE and NIST to develop affordable, portable, quick and accurate ways to test the sulfur content at pump stations to make sure it complies with EPA regulations of 15ppm, and directs NIST to develop a physical properties data base and a set of standard reference materials for alternative fuels, which is not unlike the ones that currently exist for standard fuels.

If we are truly serious about bringing alternative fuels to consumers, we need to make sure that we can store, deliver, and retail these fuels with the same efficiency and safety as we deliver traditional fuels.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 547, and again want to recognize the leadership of Chairman LAMPSON and GORDON for bringing this important legislation through the Science and Technology Committee, and Speaker PELOSI for bringing this legislation to the floor as part of her efforts to stem global warming.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I commend the Chairman of the Science Subcommittee for bringing this legislation forward.

Last year under the Republican Majority, the House passed this same legislation as part of a more comprehensive bill offered by the gentlelady from Illinois, Mrs. Biggert. This legislation, called the "Alternative Energy Research and Development Act," died in the Senate. But it's never too late to take bipartisan action on good ideas.

Reducing America's dependence upon foreign oil is an economic and national security

imperative. Achieving this goal requires us to exercise creativity and common sense. In particular, we must find ways to expand our use of biofuels in a safe and cost-efficient manner.

H.R. 547 provides very specific mechanisms to address the challenge of integrating ethanol and biodiesel fuels into our petroleum-based transportation system. In particular, this bill directs the EPA and the NIST to mitigate the harmful effects caused by the physical and chemical incompatibility of these fuels within the current infrastructure. H.R. 547 also tackles the quality concerns associated with Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel and biofuel production.

As the Ranking member on the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee I remain committed to working with my colleagues across the aisle to reduce our nation's dependence on foreign oil. In contrast to H.R. 6, the regrettable measure the House passed a few weeks ago that increases our dependence on foreign oil, this bill constitutes a productive step forward—and I look forward to supporting other measures like it.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I am pleased we taking steps to make biofuels, like E85 ethanol, easier to access and use.

The President's State of the Union Address discussed the importance of diversifying America's energy supply, explaining that the way forward is through technological advancements. I support this approach and with Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL's Leadership, the Science and Technology Committee can have an important role in accelerating these efforts by promoting research and development funds for all alternative fuels in order to use more domestic sources of fuel and less imported oil.

Given that coal is our most economical and abundant domestic resource, with a 250-year supply, I believe clean coal technology and coal-to-liquids transportation fuels must be part of any solution to achieve greater energy independence. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on energy related issues so that we clearly understand the benefits of clean coal technology and I thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for their commitment to examine all alternative fuels, including clean coal technology.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 547

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act".*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

*The Congress finds that—*

*(1) in order to lessen United States dependence on foreign sources of petroleum, and decrease demand for petroleum in the transportation sector, the Nation must diversify its fuel supply to include domestically produced biofuels;*

*(2) while ethanol has been successful in the market place as a fuel additive, newer biofuels may present unique challenges that may render the fuels incompatible with the current fuel transportation and delivery infrastructure, placing the burden of costly refurbishment and construction on fuel distributors and retailers;*

*(3) chemical additives to the fuels may mitigate the negative impacts of some biofuels on existing infrastructure and preclude costly retrofitting or installation of new biofuel compatible infrastructure and transportation systems;*

*(4) in order to mitigate air pollution and comply with Federal mandates, Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel was introduced into the marketplace in 2006;*

*(5) fuel labeled Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel may accumulate more than the statutory limit of 15 parts per million of sulfur when transported through multiple pipelines, tanks, and trucks to the final point of sale; and*

*(6) fuel distributors and retailers may inadvertently take delivery of fuel labeled Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel with more than 15 parts per million of sulfur without a practical means of verifying sulfur content.*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

**SEC. 3. BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ADDITIVES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

*The Assistant Administrator of the Office of Research and Development of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this Act referred to as the "Assistant Administrator"), in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall carry out a program of research and development of materials to be added to biofuels to make them more compatible with existing infrastructure used to store and deliver petroleum-based fuels to the point of final sale. The program shall address—*

*(1) materials to prevent or mitigate—*

*(A) corrosion of metal, plastic, rubber, cork, fiberglass, glues, or any other material used in pipes and storage tanks;*

*(B) dissolving of storage tank sediments;*

*(C) clogging of filters;*

*(D) contamination from water or other adulterants or pollutants;*

*(E) poor flow properties related to low temperatures;*

*(F) oxidative and thermal instability in long-term storage and use;*

*(G) microbial contamination; and*

*(H) problems associated with electrical conductivity;*

*(2) alternatives to conventional methods for refurbishment and cleaning of gasoline and diesel tanks, including tank lining applications; and*

*(3) other problems as identified by the Assistant Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BURGESS:

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions; and

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which was preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency Biofuels Research and Development Program, which was authorized in the underlying bill, will be cognizant of the potential clean air issues arising from additives to biofuels. Specifically, those issues arising from volatile emissions which occur during the fueling process and nitrogen oxide emissions which occur during combustion.

In my home State of Texas, and particularly within my district in north Texas, there has been some debate about the nitrous oxide emissions from biodiesel. It is my hope that the new data from the Environmental Protection Agency will put this debate to rest and allow biodiesel production to move forward unimpeded. But the debate raises an interesting question. As we look to increase the use of alternative fuels and the accompanying infrastructure, how do we make certain, how can we be sure that we do not hurt our efforts, that we do not roll back our efforts to clean our air?

I understand that there are some additives that may already exist for alternative fuels. In fact, I know of one approved for use in Texas for the low emission diesel that has proven to be safe and effective at reducing the nitrous oxide emissions in ultra-low sulfur diesel. It has also been shown to cut the nitrous oxide emissions in biodiesel and to eliminate the NO<sub>x</sub> bump that some researchers have shown for biodiesel. But we must examine this issue as we move forward to other alternative fuels and additives.

This amendment will ensure that we prevent any emissions problems associated with the new additives early, at the research and development stages, before any additives may get to market.

I think the underlying bill is a good bill, and I thank my friend from Texas for introducing it. I look forward to supporting it again this year. But I think this amendment can improve the bill to ensure that we address any clean air problems, address them at the beginning before they start.

Mr. Chairman, I was to be joined in this debate by the gentleman from New Jersey. Let me just state a couple of his points in the absence of his being here, and I will submit his statement for the RECORD.

He is concerned that in his own State of New Jersey we undergo a constant struggle of clean air issues. This

amendment will go far to ensure that any new fuels that are added to our market to decrease our dependence on foreign oil do not have an adverse impact on the quality of air that our citizens are now breathing.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO TO THE  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. ESHOO to the amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted on page 4 after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) strategies to minimize emissions from infrastructure; and

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, first, I strongly support the use of biofuels to diversify our fuel supply and to reduce our dependence on imported oil.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Chairman, do we have copies of the amendment?

Ms. ESHOO. It is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Chairman.

□ 1145

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I think what is important to understand in this debate is that there are significant technical obstacles that have to be addressed before biofuels can be widely deployed.

Many Members this morning during this important debate have spoken about the importance of biofuels. This amendment to the amendment actually kind of drills down, as it were, into the specifics and I think strengthens a very good bill.

The bill before us recognizes the specific infrastructure challenges that we are already facing in implementing the Renewable Fuels Standards program which was enacted in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. It anticipates the challenge of the more widespread use of biofuels, which I think most of us are for, by authorizing the EPA to initiate a research and development project to make biofuels more compatible with the existing petroleum storage and distribution system. If there is not distribution in this system, it simply is not going to work.

Now, the reason I am offering this perfecting amendment to Mr. BURGESS' amendment, along with my colleague Mr. CARDOZA, simply requires the EPA, as part of this R&D program, to consider strategies to minimize emissions. I want to repeat this, because these are the two operative words, to minimize emissions that may be released when biofuels are blended, stored, and transported.

We all understand that pollutants contained in gasoline and other motor

fuels are released into the atmosphere as a result of combustion, and I think Mr. BURGESS speaks to this, but his amendment is more about combustion. This is about emissions also occurring as the result of evaporation while fuel is held in storage tanks or transferred on and off tanker trucks.

In the case of gasoline containing ethanol, evaporative emissions of certain substances, specifically VOCs, can be greater than they would be from conventional gasoline. In certain regions trying to comply with the Clean Air Act, and I think Mr. BURGESS, certainly Mr. CARDOZA and others are driven by understanding that where they have ground-level ozone, these emissions could be problematic, in fact, increased.

A September 2005 report by the Bureau of Air Management for the State of Wisconsin estimated that evaporative emissions of VOCs of gasoline containing 10 percent ethanol, E-10, held in the fuel distribution system will be 15 percent higher than conventional gas.

In my view, it makes important sense for EPA to not only examine strategies that will reduce these emissions as part of this R&D program, but that it instructs them to do that.

I want to thank Chairman GORDON for his support of this effort, and I would like to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) who is also a part of this amendment.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California, and while I support my colleague from Texas' effort to address emissions concerns, I cannot support his amendment.

Mr. BURGESS' amendment simply directs the EPA and the Department of Energy to study the effect of increased emissions from biofuels. We need to do more than study this problem; and, in fact, both the California Air Resources Board and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources have studies which show increased rates of VOC emissions from ethanol-blended fuels and fuel tanks and pipelines.

We must develop strategies to minimize these emissions from biofuels now so that we can accelerate the use of biofuels nationwide in the future.

The Eshoo-Cardoza amendment does exactly what needs to be done in law to make that possible.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his reservation?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, it appears the secondary amendment is germane, and I will withdraw the reservation; but I do oppose the amendment and ask for a vote on a clean amendment on my submission.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes on the Eshoo amendment.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I will be supportive of the Eshoo amendment if it is offered as a stand-alone amendment, but I do oppose it being offered as a secondary amendment.

I do ask for a consideration of my amendment as a clean amendment. It is stronger. It is more expansive because obviously it addresses the mobile sources, as well as the static sources, that may be a source of emissions.

While Mr. CARDOZA is correct in the issuance of a study, this is a research and development bill; and as such, it is appropriate to study the effects of the emissions of biodiesel and add that concept to the substance of the underlying bill.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I thank everyone for their interest in this particular matter regarding the subject of alternative fuels generally, but I have to support the Eshoo amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The problem of increased nitrogen oxide emissions with biofuels, and biodiesel in particular, relates to the combustion of the fuel in an engine and not to challenges retailers and distributors are encountering in transporting such fuels, and that needs to be the clear focus point here.

For this reason, we actually removed reference to the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in the manager's amendment in the committee markup. So Ms. ESHOO's amendment restricts research and development to evaporative emissions from infrastructure.

Therefore, I would support and ask for support for Ms. ESHOO's amendment to that amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and I thank our friends Ms. ESHOO and Mr. LAMPSON for their efforts, and I rise in support of this bill; but I think the bill can be better, and I rise in opposition to the second-degree amendment because I frankly think it would weaken the Burgess-Ferguson amendment that would really strengthen this legislation.

The amendment that Mr. BURGESS and I are offering would help take a significant step forward in advancing fuel technology and helping to secure our Nation's energy independence, but it also is key to stopping a potential environmental problem before it starts.

I have been a champion for renewable energy technologies and new developments in alternative fuels, and I really believe that we have to ensure that these new technologies do not contribute to the ongoing environmental problems that we are facing today.

While the gentlewoman from California has offered an original amendment and has offered a secondary-degree amendment to our amendment, they sound familiar, but they are very different amendments. I believe this second-degree amendment to our amendment would significantly weaken the improvements that our amendment would make to the bill.

I commend her for her commitment to improving this legislation, but our amendment is more comprehensive and frankly just goes one step further. While her amendment would seek to minimize emissions from stationary sources at the end of the process, like at gas pumps, ours would seek to minimize emissions at both mobile and stationary sources. It is more comprehensive, it is a stronger amendment, and it would help to ensure that we are careful to recognize the possible environmental impacts that these fuels have as they move from production to the end product that ends up in your gas tank.

So in my home State of New Jersey, we undergo a constant struggle with clean air issues. Our amendment would go so far as to ensure that any new fuels that are added to our market to decrease our dependence on foreign oil do not have an adverse impact on the quality of the air that our citizens are breathing.

Let me be clear. This is a good bill. I intend to support the bill. I think it can be better. I think it can be better with the Burgess-Ferguson amendment. I think it would be weakened with this Eshoo second-degree amendment.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a farm State, one of the leading ethanol producers in the United States and proud to be part of this new movement of using renewable fuels to lessen our dependence on foreign oil, and I think it is important that we broaden our portfolio of fuels so that we can meet our ultimate goals of energy independence.

Now, there has always been, particularly with two States, California and New York, a traditional, and I have to admit I do not understand the depth or the reason behind those States' bias toward biofuels, but I find it odd as we stand here today trying to promote biofuels to lessen our dependence that we now have a secondary amendment that puts some restrictions on the use of biofuels that will actually slow the promotion of biofuels. I think it is odd the contradictory nature of let us have a biofuels bill, but then let us put in amendments that will eventually slow it.

Make no bones about this, this secondary amendment is an attempt to slow down the process of rolling out biofuels. It is a poison pill to a reasonable approach to the issue, the base bill from BURGESS and FERGUSON.

If you represent a State that is a major player or a player in biofuels production, you will want to vote against this poison pill amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word on the Burgess amendment.

I would first, Mr. Chairman, like to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will be brief.

I appreciate what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying. I think it needs to be very, very clear to all the Members of the House who are going to cast a vote on this to understand what the underlying bill seeks to do.

It is an infrastructure bill. It is not a combustion bill. It is an infrastructure bill, and that is why I have offered the amendment to the amendment. It deals with infrastructure. It directs the EPA to minimize. We all want VOCs minimized. It is the way biofuels are going to become effective in our country, and how they are stored and how they are handled is going to give rise to what we are all seeking.

This is a bipartisan effort, and I do not think anyone should get confused about what we are voting on. I wish that as we did our outreach to Mr. BURGESS that they would have been part of the same effort.

So we are all for biofuels. We want to make them effective and, again, remember that this is an infrastructure bill. It is not a combustion-type bill. So I thank the gentleman for giving me time.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this bill was very narrowly drafted to address a particular issue facing the country's energy infrastructure. This amendment does not fall within that narrow focus of the bill. The program areas which are in this amendment would be better addressed by a stand-alone bill or in some other manner.

The amendment specifically refers to nitrous oxide emissions. Nitrous oxide emissions do not occur from pipelines. This bill is attempting to address the issue of transporting additives or other fuels in a manner that makes it easier and less expensive for retailers to be able to accomplish that task.

I think there are going to be many opportunities for us to discuss the engines and the burning of these fuels within those engines at other times during this year, and I would hope that we would have the support joining us in making it happen.

□ 1200

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. I am going to assume that the gentleman is not speaking in favor of increased nitrous oxide emissions. But then do I understand, would the intent of the bill be that the truck that is transporting the ethanol to the retailer would not be allowed to burn biofuels?

Mr. LAMPSON. I absolutely support biofuels and have a significant interest in wanting to do so because I believe that it is going to bring a great deal to our economy, our independence and our security. What we are trying to do here

is to craft a piece of legislation. Not to not address the things that you are bringing up right now on how engines process this fuel, but on how we can transport it from one place to another so that someone can get access to put it in their engine.

Mr. BURGESS. But under that scenario you would not be able to burn biofuels in that 18-wheeler that was caught carrying the ethanol to the retailer.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this was a research and development bill, and we keep hearing it referred to as an infrastructure bill. I appreciate that infrastructure will follow from that research and development, but as we are studying this problem, as we are studying it from the origination, whether it be the cornfield or the Fry Oil to Fuel program, we are studying it from its origination to its end point. In my estimation, that end point should be the emissions that are emitted at the fuel pipe.

Mr. LAMPSON. Reclaiming my time, I would just point out to the gentleman that, yes, this is research and development, but it is not research and development on engines and how engines burn fuel, but on pipelines and infrastructure to transport that fuel so they can ultimately be placed into engines. There are going to be many opportunities for us to discuss how emissions come from these fuels.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. So as I understand this secondary amendment on the infrastructure, would it also apply, then, to tanker trucks that would haul the biofuel to determine if there are any emissions from the evaporation? That is what I understand.

Mr. LAMPSON. Reclaiming my time, only during the evaporative process of that. Not from the engine of that truck, if it is emitting something different from that.

Mr. TERRY. My fear is that because now the secondary amendment will jeopardize the ability to transport ethanol and biofuels from the Midwest because it may evaporate along the way, taking it to a refinery to be blended. That is the danger here.

Mr. LAMPSON. That is precisely what the amendment to the amendment is attempting to address. I think that this is an appropriate process right now. I support the Eshoo replacement and hope that all my colleagues will do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 3, line 23, insert “The Assistant Administrator is encouraged to utilize Land Grant Institutions, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and other minority-serving institutions among other resources to undertake research for this program.” after “point of final sale.”.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act.

This legislation is an important step in gathering the most current research to implement the vision of fuel independence and energy efficiency set forth by this Congress.

I commend the hard work of my colleague from Tennessee, the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, Mr. GORDON, who has brought forth this legislation, and the ranking member and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to this legislation today because I feel that as we move forward with energy reform, it is important to recognize the tremendous contributions to scientific research and academia made by land grant institutions, historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions and other minority-serving institutions.

This amendment specifically recommends that the assistant administrator of the Office of Research and Development of the Environmental Protection Agency utilize the wealth of knowledge currently available at the research-oriented universities throughout our great Nation.

As a graduate of Fisk University and Florida A&M University, I have seen firsthand the outstanding research generated by faculty and students alike. An example of these contributions at Florida A&M is the Environmental Sciences Institute. The institute has consistently partnered with Federal agencies to furnish informative environmental policy research. The research has included 40 publications during the 2005–2006 academic year and the services of Dr. Larry Robinson on the National Research Council.

Fisk University also embodies this important mission in its designations as a core research center for NASA and international recognition as a scientific research institution.

And since we are dealing with energy, I would urge that the president of

Fisk University is the former Secretary of the Department of Energy.

The recent development of the Center for Physics and Chemistry of Materials has established an outstanding resource for chemistry studies with the support of the National Science Foundation and the Department of Defense. This center generates over 34 publications a year and holds several patents for application by the United States Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this amendment will emphasize the importance and value of the research conducted by the phenomenal network of Land Grant Institutions and other universities represented by many of us in this great Congress. It is vital that we acknowledge the role of research institutions as community partners in the implementation of congressional mandates.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to foster these partnerships for a prosperous future of responsible energy use.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I just wanted to indicate our support for the amendment proposed by Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS. We will support it. We think it is a good amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just received a copy of this amendment, but I am somewhat bemused by the amendment. I guess that what the author means is that he is saying that he doesn't believe that the assistant administrator of the Office of Research and Development of the EPA would even consider these institutions.

It would be my belief and understanding that this individual would consider all institutions where there is appropriate research being done that could be helpful. I am somewhat bemused by it. I am tempted to offer an amendment that would have the individual look at institutions in my fair State that are doing wonderful work. In fact, each one of us could offer amendments that would identify particular institutions in our jurisdiction.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The only thing that I am pointing out is the significance of land grant institutions. I think the gentleman makes a valid point, but this doesn't obviate the point that you are making.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comment. I assume that the gentleman would then believe that all 435 and now 440 of us ought to offer amendments to have the individual at EPA look specifically at the institutions in our jurisdiction. And doesn't that really do a disservice to the process that we are in in having the EPA look at the appropriate institutions that may have the greatest amount of knowledge?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am amused by your bemusement. At the very same time, I certainly understand the dynamic you have put forward. If you choose to make such an amendment and if 434 other Members and the Delegates choose to do so, I would assume that is their responsibility. I am discharging mine.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I remain amused and bemused. We all acknowledge the contributions of land grant institutions and historically black colleges and universities. We have those in our good State of Georgia. They make wonderful contributions, absolutely wonderful contributions. I think this amendment, however, points out kind of the folly of what is going on here with this bill.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, this legislation came through last year under suspension, passed by, as I understand it, unanimous vote. I think that we will all support this because it is motherhood and apple pie. But it doesn't add to the appropriate discussion of the real issue here, which is trying to make certain that we have an energy-independent policy for our Nation.

I think that we are just kind of playing on the margins, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELLER OF ILLINOIS

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELLER of Illinois:

Page 4, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to certification by a nationally recognized testing laboratory of components for fuel dispensing devices that specifically reference compatibility with alcohol blended and other biofuels that contain greater than 15 percent alcohol; and

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me begin my commanding my friends, Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL, as well as my friend, Mr. LAMPSON, who is managing the bill this morning.

My amendment is pretty basic in what we are trying to achieve. I want to note that the former Speaker of the House, who, as you know, is recovering from surgery and is not able to be with us, is one I have worked with on this amendment. But this is an amendment that deals with infrastructure, as noted by those that are arguing for this bill which we all support. Our focus is infrastructure and research, affecting infrastructure of biofuels.

If we look back to when we passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005 through Congress, we included a renewable fuel standard of 7.5 billion gallons by the year 2010. Due to passage of this increase, which essentially doubled the amount of biofuels established under the renewable fuel standard, we have seen a tremendous amount of growth in investment in the biofuels industry in Illinois, my home State, as well as across America.

Currently, there are 110 ethanol plants in production, with 70 more under construction, producing today 5.2 billion gallons of ethanol as well as biodiesel. Our farmers are seeing \$4 a bushel of corn, as well as \$7 soybeans because of the increased demand for biofuels.

The President, as well, in seeing the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, announced in his State of the Union a call for a renewable and alternative fuel standard of 35 billion gallons by 2017, 10 years from now. In order for the biofuels industry to move forward and achieve these aggressive goals, we need to make sure that an infrastructure exists that can deliver fuel to the consumers.

I am often asked by my constituents, why are there so few E-85 pumps as they travel. Unfortunately, issues have arisen with the E-85 certification by Underwriters Laboratories, which is an independent, not-for-profit, product safety certification organization that tests products and writes standards for safety. UL's worldwide family of companies and network for service providers include 66 laboratory testing and certification facilities serving customers in 104 countries.

UL began work to develop standards for E-85 fuel dispensers in early 2006 at the request for certification for such a dispenser from its primary manufacturer. It was reported in August 2006 that the manufacturer was to get UL approval for their E-85 pump. UL has looked at the application for quite a long period of time. Signals were given that the approval was imminent to the point where the manufacturer issued a press release. Yet in October of 2006, UL has suspended existing authorization on components for E-85 pumps, which they had previously approved over the years, and began and are continuing a stakeholder process to develop new standards for all components in the finished pump.

According to UL, there are no documented reports on any issues, field incidents, safety issues or documented reports related to E-85 components that have been authorized, or the pumps themselves. This process could take at least another year, possibly more, depending on numerous factors.

UL will not give a timeline for completion of the standards. It is possible once these standards are published, manufacturers of E-85 pumps will have to retool their operations to comply.

□ 1215

The impacts of certification issue are already being felt in my district as well

as across this country. Even though UL is continuing to engage State and local governments and fire marshals with their findings, suspension of the installation of E-85 tanks has started to occur.

While States like Michigan and Minnesota are allowing continued use with special monitoring, States like Ohio have already prohibited all dispensing of E-85 blended fuels pending UL approval or listing. Big retailers, names we recognize, like Wal-Mart and Valero, which previously had announced their intention to install E-85 pumps nationwide, have suspended the installation of any new pumps pending this certification. This represents thousands of fueling stations across the country.

The bill before us requires the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy's research and development offices to carry out an R&D program of materials to be added to biofuels to make them more compatible with existing infrastructure.

The amendment I have offered today will require EPA and DOE and recognize the impact to research and recognize the impacts any further additives they recommend through the research program may have on issues with respect to certification by UL for fuel dispensers like E-85 and other biofuel blends like biodiesel.

In the United States there are 110 ethanol plants in production with 70 more under construction producing approximately 5.2 billion gallons. There are over 1,123 E-85 fueling stations around the country today, including on Federal property.

In my district alone, there are six ethanol and biodiesel plants, either announced or are moving forward or planned under construction, and 14 fueling stations offering E-85. Unfortunately, the process of bringing more has stalled.

We in this Congress have made a bipartisan commitment to an energy policy which encourages the development and use of E-85 and other blended biofuels. Exporting America's domestic agricultural resources to achieve energy security, energy independence, providing jobs for America is of utmost importance.

Mr. Chairman, I ask bipartisan support for this legislation. E-85 and other blended biofuels are a key part of our strategy. I look forward to working with my colleague in a bipartisan way. Again I ask for bipartisan support for this amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we like the amendment that Mr. WELLER has proposed and look forward to working with him on this and other things. Thank you very much for your interest. We will indeed support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at any point in the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT:

Page 2, line 12, insert "including hydrogen" after "biofuels".

Page 3, line 8, strike "and".

Page 3, line 12, strike the period and insert ";" and".

Page 3, after line 12, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) fuel distributors and retailers may transform their business by dispensing hydrogen, reformed on site from various feedstocks, or delivered by pipeline or tube trucks, resulting in new storage, handling, and equipment challenges.

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) challenges for design, reforming, storage, handling, and dispensing hydrogen fuel from various feedstocks, including biomass, from neighborhood fueling stations, including codes and standards development necessary beyond that carried out under section 809 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16158); and

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, is an important bill that seeks to facilitate the development of markets for biofuels and ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel. I am pleased that it is being considered on the floor today.

I supported this language last year when it passed as part of the Alternative Energy Research and Development Act. I am a strong supporter of diversifying our Nation's fuel supply. Our dependence on foreign sources of petroleum is a threat to our economy, threat to our national security, and a threat to our environment.

Promoting the development and implementation of clean domestic sources of transportation fuels will advance our energy independence and reduce the detrimental environmental effects of harmful air emissions. Bio-based fuels, such as ethanol and biodiesel, are an important component of a national energy strategy, which maximizes our domestic resources.

I also believe that hydrogen must play a prominent role in an energy policy that relieves our dependence on foreign sources of oil and minimizes the environmental footprint by improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

This bill will direct the development of additives, blendstocks, technologies and methods which mitigate the negative effect of biofuels on infrastructure and make them more compatible with existing infrastructure used to store and deliver petroleum-based fuels to the point of final sale.

My amendment seeks to acknowledge and address the infrastructure challenges that will be presented by the advancement of hydrogen fuel, which can be made from a variety of feedstocks, including biomass. Specifically, my amendment will, one, direct the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, to consider the challenges for design, reforming storage, handling and dispensing hydrogen fuel from various feedstocks, including biomass.

I believe that key to our energy security is a strategy which incorporates the various technologies and alternative fuels that will coexist in the marketplace.

As we address the important infrastructure challenges raised by the promotion of biofuels and ultra-low sulfur diesel, I also believe it is incumbent upon us to start paving the way for the hydrogen economy. These are consistent technologies that are complementary and that promote alternative development.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the attention the gentleman from Pennsylvania is giving to what is undoubtedly a crucial element of the possible transition to a hydrogen-based economy. But I oppose the amendment because it has no relation to H.R. 547.

This amendment is simply outside the scope of what is a very carefully and narrowly drafted bill to address specific short-term research needs that would allow currently available biofuels such as ethanol and biodiesel and ultra-low sulfur diesel to be distributed in existing pipelines, and use other current liquid fuel distribution technologies. These are all fuels that can be used in a current generation of commercially available automobiles.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment, in contrast, deals with problems of containing hydrogen, a fuel now derived from natural gas rather than biomass, and distributing it if and when hydrogen vehicles become available.

Hydrogen would require a new distribution infrastructure. So while the amendment uses similar words related to distribution, it is talking about an entirely new generation of distribution technology.

Also, while it is possible that some hydrogen could actually be developed

from biomass, it is not today. So the references to hydrogen derived from biomass in the bill are not really related to the research on hydrogen distribution that would be conducted if this amendment became law.

It is also unclear what would be the funding source for the gentleman's amendment since it establishes a program at the Department of Energy while the funding in H.R. 547 all goes to the Environmental Protection Agency. For these reasons I would ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

This amendment does address an important concern. I ask the gentleman to consult with his colleagues in the Hydrogen Caucus about ways to work the intent of this language into hydrogen legislation that the Committee on Science and Technology is likely to consider as it moves on to other energy research legislation later in the Congress.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to Mr. DENT, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I do have a great deal of respect for the chairman, but I do respectfully disagree with his contention that this amendment is outside the scope of this legislation.

Clearly the Chair and the Parliamentarian have ruled this amendment germane. And it is germane for a number of reasons. Specifically, biomass is a feedstock, as we know. It can be used in the production of hydrogen. So I am trying to emphasize once again that these are very consistent technologies.

There is \$10 million authorized in this legislation. We just seek to take some of that funding for this amendment. We are not asking for additional funding. Again, as you develop an infrastructure for biomass and biodiesel, developing one for hydrogen is just as essential.

I think that this is entirely consistent, well within the scope of the legislation before us and should be supported by all of the Members of this Chamber. I do have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Tennessee. I know he is dedicated to alternative fuel development.

But I think we cannot move forward on some aspects of alternative fuels while ignoring hydrogen in a hydrogen-based economy, which is where many of us would like to move at some point in the future.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the funding within the bill goes to the Environmental Protection Agency. And I believe in your amendment, the funding for the research on hydrogen goes to the Department of Energy.

Would the gentleman explain how that is going to be funded?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to respond to the query of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment says that the funding is through the EPA with consultation with the Secretary of Energy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. Energy policy vitally impacts our Nation's security, the strength of our economy, and the health of our planet.

Today, high gas prices stretch family budgets. Our addiction to Mideast oil threatens our national security. Increased consumption of fossil fuels contributes to global warming. These issues will dominate the 21st century, our future, and America's role in the world. It requires a new energy initiative, and the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act is a critical component of that effort.

This bill is aimed at improving the Nation's transportation fuel infrastructure, to improve the storage and transportation of biofuels.

□ 1230

It will facilitate affordable delivery of alternative fuels to gas pumps throughout the country. It is just one piece of a large puzzle. But it is an important move towards a sustainable energy future. We need this legislation to address specific technical problems that hinder the storage and distribution of biofuels. Many of the country's gas stations are not equipped to handle large increases in alternative fuels. Ethanol and other biofuels have unique chemical properties that make them incompatible with much of the country's existing fuel infrastructure.

Despite their enormous promise as a cleaner, homegrown fuel source, biofuels can be corrosive to pipelines and tanks, can clog filters and contaminate water and air with volatile emissions. In the past, these technical problems have created a significant barrier to market acceptance of these alternative fuels.

The bottom line is that it would be enormously expensive to modify existing infrastructure to accept ethanol and other alternative fuels. We need a focused, scientific effort to address this problem. H.R. 547 would allocate \$10 million in R&D monies on new technologies and methods, including additives, blend stocks, and easier tank reconditioning methods that allow gas

station owners to retrofit their infrastructure, significantly reducing costs for businesses and consumers.

It is clear that the United States must take meaningful steps to move away from our dependence on foreign oil. I think we all agree that this is merely a first step. But in order to make alternative fuels financially feasible for American drivers and gas station owners, we need to take some of the small steps like this one today.

I am proud to support this bill. I congratulate my colleagues and urge swift passage.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we have dealt with on the floor this morning now a second-order amendment. If, when we get to the point of voting, the recorded vote on the second-order amendment, if that vote passes, but it is not decisive, meaning that the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner don't make the difference, is there any way for a Member to get a revote on that second-order amendment once we go into the full House?

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member may demand a separate vote on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That includes the specific second-order amendment that would have been offered; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Any amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan specify which amendment he is calling up?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the amendment. I am told by the proponent that he has, actually, two.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must ascertain which amendment is before the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Just so I understand, Mr. Chairman, have you reserved your point of order?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I will at this time reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has an amendment that is printed in the RECORD, and he has an amendment which is freestanding. We need to determine which amendment he is seeking to offer.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. The amendment that is printed in the RECORD, sir, is another section of the

bill. This amendment is for section 3, which we are discussing now.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to where in the fuel supply chain additives optimally should be added to fuels; and

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think this is going to be an improvement to the bill.

This is a good bill. And what this, my amendment, does is deal with the issue of infrastructure. This bill talks about infrastructure. And we have asked the EPA, in this particular bill, to study what additives we add to make the process better when we are talking about moving alternative fuels through the infrastructure. But that sometimes infers that you are either at the point of origin, the refinery, or the point of sale.

But there are lots of places that we may be able to apply additives in the process of making alternatives fuels viable, and what we are asking with this amendment is very simple and noncontroversial. We are saying, when you are studying what additives to put in, you should also include where is the best place to put those in in the long process.

Our fear here is that we get isolated to only looking at a very small section of where those additives ought to go in this system. And one thing that we know, and we have talked about it here, the gentleman and my friend from Massachusetts made a great argument about the retrofitting gas stations and how important the infrastructure is.

Well, if we don't know where these additives go in the system, we, in fact, may be shooting ourselves in the foot here. All it does is take what is existing in this bill and expand it by saying, don't only look at what, but where, those additives can go in the system to make an improvement in our alternative fuels as we march to the future.

Very simple. I would argue it is certainly germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina insist on his point of order?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, based on the statements of my friend, I will withdraw my reservation.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this is an acceptable amendment and thank the gentleman for submitting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further amendment to section 3?

The Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. SULFUR TESTING FOR DIESEL FUELS.

(a) PROGRAM.—*The Assistant Administrator, in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall carry out a research, development, and demonstration program on portable, low-cost, and accurate methods and technologies for testing of sulfur content in fuel, including Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel and Low Sulfur Diesel.*

(b) SCHEDULE OF DEMONSTRATIONS.—*Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator shall begin demonstrations of technologies under subsection (a).*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

The Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIALS AND DATA BASE DEVELOPMENT.

*Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall develop a physical properties data base and standard reference materials for biofuels. Such data base and standard reference materials shall be maintained and updated as appropriate as additional biofuels become available.*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

The Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

*There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency \$10,000,000 for carrying out this Act.*

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSKAM:

Page 5, lines 18 through 21, amend section 6 to read as follows:

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBJECT TO PAY AS YOU GO.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency \$10,000,000 for carrying out this Act, to be derived from amounts otherwise appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for energy research, development, and demonstration activities related to fuels or environmental research and development activities related to fuels.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, like so many others who have come to the floor today, I rise in support of the underlying bill, H.R. 547. The underlying measure, without question, is one that is worthy of our support.

All of us, many of us in the course of our journeys to come here, gained the confidence of the electorate by talking about alternative energies and alternative fuel sources. I come from Illinois, which ranks second in corn production and is one of the leading producers of ethanol. In my district, I have over 140,000 residents who are directly employed in manufacturing, and they would greatly benefit from having clean fuels, that is, moving products around.

But as I was evaluating and meeting with my staff to talk about the underlying bill, there was a word that kept popping up in the analysis and that was a key word, new, N-E-W.

I know that in the course of my journey to come here, one of the things that I heard consistently throughout the course of the campaigning was that my constituents, Mr. Chairman, wanted us to live within our means. And so the amendment that I have offered is very, very simple. It directs the EPA that \$10 million authorized for these three new programs that don't currently exist, created under the bill, would have to come from funds that are already appropriated. It is the simple measure of pay-as-you-go. You see, we don't get it both ways. We don't get to act as if we are fiscally disciplined, and yet at the first opportunity, not act fiscally disciplined.

My dad has a phrase that he communicated to me over and over and over when I was growing up and that was this. He said, "Life is choices," and I think we have a choice today to make. This is our first opportunity, with this open rule, to amend a new program that we have seen created in the 110th Congress. We didn't have that opportunity in other bills that have come along. But this is our first opportunity.

A \$10 million appropriation, Mr. Chairman, or a \$10 million authorization, is comparatively small, if you compare it to the overall EPA budget of \$7.7 billion. It is less than one-tenth of 1 percent. But my argument is simple: that we need to show the American taxpayers that they can have confidence in us in these comparatively small programs, so that as we move in and continue through this Congress, as new programs are considered, that they are within the context of fiscal discipline.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today to focus the House's attention on it and to bring the attention of the Nation to it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not reserve his time. He either uses his time or yields back.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may yield to the gentleman from Missouri if he stays on his feet.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I may

move to strike the last word as I run through the time here, if I do.

I am grateful to the gentleman for bringing this amendment. I think it is exactly the kind of fiscal responsibility that many of us on both sides of the aisle talked about during our campaigns. It is an important thing to have before the Congress.

We have talked about PAYGO for taxes, but this is really PAYGO for spending. This is trying to reprioritize the spending of the Federal Government, to look at spending we are doing now as the first way to pay for spending we should be doing in the future.

I haven't heard anything in the debate today that doesn't suggest that we need to move forward with the bill that the chairman has brought to the floor, that the committee has brought to the floor, that there is a lot of interest in amending this bill in ways that make it better. But there is no real discussion that the underlying bill doesn't do the kinds of things we need to be looking for as we move toward energy independence.

Millions and billions of dollars, however, are authorized with no real requirement for fiscal discipline. In one of the votes we have taken this year in the early bills, the 6 for '06, the implementation of the 9/11 Commission, when we finally weeks after the vote got the cost estimate of the vote, the cost estimate was an estimate of \$30-or-so billion over 5 years. And so we need to be sure that we are doing things that make sense with the people's money.

I think President Reagan, who would have been 96 this week had he lived, said that a government has never voluntarily reduced its size.

One of the ways we can at least maintain the size of the government is, we look at new and worthy things to suggest that the size of the government would not grow just because the needs of the government are changing.

□ 1245

In this bill we ask for the authorization—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

This legislation authorizes \$10 billion in spending to the EPA. And, frankly, the EPA spends a lot of money that could be spent in different ways. In the EPA budget last year \$47,459,367 was spent in projects in foreign countries. I would suggest, in supporting the gentleman's amendment, that probably you could find \$10 million there and, if you couldn't find it there, you could find it somewhere else.

Currently, the EPA has paid for things that establish a coal bed methane clearinghouse in the People's Republic of China or developing or producing a television documentary in China, in Chinese, on mercury pollution or improving environmental monitoring quality and capacity in the

Ukraine. They may all be good things, but none of them as important to American taxpayers as the proposal today. This proposal would allow this bill to move forward, but require the EPA to find the \$10 million for this new program by evaluating the value to the American people and the American taxpayer of their old program.

I think the money that is there to do this can be found elsewhere. I particularly am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) for bringing this to the floor as one of our first opportunities to talk about PAYGO for spending.

If we are going to do things that meet the new priorities of the country, it is also an opportunity every time to look at the current spending and to reprioritize what the Federal Government has been doing.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the two gentlemen who have spoken on this are making very good points.

The EPA, however, has been an underfunded agency, and to take money from one area that has been appropriated is like robbing Peter to pay Paul. And I will give you a good example.

The Energy Star program. The Energy Star program is an investment that we have made in the future to help consumers, and the money that we spend on the Energy Star program, for every dollar that we put into it, we get about \$10 back, a tremendous investment. So it is an area where government can do something positive and save a great deal of money.

What we are trying to do right now is to improve an infrastructure that will give us the ability to have access to cleaner burning fuels, that will give us an access to having a product or products that consumers are demanding, and we do it more safely, more conveniently, and hopefully with less expense.

We believe that the bill as it stands is one that provides for the new dollars necessary to make this project one that could be very appropriate for the citizens of this country. And the bill could save consumers somewhere between \$5 billion and \$30 billion a year, a total of close to \$30 billion on a \$10 million investment. That is one heck of a return, and it is the opposite of what I believe the gentleman, Mr. BLUNT, was talking about a few minutes ago that we want to control the size of government.

Government doing good works indeed brings us significant returns. This is an area where there will be a significant return, and we think that new dollars need to go into this program.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It strikes me that everything the gentleman has said is actually consistent with the underlying amendment.

The amendment that is before the House simply says that it needs to make priorities and make those priorities clear. I take the gentleman at face value that the underlying program and the underlying \$10 million is worthy of investment. But we don't get to have it both ways, it seems to me.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman's amendment says specifically "to be derived from amounts otherwise appropriated to the EPA." To me that means we are going to take money from another project to make this one work. That does not work, in my mind. If we are going to have a new investment that we expect a huge return on, we need to put the money into it and make sure that it is a committed project and we believe it is one that will give us a great return.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Texas. And I guess one of his comments that this bill would save \$30 billion on a \$10 million investment means that he would support dynamic scoring through CBO, which is something that we have been begging for for a long time.

So I know that you will endeavor to work with us as we move toward dynamic scoring for CBO.

But I find it amusing, distressing actually, that the other side continues to break promise after promise. I read now from "A New Direction for America," which is what the majority party put out prior to the last election, and they said: "Our new direction is committed to pay-as-you-go budgeting, no more deficit spending. We are committed to auditing the books and subjecting every facet of Federal spending to tough budget discipline and accountability, forcing the Congress to choose a new direction and the right priorities for all Americans."

Well, fiscal discipline clearly is not the order of the day today nor is pay-as-you-go. The other side will tell you they have pay-as-you-go; but, in fact, it does not apply to this sort of bill. So it doesn't apply to authorization. So when rules are rules only when you want them to be rules, then they really aren't rules at all. So it really is not pay-as-you-go. It is go and spend, which is the program that the majority party has in place.

This is a great bill. This is a great bill. And I think probably \$10 million is an appropriate amount of resources of the American people's hard-earned taxpayer money to spend on this kind of endeavor. However, we are charged with developing the priorities of the

Federal Government, and, in fact, I believe this to be a priority. But the majority party is charged, when they bring a bill like this to the floor, to say, well, this is indeed a priority but something else has to go to the bottom of the list, in fact, fall off the list to the tune of \$10 million. That is what PAYGO is. You say we are going to spend \$10 million on this, but we are not going to spend it on this. Well, in fact, the majority party hasn't done that. What they have said is that we are just going to continue to spend and spend and spend and spend.

Mr. Chairman, that is not responsible. That is not responsible spending. That is not responsible use of the hard-earned taxpayer money. So I would hope that the new majority would, in fact, embrace the policy that they talk about, which is making certain that PAYGO rules are in effect. In fact, the promise was to have PAYGO rules be in effect for everything, for everything that came to the floor. Well, we haven't seen that, and I look forward to that because I think it is the appropriate way for us to budget and for us to spend.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would be happy to yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he is saying that the coal bed methane clearinghouse in the People's Republic of China is more important than this and maybe doesn't need to be looked at versus the \$10 million for this, or developing and producing a television documentary in China on mercury pollution or improving environmental monitoring capacity in the Ukraine, as Mr. BLUNT mentioned, that those are more important and might not be a way to redirect money.

I heard him make the comment of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I thought that was the MO of the majority party, but I guess Peter has to be rich and Paul has to be poor.

But this is something, and I applaud the gentleman for bringing this up, that if we are going to be good stewards of the money, we have got to prioritize our spending.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for those comments.

And I too want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this issue forward. All of us, when we were out talking to our constituents running up to the last election, all of us heard that we needed to be responsible with the taxpayers' money. So I applaud him for bringing this bill forward so that we make certain, we make certain, that we prioritize in an appropriate way on something that is as important as this piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First I want to state that I appreciate this open rule and this open dialogue and debate that we have here on the floor of the United States Congress today. It is a healthy process that we are going through, and it is a process that, of course, is designed to perfect legislation or allow that perfect legislation to have an opportunity to be vetted and rise as a perfect piece.

And as I look at this overall proposal to authorize \$10 million to develop an additive so that we can put renewable fuels and particularly ethanol down through the pipeline, Mr. Chairman, I can't help but reflect back upon the beginnings of renewable fuels in the United States of America.

As most people know, I represent the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa. And there, of all the 435 congressional districts, we are number two in ethanol production. By the end of this year, we will be number one in ethanol production. We are number one in biodiesel production of all 435 districts. And also with renewable energy, we are today tied for fourth and will this year be tied at least for second and perhaps first in the electrical generation by wind. That puts us, Mr. Chairman, within the grasp of winning the renewable energy triple crown: ethanol, biodiesel, and wind all tied up in one congressional district.

Now, I raise this issue because I have the great privilege of having grown up and having developed my business and my life and my experience in the epicenter of renewable fuels. And that perspective is so utterly valuable, at least for me. And when I go back to Iowa and have the opportunity to visit the Iowa Senate where I formerly served, I am always proud to shake the hand of State Senator Thurman Gaskill of Corwith, Iowa, who pumped that first gallon of ethanol back in 1978. And from that first gallon, we are here today on the floor of the United States Congress talking about a problem of how to transport all of these billions of gallons of ethanol that we are producing. It is a fantastic transformation that we have taken from 1978 to today. It hasn't been without work, it hasn't been without risk, and it hasn't been without its failures along the way. But it is a glorious success.

And I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois coming forward. And here we are, Iowa is the number one ethanol-producing State in the Union as well, and it produces 26 percent of the ethanol in the country. And it is important to know that the United States has surpassed Brazil in overall ethanol production.

So we have an industry here that is growing. We have an infrastructure that is being established and founded, and we are to this point now where we have so much fuel that we are producing. Not nearly enough, I want to add that. We have to find a transportation way to resolve that issue.

I want to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that of these difficulties that we have had in the past, we have put some tax credits in place, and the private sector has been magnificent in finding solutions. For example, the increase in the production of ethanol out of every gallon of corn has come from a lot of industry-driven solutions, and this transportation problem also can come from industry-driven solutions.

So I want to watch this authorization as it moves through. The private sector has been very, very effective. And yet we will be producing more and more ethanol as the years go by and blending it in. And as we move to cellulosic, of course, this becomes more and more important.

One of the difficulties with this bill also, though, is the component of ultra-low sulfur fuels and the burden that it puts on our jobbers, on our fuel distributors, that they will have one truck and they will have to haul a load of low-sulfur fuel and then turn around and load that up and haul a load of ultra-low sulfur fuel.

□ 1300

As that unfolds, they are going to find themselves in a situation where they will be vulnerable to regulations without any means to determine whether their load actually meets that very tight standard on ultra-low sulfur fuel.

So as this process moves forward, I would remind this body and ask the Department of Energy and the EPA to pay very close attention to finding a way to develop an economic testing system that will allow these jobbers to be in compliance.

So, overall, we have gone by leaps and bounds from that first gallon of ethanol that was pumped back in 1978, and here we are the number one ethanol-producing nation in the world. We have far eclipsed Brazil. Our technology is far ahead of theirs. And this is not just an ability to produce ethanol, but the intellectual property that grows from having done this.

We have the science down and we have the research and development in place and that is growing and multiplying, and as that happens we build more and more expertise. That expertise grows from the epicenter of these renewable fuels out into the regions of the country.

So I would say we will see ethanol flow out to the limits of the corn belt, biodiesel to the limits of the soybean area. We will see the cellulosics fill in the gaps. And we are going to see the markets drive this and tax structure be supportive of it.

I am supportive conceptually of this legislation that is before us, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

After section 6 insert the following:

**SEC. 7. ENERGY SECURITY FUND AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL GRANT PROGRAM.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the “Energy Security Fund” (referred to in this section as the “Fund”), consisting of—

(A) amounts transferred to the Fund under paragraph (2); and

(B) amounts credited to the Fund under paragraph (3)(C).

(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—For fiscal year 2008 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall transfer to the Fund an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equal to 50 percent of the total amount deposited in the general fund of the Treasury during the preceding fiscal year from fines, penalties, and other funds obtained through enforcement actions conducted pursuant to section 32912 of title 49, United States Code (including funds obtained under consent decrees).

(3) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest in interest-bearing obligations of the United States such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, required to meet current withdrawals.

(B) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(C) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund in accordance with section 9602 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(4) USE OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be made available to the Secretary of Energy, subject to the availability of appropriations, to carry out the grant program under subsection (b).

(b) ALTERNATIVE FUELS GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Clean Cities Program of the Department of Energy, shall establish and carry out a program under which the Secretary shall provide grants to expand the availability to consumers of alternative fuels (as defined in section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code).

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any entity that is eligible to receive assistance under the Clean Cities Program shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

(i) CERTAIN OIL COMPANIES.—A large, vertically-integrated oil company shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection.

(ii) PROHIBITION OF DUAL BENEFITS.—An entity that receives any other Federal funds for the construction or expansion of alternative refueling infrastructure shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection for the construction or expansion of the same alternative refueling infrastructure.

(C) ENSURING COMPLIANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall promulgate regulations to ensure that, before receiving a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity meets applicable standards relating to the installation, construction, and expansion of infrastructure necessary to increase the availability to consumers of alternative fuels (as defined in section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code).

(3) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—

(A) GRANTS.—The amount of a grant provided under this subsection shall not exceed \$30,000.

(B) AMOUNT PER STATION.—An eligible entity shall receive not more than \$90,000 under this subsection for any station of the eligible entity during a fiscal year.

(4) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant provided under this subsection shall be used for the construction or expansion of alternative fueling infrastructure.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 3 percent of the amount of a grant provided under this subsection shall be used for administrative expenses.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping for an 11th hour reprieve on this issue. We had sent up the call and the white flag to try to get this worked out. Hopefully, maybe in the few minutes I will take to talk about this, you will be moved to tears and be ready to accept the amendment, my friend.

One of the things that we have talked about today, and this is an important issue, is how we move forward on alternative fuels. This bill is important. It outlines some pretty important steps for us to move forward. But this amendment gives us the opportunity to have a concrete action that we can take that will immediately allow us to impact.

You think about my generation: It was going to the moon. The generation after me was the E-economy. This generation is going to be alternative fuels and how they change the course of our consumption of fuel both in our homes and in our cars; how national security, by getting us away from foreign oil, is changed forever, and not soon enough; how it helps our economy, how it helps our environment. All of that is right now. It is not 10 years, it is not 15 years, it is right now.

We have set up a pretty good system for research and development. We now have great amounts of resources going to get us to alternative fuels. We also have a look at the production of it. How do we produce biomass? How do we produce ethanol? What is the next level of cellulosic ethanol?

Then the big problem is the distribution of it. That is the one thing that we are just having a difficult time getting over. It is the one hurdle for an exponential growth in our ability to move to alternative fuels. Be it hydrogen, be it ethanol, be it biomass, all of those things have infrastructure problems.

The one thing that we know we can do is expand the number of ethanol

pumps. We have to do it. It must happen. But there is a problem. If you are a small, independent gas station owner, you have to take a huge risk, \$30,000 to \$60,000 to put in an ethanol pump on an economy of scale that isn't there yet. So we have to kick-start it. This is our opportunity to double the number of ethanol pumps available across the country.

I know we are going to get into some wrangling about germaneness, and about this paragraph doesn't jive with that paragraph, and this committee hasn't had a chance to talk about it, but this committee has. This bill passed by voice vote last year.

Voice vote, we all agreed in a bipartisan way. It went through committee. It had its hearing and moved on to the Senate. Unfortunately, that is where we didn't move it forward. But this is our opportunity to get it done and get it done soon.

My friend from Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, talked about the urgency, about how fast we should go forward on this and how important it was that we get away from dependency on foreign oil; and what that means to our national security, our economic security, our environmental security. There are only 34 States where you can even get ethanol at a gas station.

Let us take this bold move now. If we are serious about moving forward, let's just swallow this one and say, this is the right thing to do. We have already had hearings. We have already voted on it in the House. Let's get this thing moving, so we can double the number of ethanol pumps and move forward for the safety and security of the next generation that will change the course of our economy here in the United States.

I ask my friends to reconsider their reservation, and I would urge the support of this amendment. I look forward to working with you on this and other issues in the future.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my friend is eloquent as usual, but he still has an amendment that is not germane, and I continue to pose my objection.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the amendment concerns matters that are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his amendment and his dedication to what I clearly believe is an important issue, deploying the necessary infrastructure to carry biofuels. However, I find it necessary to support the point of order that this amendment is nongermane because it is beyond the scope of this very narrow research bill and squarely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce because it uses the

CAFE program as a funding source and essentially is an expansion of the Clean Cities program that was created under legislation coming from that committee.

While it is complementary to what we are trying to accomplish today and a subject which is potentially worth exploring elsewhere in this Congress, this is not the proper forum for this amendment, and I would oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this matter is clearly in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and if the gentleman would be willing to withdraw his amendment, I would say to him on behalf of the committee, we will be glad to work with him in the future.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman. I look forward to working with you on the committee. I know you are a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I think we can all agree this is an important direction and I look forward to working together.

Mr. Chairman, I would move to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS:

Page 5, after line 21, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.

Research and development under this Act shall address issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment under section 7 should be the increased per gallon rate for biodiesel credit.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman please submit a copy of the amendment to the desk?

Mr. BURGESS. The amendment was submitted and should be at the desk, but we will bring a copy to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS:

Add at the end the following new section:

#### SECTION 7. INCREASE IN PER GALLON RATE FOR BIODIESEL CREDIT.

(a) INCOME TAX CREDIT.—Paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of section 40A(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining biodiesel mixture credit and biodiesel credit) are both amended by striking “50 cents” and inserting “\$1.00”.

(b) EXCISE TAX CREDIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 6426(c) of such Code (relating to biodiesel mixture credit) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—The applicable amount is \$1.00.”.

#### (c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 40A(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(2) Section 40A(d)(3)(C)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “subsection (b)(5)(B)” and inserting “subsection (b)(4)(B)”.

(3) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 40A(e) of such Code are both amended by striking “subsection (b)(5)(C)” and inserting “subsection (b)(4)(C)”.

(4) Section 40A(f)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Subsection(b)(4) shall not apply with respect to renewable diesel.”.

#### (d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fuel sold or used in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCISE TAX.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to any sale, use, or removal after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BURGESS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I won't spend a lot of time expanding on why we need to reduce our reliance on foreign energy. I think it has been well stated this morning. Most of us recognize, just looking at a picture of the leader of Venezuela, what the problem is.

We recognize when we see what is happening in Nigeria and other areas, the Middle East, what the situation is. And our energy position is not sustainable within the United States. So homegrown fuels, such as biodiesel, can help move the United States toward greater energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, as animal feed prices rise because of increased use of corn for ethanol, we need to examine ways to increase alternative fuels without reducing arable land use for farming.

Mr. Chairman, there is a small company back home in my district in Texas, Biodiesel Industries, and they have discovered how to make biodiesel from a variety of feedstock. Yes, they use the usual soybean and sunflower oils, but they also manufacture it from recycled restaurant grease, and we have got an abundance of recyclable restaurant grease in the DFW area.

Biodiesel Industries runs a Fry Oil to Fuel program which recycles used vegetable oils into biodiesel. Over 130 restaurants, schools, businesses and large kitchens in the metroplex have signed up to participate. Small restaurant owners typically have to pay for a grease collection or simply throw it away, but as part of the Fry Oil to Fuel program, both the recycling service

and the collection container are provided at no cost.

Large companies, on the other hand, often have contracts with animal feedlots, which could increase the risk of illnesses such as Bovine Spongiform Encephalosis and other animal neurologic diseases. If the grease goes into landfills, it creates methane, which we know is a potent greenhouse gas, much more potent than carbon dioxide. That landfill methane can be captured and used to create electricity, which is what Bioindustries does, but most often this methane is just simply vented into the atmosphere. If the grease goes into feedlots, it creates what we could politely refer to as bovine methane, again, a potent source of greenhouse gasses.

Putting that grease to work as part of our fuel supply helps to increase our energy supply here at home and could actually help to clean up our air.

This is not just happening in my district in north Texas. There are other facilities around the country doing this very same type of biodiesel protection.

The American Jobs Creation Act provided an agri-biodiesel tax credit of \$1 per gallon for biodiesel from virgin agricultural production, and 50 cents per gallon for biodiesel from recycled grease through 2006. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 extended these credits through 2008.

My amendment would simply double the tax rate for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease from 50 cents to \$1 a gallon, making it financially comparable to those from virgin agricultural sources. The text is identical to H.R. 6354, which I introduced at the close of the 109th Congress.

I believe this issue is of paramount importance. We must encourage our citizens and our entrepreneurs to think outside the box in reducing our reliance on foreign energy.

I want to thank my friend and colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for his support on this amendment, both in the Rules Committee yesterday as well as speaking so eloquently in support of the rule today.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on my reserved point of order.

I would make the point that this amendment is not germane to the committee's substitute made in order under the rule. It would be more appropriate to have it in the Committee on Ways and Means, because there is a tax provision.

Again, the amendment concerns matters not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is not germane.

The bill addresses research demonstration and development of certain fuels. Specifically, it addresses biofuel activities, sulfur content of diesel fuels and reference standards for biofuels. The bill was referred to and reported by the Committee on Science and Technology. The amendment seeks to increase a Federal income tax credit, a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1315

One of the fundamental principles of germaneness is that the amendment must confine itself to matters within the jurisdiction of the committee with jurisdiction over the underlying bill. The bill is within the sole jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology. The amendment contains matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The amendment is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CANTOR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANTOR:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL FINDING.

The Congress also finds that in order to lessen United States dependence on foreign sources of petroleum, and decrease demand for petroleum in aircraft, such as passenger planes with 42 business class seats capable of transcontinental flights, the Nation must diversify its fuel supply for aircraft to include domestically produced alternative fuels.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I reserve the right to object as well, Mr. Chairman. We have not seen a copy of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, today's debate on H.R. 547 ultimately is about finding ways for our Nation to reduce its dependence on petro fuels. I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman, one in response to an issue that has caught the attention of the American people and is being wildly reported in the press. The subject of this report in the amendment is the request by the office of the Speaker for the use of a luxury jetliner.

Today, the New York Post cleverly questioned the "Airogance," that is A-I-R, of a request to use a \$22,000-an-hour taxpayer-funded luxury jetliner to fly the Speaker from coast to coast.

While citing security concerns, a request was made by the Office of the Speaker for a plane that, according to the Air Force, has a game room, a stateroom, entertainment center, bedroom, shower, and seats 42 to 50 people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hardly think these amenities help with security, and I personally would describe them at the very least as inappropriate and an unnecessary extravagance.

Again, H.R. 547 is about finding ways to shift our Nation's patterns of fuel consumption. We hear a lot of talk about doing everything we can to achieve energy independence. And there is a lot of talk as well about stopping global warming. In this context, Mr. Chairman, these reports and the underlying request by the Office of the Speaker is an extravagance of power. It is something that, frankly, the taxpayers won't swallow. And I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on my reserved point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane to the committee substitute made in order under the rules. The amendment contains a different subject matter than the intent of H.R. 547.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman continuing to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise today in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Virginia. We are discussing a very important issue that faces all Americans today, and that is making America energy independent.

As part of that goal, as part of that goal we must have energy conservation. Everyday somebody comes to the floor and talks about energy conservation.

There is another aspect to making America energy independent, and that is the aspect of fiscal responsibility. We have a program here today, it may be a very worthy program, but it costs money. How do we pay for it? You cannot be energy independent and support programs represented by the underlying bill unless you have the fiscal responsibility to pay for them. And that is why, Mr. Chairman, recent actions of our Speaker are most curious.

According to CNN, the Speaker's office has now requested that the military provide her with a luxury jet that seats 42 business class seats according to CNN, a fully enclosed stateroom according to CNN, an entertainment center, a private bed, state-of-the-art communications system, and a crew of 16.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to tell the American people that we are going to be energy independent, you have to lead by example. You have to have a culture that says, yes, we are going to do things to conserve energy.

Now, somebody has brought up the aspect of security. That is a legitimate issue. But how come our previous Speaker, according to CNN, used a smaller jet, consuming far less fuel, that seated 12, not 42, and didn't have the requested fully enclosed stateroom, entertainment center, private bed, state-of-the-art communications center, and a crew of 16? Again, Mr. Chairman, you have to lead by example.

I also noticed recently that our Speaker was critical of the President

when it came to the issue of global warming. She was quoted as saying in the Boston Globe: "The signs of global warming and its impact is overwhelming and unequivocal." And in criticizing the President she said: "It is not just about what he says; it is about what he does."

So now we have the Speaker telling us, number one, we are going to have a Congress that is fiscally responsible, and we have the Speaker telling us that we have to be concerned about global climate change and energy conservation. Let's look at the fiscal responsibility aspect of this.

According to the D.C. Examiner, now a flight from the Nation's Capital to her hometown of San Francisco is going to cost \$300,000. Now, any one of our constituents can go on line to Expedia.com and make the same trip for \$300. Okay, well, again, maybe there is some legitimate security concerns, but do we need the 42 business class seats, a fully enclosed stateroom, an entertainment center, private bed, state-of-the-art communications system, and a crew of 16? How is that leading by example? How is that an example of this Democratic Congress's commitment to fiscal responsibility and energy conservation? I don't think it is.

So why is the Speaker requesting this? Well, according to the Washington Times, it says that she is seeking regular military flights not only for herself and her staff, but also for relatives and for other members of the California delegation. That is according to the Washington Times.

According to CNN, just recently she asked the use of the military plane to attend a retreat in Williamsburg, Virginia, that is a 2-hour drive from Washington, D.C.

Now, this plane that she wants costs \$15,000 an hour. How many gallons of fuel is that consuming? How do we come forth to the American people and say let's pass a bill for energy conservation, and then we have this waste? I don't understand it, Mr. Chairman.

And now apparently there is a new wrinkle here. We understand from the San Francisco Chronicle that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) when asked about this said, and referring to the Pentagon: "I don't need to pressure them. I just tell them what they need to do," in dealing with this request to the military for this luxury plane.

Apparently he was further quoted in CNN, ABC, and the San Francisco Chronicle that "the Pentagon made a mistake in leaking information," quote, "since she decides on the allocations for the Department of Defense."

This is not conservation. It is not fiscal responsibility. Let's support the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Texas continuing to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his reservation.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the key principles of leadership is to lead by example, and the leader of this House, Speaker PELOSI, has moved us to restrict access to executive jets, as she should have. She has also moved to institute new spending controls for the Congress and for the government, as she should have. And she has moved to reduce our impact on the environment, especially man's effect on climate change, as she should.

I agree with each of these priorities. But the Speaker's staff request to upgrade her military domestic taxi service from a small plane that was offered to Speaker HASTERF for 12 passengers and a crew of five, to a major airliner with 45 passengers and a crew of 16 appears to be extravagant, appears to expand the Congress's excess to executive jets, appears to remove any spending controls from our operations, and dramatically increases our impact on the environment, especially climate change.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a major airliner costing over \$10,000 an hour to fly is an extravagance that is beyond the Speaker's status as third in line to succeed the President under our plan in the Constitution and in procedure for the continuity of government.

In fact, the Department of Defense has ruled that since the Speaker has never become the President of the United States in the 220 years of our country's history, that the continuity of government plan does not include providing 24/7 military taxi service within the domestic United States, carrying family, other Members of Congress, staff, and supporters to both political and official events.

Now, we know that jetliners emit a large amount of greenhouse gases, and we know that this aircraft costs millions of dollars, and we know that the Congress has dramatically restricted the access of executive jets to everyone else, but the Speaker.

I might inject a point of common sense here that the Speaker's staff has said that, for security reasons, she must have unlimited access to an aircraft at the 89th Military Airlift Wing like this one.

And I may point out that in my experience of watching public officials move through airports, a figure like Senator OBAMA or Senator McCAIN attracts a much larger crowd than one for the Speaker. I might think that if we have to offer a military taxi service to the Speaker, we would also have to offer one to the fourth in line for the Presidency, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

How much will this cost? How much in greenhouse gases will it emit? And last and not least, what sort of example does it send as a leader who is advocating all of these other policies that, in the operation of her own staff and her own offices, she is not following those principles?

For that reason, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, our Speaker loves to fly and it shows. Today, we are debating a key provision in this important bill before us, the first open rule of the 110th Congress. We are glad that the majority could get around to it in the second month we are here.

But today it is important that we discuss a revolution in biofuels, an idea that we can look at ways to relieve the burden of global warming.

□ 1330

We know the Democratic majority is very focused on researching this idea of global warming, the idea that fossil fuels are warming the Earth and that the burning of fossil fuels are warming the Earth.

It is ironic that the highest officer of this body seeks a large jet to fly across country that could seat 42 people, perhaps some of the Speaker's friends and allies and supporters, some here in this body, some, oh, perhaps downtown, large contributors, I am not sure, although that has been denied by the Speaker in the request for those people to fly along, this plane, that are contributors and campaign supporters.

But let us talk today about a few important provisions. After the Speaker made a promise to the American people that they would be the most ethical Congress ever and after including the ban on the use of corporate jets in her lobbying reform bill, Speaker PELOSI asked for carte blanche access to one of the most extravagant and luxurious airliners in the military arsenal. It seats 42 people and has an office. It has a bedroom. Plenty of her cronies could fly along.

But the Speaker decided she, her family, her friends, her staff, her Democratic friends from California deserved to fly in style. This is not a matter of security, Mr. Chairman. It is a matter of, well, whatever is convenient for the Speaker as an individual.

But this is a bullet point to a larger value for this Democrat majority. It is about the Democrats' abuse of power since they have taken office just a short month ago, and it began when this Speaker denied minority rights to Republicans and continued with Tunagate which the Speaker, throwing a sop to her home constituents headquartered in her district, allowed American Samoa to be exempt from the minimum wage bill. Now they are seeking a matter of personal convenience and luxury.

Well, I believe the Speaker deserves security, not luxury; security, not convenience. As the New York Post reported today, the conventional view is that emissions of carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, are a major factor in global warming, and the jet PELOSI is demanding produces more than 10,000 pounds of carbon dioxide per hour, far more than the commuter plane the previous Speaker used.

If the Speaker is so concerned about global warming, maybe the Speaker should consider the same mode of transportation her colleagues took to the retreat this past weekend. They took a train.

It is very important that this House debate this important provision that the Speaker's request from the American military, and I think it is important that we discuss in terms of our research that we are trying to put forward on new fuels, new forms of transportation, new modes of powering our economy, and in terms of the global warming debate that is a large issue the American people are concerned about.

Let us talk about this luxury airliner and let us see what my Democrat colleagues say about the Speaker using it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in support of the Cantor amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia for bringing this amendment.

As we look at the overall atmosphere that is here, and not just the atmosphere in this Congress, Mr. Chairman, but in the atmosphere up above and on this Earth, and we see the effort that is coming, this strong effort, to address global warming.

Now, I am not one of those strong proponents of those kinds of efforts; I want to make that clear. I do not think the science is there, but I do look at how this Congress has started, how it was going to be the most open Congress in history, and it has now been opened up today, and I appreciate that.

We understand the issue that had to do with minimum wage and the Tunagate issue, and now here we are a judgment issue, a judgment issue of the small plane that Speaker Hastert had was plenty big enough for a very big man and the entourage that he needed to provide his security, and yet now here we have a request for a plane that I see is 42 business class seats, 16 staff people that consumes \$300,000 for a round trip.

The statistics that I have are \$22,000 an hour, \$22,000 an hour. Mr. Chairman, that is more money than many of my constituent families make in a year. Well, let us just say that \$22,000 an hour is that amount. Then how many people, how many families does it take to earn enough to pay for a year of this plane flying back and forth from Washington to the west coast every single week? So I use 50 weeks, added the math up, its overall costs by those numbers is \$15 million annually for this big plane to bounce back and forth and to be able to load all of the family and the supporters, the staff, perhaps other Members, constituents, who knows who might be on that plane, \$15 million.

Now, how hard is it to pay \$15 million out of the Federal Treasury? Well, if we took all of the revenue of the income of those families that I reference, Mr. Chairman, those families at \$22,000

a year, it would take 682 families to earn enough revenue just to pay to fly the Speaker back and forth so she could be with her family on the weekends in San Francisco.

That lays out what is happening here in my mind, and I take us back to that place near enough to Hollywood that I can reference it. Many of the people in Hollywood that have been flying around on private jets and driving around in big SUVs have been called to task for their positions promoting an effort to stop global warming, but the hypocrisy of riding in those SUVs and flying in private jet planes. Now, the pressure has gotten great enough that I do not know that Hollywood has actually seen the conflict between their public position on policy and their actual practice when they climb in the SUV or get on their private jet.

But the public does know that Prince Charles of Great Britain has recognized the conflict, and he has been flying in private jets for years; but this year, he is taking the step that he is flying commercial, not because he is not a very intense individual that is a high-risk target.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would invite the Speaker of the House down to this floor to answer these important questions. I think this would be something the body would appreciate. I think that would be a very helpful proposition, if the Speaker of this Chamber comes to the floor to answer these questions.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman and my statement then would be, I also offer that same invitation.

I would say if it is good enough for Prince Charles, it should be good enough for the imperial Pelosi regime.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of my colleague's amendment from Virginia on three points: conservation, fiscal responsibility, and example.

Those of us on our side of the aisle from time to time are criticized, perhaps correctly or incorrectly, on our lack of appreciation of conserving fuels when it comes to driving cars, buses, trains, airplanes. I have had amendments in the past that would seek to try to educate Americans how they can drive their own personal automobiles smarter, in ways to use less gasoline. Not only would that help them in the pocketbook but also help the environment.

This is a clear overreach from a standpoint of conservation because the jets available to the Speaker, she should make the most appropriate selection of that jet to accommodate not only her safety. Clearly, that is an important mission for this to be consid-

ered, but also take into consideration the operating characteristics of the airplanes that she wants to fly in.

So the selection of a 757, however it is configured, we have already paid for that configuring and somebody in the Air Force decided that they needed that particular configuration, and I am not questioning that, but the 757 itself is clearly too large an airplane to carry one person, the Speaker, to and from her district.

The fiscal responsibility stands on its face. It does not take a CPA to understand that an operating cost of \$22,000 per hour versus the operating cost of a G-5, which is in the \$5,000 range, that \$17,000 an hour differential is being paid for by somebody.

Well, in my mind, that somebody is a taxpayer in west Texas. That taxpayer is probably working morning tower on a Parker drilling rig or a Patterson UTI drilling rig, going to work at eleven o'clock at night working till seven o'clock the next morning, trying to pay his taxes, in addition to feeding his family and providing for them.

That is who I think is going to pay the \$17,000 when I look at the option of the \$5,000 G-5 versus the \$22,000 757.

The last point I want to make is that of example. All of us are in leadership positions. All 435 Members of this House are leaders in one small way or another. We lead our own offices, and we set the example of the way we conduct ourselves. If I conduct myself one way, my staff, in all likelihood, is going to mimic that. They are going to do what I do and hopefully maybe learn from my example. I think the same thing will happen here.

When the leader of this House, by her example, says money is no object, cost is no object, if for whatever we are trying to do, that is not a consideration to be considered when you look at decisions that have to be made.

Now cost does not drive every single decision; but where I grew up, most of the folks in District 11, that is one of the questions that gets asked whenever we are trying to make a decision, how much is that going to cost, because in our own mind we make a quick cost-benefit analysis between the benefits that we seek versus those costs. If we can get those benefits for a lower cost, then I can assure you most folks in District 11 will opt for the lower cost to get those same benefits.

So the benefits that we want is the Speaker being able to go to and from her district safely with the security folks that she needs to have on the plane. Beyond that I am not sure why we should be flying folks back and forth on this jet; but if there are empty seats in that smaller jet, I do not begrudge any of my Democrat colleagues from California wanting to ride back and forth. That is fine. As I make the stop in Dallas or Houston and wait for the next leg of my flight or I have missed that next leg of flight, I will not begrudge the fact that they are flying nonstop to San Francisco. That is fine.

So safety of the Speaker, clear, that has got to be done, but we also ought to do it in a cost-effective manner. So if she is leading from the top, with her tone from the top being that money is no object, whatever it takes to have something done that she wants done, that needs to be done, we are not going to consider costs, then I think that will percolate throughout her staff and the Democrat side of this institution, and the fiscal responsibility that they laid claim to throughout the campaign last year and they are trying to lay claim to in this Congress I think is called into question.

So I support my colleague's amendment and urge a vote "yes" in favor of it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cantor amendment. We all had campaigns this last November, and my opponent kept calling the 109th Congress the do-nothing Congress, and I want to officially name the 110th Congress as the smoke-and-mirror Congress.

We have consistently heard from the other side about the minimum wage and the average American. We have heard about global warming. In fact, I think the Speaker even testified today on global warming, and yet we see the abuse of power that is going on here in the fact that we have not been through regular order on a lot of the bills that have passed here, especially in the first 100-hour program.

We were going to have a 5-day work week which I am not sure that we have had one yet. We are going to be productive in the fact that we are flying up here and all Members, all 435 Members in this body have to fly back up here on Mondays to vote on naming a post office or wishing somebody a happy birthday, rather than being at home with our constituents and our families.

Now, I have learned something else today or over the last couple of days that evidently the 757 is the smallest aircraft we have that can haul one person. It seems to be that the military would have some sort of other plane that could haul one person to California that would be more fuel efficient, take less than a 16-person crew and cost less than \$22,000 an hour.

I am very fortunate in I live in Georgia and I live about 45 minutes from the world's busiest airport in Atlanta, and so I can actually leave Reagan and get home in about a 3-hour period of time. I am very fortunate.

But I have flown home with many Members, my fellow Members in this House, some of them are going to Atlanta to fly on to Oklahoma or on to Texas, even had one colleague that was going on to California, having to stop in Atlanta. We are not all fortunate to have nonstop flights to our district.

I fly many times with Mr. MILLER from Florida or Mr. Ross from Arkansas or others that have to make stops and have to make transfers of planes, that have to sit in middle seats.

□ 1345

We don't get to eat chocolate. We can have our choice of some crackers or peanuts. We don't have a crew of 16 at our disposal.

So as we sit in those middle seats because of the last-minute time that we have to catch a flight, many of us might think that, you know, we need someone to lead us by example. So I would call on the Speaker to lead by example, to put some meaning into the things that I have heard being said from the other side of the House.

You know, I keep hearing the word "bipartisan," I see people's lips moving. I hear these words coming out of their mouths. I just haven't seen any action on it.

I keep hearing the word "conservation." I hear the word, I see the lips moving, but I don't know if this is a good example of being a conservationist with our fuel and with our air quality.

I keep hearing "being compassionate," haven't seen it. So there are a lot of things that I think can be done by a leader by setting an example.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just like to ask that somebody step up to the plate and lead by example.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The gentleman from Georgia has been talking about examples. Well, let me give you an example, we just heard about whining, whining about chocolate and whining about tobacco. Here we are trying to give you an example about leading, about doing something about this country's very, very, very major problem with global warming and with alternative energy and energy dependency.

Let me tell you what, I have just been through 3 hours of a hearing, 3 hours, where representatives of the IPCC, which represents 113 nations including the United States, came before us and said after 5 years of study, 30,000 comments, 600 scientists; they made a recommendation, and that recommendation was that with 100 percent certainty, there is global warming, and with 90 percent certainty, human action is making it worse.

Today, our example is trying to do something about that. Today, we have the first bill on this floor to deal with alternative energy, to deal with making our Nation energy independent. So this is an example of us trying to move forward.

It is a bipartisan bill, and I might remind the gentleman that when, after 9/11, when Speaker HASTERT was the first to be given transportation for security reasons, I don't think anybody over there complained. I don't think anybody over here complained.

When the President of the United States, George Bush, said that it is a matter of security, we didn't hear anybody complain; when the Department of Defense has also given a ruling on this, that again what is available will

be available for the person who is the second-ranking person to be President of the United States.

Now, if Speaker PELOSI is going to be attacked here on this floor for eating chocolate or anything else, you can imagine what more serious people might be doing. So, yes, this is an example today. We have an example of, if we want to, on a bipartisan basis do something about global warming.

Let me tell you, we talk about 10 years from now, maybe. Or is it 20 years? Sometimes you can say, well, to have a serious problem with global warming, it might be 30 years or 50 years. Well, that is not hypothetical. I have a 5-year-old daughter. Some of you probably have young children or young grandchildren. If any of them were born in this century, in all likelihood, they are going to live till the end of this century. They are going to inherit a much different world.

So this is real. So I think now the time is to lead by example. Let us do something about this. We have a good bill on the floor. This is our example. You can have whatever example you want.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. I do rise on the point of conservation and pointing out some conservation. You know, it is amazing to me to hear all of this talk that we have about global warming. But you know what, the debate that we are having here just points out, Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between conservationists and environmentalists, and this is one of the debates that points this out. Conservationists walk the walk. Environmentalists talk about it, but they do not walk the walk.

You know, I remember, I appreciate so much the gentleman from Tennessee's comments about global warming and the threat that is there. Well, you know what? I am old enough to remember having been in high school in the 1960s, and I remember in the early 1970s, going into college where we were all going to freeze to death.

We were going to freeze to death. It was on the cover of every magazine out there. We had an Ice Age that was coming. I was scared to death. I thought, my goodness, I will never be able to have children, watch them grow up, because we are going to be living in igloos.

Well, but you know what? It did not happen, and now we find out, guess what, 100 years ago, they thought they had a warming cycle; or they did, they documented it. Then we find out that the rises and falls in temperatures of this great Earth are cyclical. It is there, and, yes, it is rising a little bit right there. But in 1969 and 1970 and 1971, the Ice Age was coming, and there was scientific proof.

You know, at Energy and Commerce Committee last year, we had some great hearings. We talked about the

fallacy of the hockey stick theory. We discussed that. We heard testimony, and we can have all of our community of scientists who are trying to serve the purpose of validating one another's theories, but not wanting to go back and use the evidence from 100 years ago, and it just proves the point, as is often said on this floor, you are entitled to your opinion, but you are not entitled to a different set of facts, and that is the truth.

You know, it is of tremendous concern, on a day when we are talking about the environment, that we do have an example being brought forth that would be spending, not only \$22,000 an hour, but would be spending a lot in emissions, in gases. This is something that does deserve to be discussed, Mr. Chairman.

I tell you what, we have named this, we have talked about this being the hold-on-to-your-wallet Congress, and for every hour that our friends across the aisle are in charge, they are racking up, not thousands and millions, but moving to billions. Hold on to your wallet because of what they are choosing to spend the taxpayers' hard-earned money on.

It is of great concern to me, when I read reports that are coming out of all sorts of papers and news organizations about how this is coming to be, people returning to smoke-filled rooms, picking up the phones, calling, saying, this is the way it ought to be done.

Mr. Chairman, it is of great concern to me, I think for those of us who are conservationists, who want to be certain that we leave this Earth a better place than we found it. We are wise to stand and to question the bill and to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to identify a little bit with my colleague from Georgia who was here talking about this being the smoke-and-mirrors Congress. There are so many things being talked about that aren't true. Today, I was speaking with one of my constituents at home from Wilkes County, Angela Henley. The issue of airplanes came up, and she said to me, you know, I think the officials should adopt the principle to lead by example and not by extravagance. I said, you know, these are the kinds of things, this is the reason we ought to be going home more instead of spending all this time we are spending in Washington.

The majority party wants people to believe that you have got to be in Washington, because that is where all the wisdom of the world is. But I think it is this Beltway mentality that gets us in trouble all the time, and gets people to thinking that we as Members of Congress are here to be served, not to serve.

I said here this morning in opening remarks that I am very troubled by this whole affair. I came here to serve the people of the Fifth District of

North Carolina. I don't think that we are supposed to be treated like kings and queens.

We came here to do the work of the people. It is called the people's House, and I think it is very important that we do that.

What is happening is, the mentality of the majority party is that all the wisdom of the world is in Washington, D.C., the only work that gets done is in Washington, D.C. We should be here 5 days a week, not be in our district with the average American citizen.

Well, you lose track of what the average American citizen is dealing with. That is why I thought Angela Henley's comments were so brilliant today when I talked to her.

Again, elected officials should adopt the principle to lead by example and not by extravagance. That is the message that needs to be sent. That is not the message that is being sent by the majority party and by the Speaker in her example.

What we need to be doing is we need to make sure we are doing what is right by the American people and not putting additional burdens on them by adding costs.

The other thing I want to mention is, there has been a lot made about the fact that the Department of Defense has approved this. This was a headline in yesterday's paper saying the appropriators are going to get out of the departments what they want by twisting the arms of the various departments and agencies. And we all know that there is a close relationship between some of the appropriators and the Speaker, and I have no doubt that the appropriators are going to get from the departments what it is they want from them, to justify anything at all that they want to justify whether it is extravagant or not.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Interesting, Mr. Chairman, the report of this amendment has reached the White House. I would like to report to you the official statement from the White House just given by Tony Snow.

Quoting Mr. Snow, "This is a silly story. I think it's been unfair to the Speaker. What happened in the wake of September 11 is the Department of Defense in order to protect the Speaker began offering aircraft to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, did it with Representative Hastert, doing so with Speaker Pelosi.

"We think it's important that the Speaker of the House enjoy the same kind of security that we arranged for Speaker Hastert in the wake of September 11. And like I said, I think that there's been a lot of overhyped reporting on this."

I certainly concur with Mr. Snow. This is a silly story. We have a chance to get on to serious business. To put this to rest, as the author of this bill, and as the chairman of the Science

Committee from which it came, we want to accept this amendment and allow this country then to get on to the serious business of trying to do something about alternative fuels.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you so much, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The question is, if we want to combat global warming, why should we, as an institution, allow one person to use a 737 for a \$300,000 transcontinental flight? That is the question I pose to the Science Committee, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1400

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time and give it to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Thank you for that commentary, and I think the White House has given you the answer. If you would like for me to read it to you again. As I heard BARNEY FRANK say here one time, I can read it to you, but I can't understand it for you. But I would be happy to read it to you again:

"This is a silly story, and I think it's been unfair to the Speaker. What happened in the wake of September 11 is that the Department of Defense, in order to protect the Speaker, began offering aircraft to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; did it with Representative Hastert, doing so with Speaker Pelosi. We think it's important that the Speaker of the House enjoy the same kind of security that we arranged for Speaker Hastert in the wake of September 11. And, like I said, there has been a lot of overhype in reporting this story."

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman mentioning me. I just want to explain, I hadn't really expected to be here, but as I was walking by, I thought I heard someone yelling, The plane, boss, the plane, and I wanted to come in and see what was happening.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is really one of my heroes on the floor, and I really appreciate and respect his sense of humor.

With that, the silliness in this that I see is the silliness when about a year ago, during the height of the energy crunch, a member of the Kennedy clan, who was not a Member of Congress, flew to New York on his private jet to talk about conservation of energy and global warming. It reminds me of the silliness of those who ride in limousines to and from their dinner engagements while whining about mothers using SUVs to drive. That is the type of silliness that I see in this debate. It isn't just about having a plane for security, it is the opulence of the plane that is at discussion.

But I have got to tell you, I see something deeper in this than the type of plane, and that is comments published in the San Francisco Chronicle, made by the subcommittee chairman of Appropriations on Defense such as: "Don't need to put pressure on them, just tell them what they need to do." This gentleman is the one that has been bidding for our Speaker on what type of plane.

Then when this became a story, mentioned also, I guess, with some sort of pride that was also quoted in many newspapers, CNN, San Francisco Chronicle, reminding the Defense Department that it is them that will make the decisions on appropriations, leaving the insinuation that if the correct plane is not given to the Speaker, that they will cut the Defense Department.

Now, I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in our Chamber, and I would yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to explain which part of the defense budget he intends to cut or not appropriate if she does not get this specific plane that she wants.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr. TERRY. I am sorry. I yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. My remarks are to the Chair. I am yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to answer the colloquy that I put forward to him.

I see the gentleman is not moving.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, isn't it customary that after a minority speaker speaks, then you go to the majority side?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members, I have sat in my office and got caught up on a lot of work and I was listening to the debate, and I guess I am concerned about the tenor of the debate because I am serving in this Congress and I am in my eighth term, one term in the majority, the last 12 years in the minority, and I have never seen a display of what we are seeing on the floor today.

Because I served with Speaker HASTERT and many speakers, and it is frustrating to see this activity. My concern is what we are portraying to the American people. And I think the chairman of the Science Committee pointed out the White House statement on the use of the plane.

I was here on the floor after 9/11, and I know that not one Member on the Democratic side questioned whether Speaker HASTERT needed the security, needed a nonstop to his district. And I think that is far beyond anything we should be considering.

I want to save energy, although I have to admit, I have a district where

we produce a lot, and I am glad people use it. But I also know that we have more important things in this House to do than to pick at one person who happens to be the Speaker of the House. I could go back and find lots of things from former Speakers of the minority party and talk about it, but again, we didn't do that. I didn't, and I don't remember any of my colleagues doing it. But I also know that if we are going to seriously be legislators, then we need to pass this bill.

I was concerned with some of the amendments that were brought up earlier literally by members of my Energy and Commerce Committee that were not germane because their amendments would have been germane if this had been an Energy and Commerce bill, but it is not. It is a Science bill. That is why I think if we are serious about dealing with global warming, more efficiency in fuel, there are lots of ways we can do it. I know the Science Committee is doing their job, and I know the Energy and Commerce Committee will; and if there are tax issues that need to be dealt with, I know the Ways and Means Committee will deal with it.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I would hope we would realize that the actions today do not reflect good on the House itself.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) to H.R. 547. I also rise to support H.R. 547, Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. It is a good bill. And I am on the Science Committee, and it did pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. Chairman, I was also at the hearing this morning that lasted 3 hours on the Science Committee with my chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee. And we were honored to have the Speaker of the House of Representatives testify before that committee. Well, this is a historic opportunity. She was received with a great deal of respect and certainly respect by me.

She testified; I don't disagree with any of her testimony. She talked about global warming and the concern that she has for our young children and the environmental debt that has to be paid at some point in the future. Unfortunately, her schedule did not permit time to take questions, maybe a couple, from the Members of the Science Committee. Maybe one question that should have been asked if we had that opportunity is how about the economic debt that we would have to pay if we do something draconian when all these other countries, especially countries like China and India, are totally ignoring it, and they are going to continue to pollute the environment.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Virginia brings is about the concern with continuing to produce carbon dioxide, and yes, polluting the environment, and jet fuel is a big problem, a big contributor to

that. I commend the chairman for accepting the amendment, and I think we should do that unanimously. Maybe the Speaker would like to come down on the floor and take as much time as she would like and talk about her support for this. But the Speaker has made a mistake in requesting a jet plane far beyond what the previous Speaker had.

I don't disagree that she should have the same security as the previous Speaker; we are not arguing that point. Mistakes can be made like Tunagate; the Speaker may not have known about that. And she was smart enough to call a press conference and say we are going to correct that, she should be smart enough to hold a press conference and correct this.

Mr. WEINER. I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this can't possibly be the best they have got. This can't be. I cannot imagine that a party that governed for the last 12-some-odd years, who had a Congress that met less days than the do-nothing Congress, who wasted billions of dollars in the Iraq war doing no oversight, drove up the deficit to record heights, wasted homeland security funds, it can't possibly be that the best that party has is to now devote an afternoon talking about the security arrangements for the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Well, let's talk a little bit about what we have. Putting aside for a moment, which apparently is what the other side wants, putting aside for a moment the bill we are here to debate, which is a way to improve energy programs with existing infrastructure, and I can guarantee my colleagues will be lining up to take advantage of that program, we have, in the first 100 hours of this Congress, raised the minimum wage; we have lowered the cost of people to send their children to college; we have implemented the 9/11 Commission Report. We have moved through an agenda with efficiency to get things done for the American people, and now my colleagues on the other side want to have an argument with the White House over the appropriate arrangements for the Speaker.

Now, look, I am sure that my good friends on the other side are so detached from reality that they think this is what the American people want to work on. This is a party that squandered the leadership that they had. Now the Republic Party is in the minority for the foreseeable future. The Republic Party is so completely bankrupt of any ideas of their own, they have taken to bringing up 3 hours of discussion and a debate between the White House and themselves about what kind of security the Speaker should have.

The Republic Party is the minority party not only for this reason, but this is one of them. And then to make it worse, the Members that the Republic Party sends over can't possibly be the

A team. This can't be the best. This can't be the most articulate, most informed voices of the Republic Party, can it? This is it.

I was in my office and I heard a Member of the Republic Party, and you will correct me, Mr. Chairman, if I am wrong, complaining that he had to sit in a middle seat. No, not a middle seat. Complaining that he had to eat peanuts on his flight. I don't even know what this is about.

Let me tell you what the American people are interested in. They are interested in the idea that, like Damocles' sword, global warming is now hanging over the head of all of us, all of us, Republican or Democratic, even the Republic Party must be concerned about that. We have had thousands of scientists that have reached a consensus—

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. I will certainly be glad to yield.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the Congressman from New York for yielding, but don't you think a jet that is a 757 and can seat 42 people, flying one person is contributing to global warming?

Mr. WEINER. Reclaiming my time, even those members of this panel, these scientists that took a look at global warming, global climate change, 90 percent of them, a record level of consensus, say that human causes are to blame.

We are not going to leave it to the Republic Party to solve this problem. They are in the minority. They are probably in the permanent minority if they are going to spend their time obsessing about security arrangements for the Speaker and disagreeing with the President of the United States' spokesman. But we are. NANCY PELOSI, this party is going to do something about global warming; we are not going to wait for the Republic Party to join in. Just the same way we said we were going to increase the minimum wage, the same way we said we were going to increase safety by implementing the 9/11 Commission Report, the same way we said we were going to reduce college costs for the American middle class and those striving to make it, that is what we are going to do.

You can have this debate all you want about the security arrangements for the Speaker, but we are going to go about doing the job of the American people. That is why the Democratic Party is in charge, not the Republic Party.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

It is always interesting hearing from my friend from New York.

You know, we are about solutions, we try to be about solutions; that is what this body ought to be about. And I would humbly submit that if we were to set up windmills surrounding the Capitol, I believe there is enough hot air that comes out of this place that we could offset all the losses of energy

from an extravagant plane that flies from here to California with lots of passengers and a gym or whatever all it has got on there; but I would actually like to talk about the bill that the amendment is addressing and come back to the amendment for a moment.

□ 1415

But I come from a district there in east Texas that is blessed with an abundance of natural resources. And not only do we have oil and gas, we have got coal, and we have some something that is so often overlooked called biomass. Some folks don't know what that is, but it can take all kinds of forms, and one of those forms is the pine tree. You cut down the pine tree, you take the center of it, use it for paper, pulp, plywood, all of these other things. And then there is all this waste that can generate energy.

But the use of biomass is a source of energy, it is necessary for domestic industry purposes and actually is being used in our timber and paper industries to defray rapidly increasing overhead costs.

Presently, the uncertainty of energy supplies and prices make it impossible for domestic industry to efficiently forecast operating costs or make credible plans for future capital expenditures. For example, the forest products industry is partially self-sufficient because they use some of the biomass to provide energy to produce what they do. The biomass fuels can include bark, scrap wood, wood residuals, wood extractives from the pulping process.

So necessary to maintain a manufacturing base in this country that will sustain a driving economy is the energy produced by biomass, and I think that can play a vital role.

It is not enough simply to have a source of energy. It is also necessary to have a means to deliver it. So we have also got to improve our ability to deliver a wide array of energy resources to consumers by addressing the infrastructures. This bill doesn't really address any of those. It is kind of a feel-good bill. Anything can help a little bit.

But in conclusion, I just submit, look, if we all pitch in a little bit, districts like mine that have energy, if you allow us to use CO<sub>2</sub>, maybe pump it in the ground, get the last bit of oil up, use biomass, convert it into energy, if we keep doing those sorts of things using alternative energy, I think eventually we can pay for all the waste and extravagance that we are already seeing coming from the Speaker's request.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to support this amendment. However, I will admit that it is rather more symbolic than substantive. And earlier this morning, Speaker PELOSI spoke before the Science Committee, as we have been reminded here during this debate. And during that testimony she declared her commitment to combat global warming. And that is a high priority.

Well, it is not then irrelevant for Members of Congress to call into question the seriousness of such public proclamations when personal choices are so extravagantly contradictory to those proclamations.

I am sorry. Speaker PELOSI, by commandeering a huge government plane for her personal transport to California, this is totally contradictory to the alarm bells that we heard her ringing in the Science Committee just a few hours ago.

And just for one, let me note that I certainly appreciate that Speaker PELOSI came to speak to us. And I certainly respect BART GORDON and the job that he did in putting together a very fine panel of witnesses for us. But I am personally a skeptic about global warming.

And let me just note that what we have here, after listening to the witnesses today, is the clear evidence that global warming and cooling have taken place in cycles throughout the history of the world. Right now, we are being told that this particular cycle is caused by human beings and how dangerous that is.

Well, let me note that even the witnesses today, the very witness that was showing how we can prove the Earth is warming on the chart, started his chart in 1850, which happened to be, by his own admission, the very end of a cooling period that had been going on for 500 years. So you start at the very low point and then you go to today and claim, oh, it is getting warmer. So what? You started at a low point.

Now, there is consensus that there is some warming going on, 1 degree over the last 30 years, supposedly. In reality, it is 1 degree over 100 years. And, yes, this is happening, but is it caused by human action? Even after hearing the witnesses today, I can't tell you that I don't believe, I still do not believe this is caused by human activity.

Now, why is this so important that we discuss this? Why is it important that we reject this alarmism? Because we are all now committed to an energy-independent America, and we are going to have to focus our energies and resources on developing new alternative sources of energy and technology that will make us independent of foreign oil.

And if we are alarmed by global warming and we are stampeded into focusing our efforts on something that is going to change a climate trend, instead of, for example, focusing on energy that will help clean the air at the same time, while making us independent, we are going to be making some bad decisions.

And who will be impacted by those decisions if we are stampeded by all of this alarmism about global warming? The people who will be better off are the researchers who have been getting grants by the billions of dollars over these years in order to claim that there is global warming. And I might add, there is plenty of evidence that researchers who are opposed to the global

warming theory have been cut off from research grants.

But who will be worse off? My children will be worse off. Your children and grandchildren will be worse off because we have not developed the technology aimed at cleaning the air and making us energy independent. Rather, we will have been stampeded into spending more money on useless research and money aimed at changing the climate trend of the planet, rather than on the health of the people of this planet. It makes no sense whatsoever.

If we are committed to energy independence, let's be serious about it. Conservation is part of the answer. And if Speaker PELOSI is serious, she should be serving as an example and not be doing things like commandeering a huge aircraft, which is enormously wasteful, to take her all the way to California.

And although this is symbolic, I think there is some substance here that does deserve to be commented on, so I am supporting this amendment.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last comment.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned by what I am hearing on the opposite side. And I understand fully the frustration of the American people, having listened to the leadership of this party for so many years distracting Americans from the real issues confronting us. And to hear them attack NANCY PELOSI, the Speaker of the House for using a private airplane to take her back and forth to California, and of that size, is just outrageous.

The truth of the matter is that this is the party that completely blocked the 9/11 recommendations that were so critical to the security of this Nation. This is the party that refused to make sure that all the cargo inside the belly of airplanes is inspected. And now, when we have the Speaker of the House, who is rightly concerned about security, using a plane to protect her, and it is absolutely critical that we have this, now they are standing up to speak about this.

I am also deeply concerned about the claim that we are not being effective on global warming, because the American people understand this. They have seen the data. They understand it. They want us to move forward in a bipartisan manner. And they want us to stop bickering.

And so I plead to all of us to stop the bickering. Let's move on with the legislation.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from New Hampshire for yielding because she of all people understands, coming from New Hampshire, that these issues of global climate change are not something that we can simply choose to do, what the other side is saying, which is ignore them for generations more and just hope for the best.

You were elected, and you came to this House saying that we are going to start getting things done. You said that we are going to reject the frivolous politics of the other side. We are not going to spend our time arguing over what the correct security protocols for the Speaker are going to be. We are going to focus on things that the American people really care about.

And I just want to ask you, has anyone stopped you on the streets in New Hampshire and asked you, expressed concern about global climate change?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. People in New Hampshire are deeply concerned; both parties, by the way, are deeply concerned about global warming. And they want us to get on with the job of taking care of this and not spending our time and the people's time. And we are on the payroll of the American people, arguing and quibbling about such minor issues as the airplane.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman further yield?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I thank the gentlelady.

And I would also say that I am sure that we are all very concerned about the security arrangements for the Speaker; and I think we would all agree, we want to do whatever is necessary, the same way none of us had any concerns when Speaker HASTERT got the protection.

But frankly, there are people that are working on that right now, and I think, and maybe you do as well; I will ask you. Do you agree with the statement of the White House that this is a silly issue that people are making too much of and that we should get back to the job of the country?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Reclaiming my time, yes. I absolutely agree that this is wasting our time. We are earning our paycheck from the American people, and we need to do the work of the American people.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman further yield?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I really do want to express my gratitude. The people of New Hampshire are very fortunate to have someone that came to Congress like you did. In your first 43 hours, you voted to raise the minimum wage, something that hadn't been done for years of neglect. You voted to make it less expensive for parents of New Hampshire to send their kids to school. You voted for a responsible continuing resolution that increased spending to put cops on the beat in New Hampshire.

You have, frankly, in your first several weeks here in the House, done more than your predecessors did for years and years because they were focused on issues like this on the other side. And I want to thank you for your service.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Reclaiming my time, I thank you and we intend to

continue to deliver to the American people what they have asked us to do.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings, or audible conversation, is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I am not going to take much time. I am very concerned about the fiscal responsibility that we should have. And I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent a lot of time defending the \$300,000 per trip that the Speaker is going to be spending flying back and forth to California. But I don't think the American people are going to understand how \$15 million a year is being spent for one person to fly back and forth to California.

The Speaker is a very important person. She is third in line to the presidency, but there are other ways to get out there that cost less. I think the plane the former Speaker used would cost about one-fifth or one-fourth of that.

And I don't think, no matter what the other side says, that the American people are going to buy \$1.2 million a trip for her to go to California or \$15 million a year for her to go back and forth to her district. It just won't wash, especially at a time like this when we are trying to get spending under control.

Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is one of those debates where you are sitting in your office and you are watching what has happened and you have no intention of coming down, and then you hear something said and you feel it is important to talk about that issue. That is how this strikes me, and I think it is important to set the record straight on some important points.

I don't think anybody on this side of the aisle challenges the importance of protecting the Speaker of the House and ensuring that she is secure. Indeed, that is a very important point to all people in the Nation. But that is not what this discussion is about.

I believe this discussion is about whether or not we are being asked to waste money, whether we are being asked, as has been articulated, to spend an extravagant amount of money, not to fly the Speaker and a few staff members, but to fly the Speaker and lots of staff members, plus family, plus other Members and who knows who. I think that is a legitimate issue to discuss here on the floor and an appropriate issue to discuss here on the floor.

One of the things that troubles me in this debate is that people say, well, we shouldn't be discussing this. I would like to invite my colleagues to think about the context in which this debate occurs. I would suggest that it is important to understand that when the

majority takes office and brings the first six bills to the floor under what is called a marshall law or some provision that says no amendments will be offered, and that is what happened here, you brought this under a rule or a provision that said we could offer no amendments to the minimum wage bill. Can't discuss it. Can't propose an alternate idea.

You then brought the 9/11 recommendations bill to the floor. No amendments. Not allowed. Can't discuss it. Can't offer your own ideas. At that point, in fact, you didn't even have a functioning Rules Committee.

□ 1430

You proceeded to bring many other important bills to the floor. The gentlewoman said that Republicans, in her view, didn't address the important issues, and yet your first six bills including minimum wage, stem cell, the 9/11 recommendations, student loans, energy, and Medicare prescription drugs, you bring to the floor, and you do not allow a single amendment by Republicans. And then you say, well, as soon as the 6 for '06 is over, we will allow amendments. We will go back to regular order.

But, in fact, that didn't turn out to be true. The seventh bill was the page board. Then the Pension Act, a very important bill that I thought was important for the Nation to pass, no amendments. Then the delegate bill. Finally, we get to bill nine, and you allow one amendment on that bill.

Then you come to the CR omnibus bill. On the CR omnibus bill that runs this government for the balance of the year and spends billions of dollars, how many amendments were the minority allowed? Absolutely none. And now you find it odd that we would want to engage in this debate right now.

As long as the rights of the minority are repressed by the majority so that we cannot do our job and represent the people of our district then you can expect this kind of exchange to occur on the floor.

And for my colleague from Texas who came to the floor and said he was disappointed in the level of debate, I would suggest that you look within yourself. If you repress debate, if you do not allow us to speak and address our issues, then we are going to use whatever tools we can.

I want to address another point that has been raised on the other side, and that is that the White House has said that it doesn't view this issue as all that significant or views it as "silly." Well, with all due respect to the White House, I respect Tony Snow and the White House's position on the issue; but, quite frankly, Tony Snow does not hold an election certificate and Tony Snow doesn't represent the taxpayers of Arizona. He does not have a duty, as I do, to come to this floor and to discuss the consequences for our taxpayers.

It seems to me that next week we are going to debate an issue of great importance to this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHADEGG. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this debate has gone on for a long time and my colleague is very eloquent in what he says.

Let me just say that I hope that Speaker PELOSI will take the time to come down and explain to the full House the reason why she thinks she should have \$15 million a year to fly back and forth to California. I think she could be very eloquent in explaining why the taxpayers should spend that much money, and I would like to hear what she has to say.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is important to understand the context in which each of these debates occur.

I agree with my colleagues on other side of the aisle who would say that this debate is not the central debate in America today, whether or not we spend an excessive amount of money to accommodate one Member of the Congress who ought to be protected. That is not exactly the most momentous moment or issue before the Nation right now.

But next week we will debate the war in Iraq. Next week we will debate the confrontation of this Nation with global terrorism. Next week we will debate the jihadis and their desire to destroy America and the importance of that fight.

Now, here is my concern: you on the other side of the aisle are concerned that we are making a big deal out of this issue. I would like to know if somebody on the other side of the aisle will promise me that next week you will have an open rule on the Iraq debate so that we can have a full discussion of all of the issues, because I welcome that debate. But what I fear, what I fear deeply is that we will not have an open rule next week. We will not have a reasonable opportunity to debate all of the alternatives.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHADEGG. If you will answer the question of whether or not there will be an open rule next week, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WEINER. Certainly.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will the gentleman vote for an open rule?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I have got to tell you something. I don't recall there being an open rule when we had the original vote on the war; do you, sir?

Mr. SHADEGG. All I know is we have been here so far almost 1½ months and we have been allowed, in 1½ months, one amendment. And it seems to me that you are frustrated with this debate and you want us to be discussing more important issues. It seems to me we ought to be discussing issues like

the importance of the war against global terror.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SHADEGG. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WEINER. I recall we were given an up-or-down vote without any opportunity for alternatives on the original war in Iraq, and I think we are going to have eight votes, and we have accepted this amendment, eight votes on various amendments to this bill. I think the lady doth protest too much.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will the gentleman answer the question I asked, though? Will there be an open rule in the debate on Iraq next week?

Mr. WEINER. I don't have any control over that. I think the gentleman is in scant position to protest when he himself was part of the leadership that said we couldn't have an open rule when we originally voted on this thing.

Mr. SHADEGG. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the Contract with America we offered to the minority 154 amendments. We had a functioning Rules Committee. Every bill in the Contract with America went through the standing committee process. Every bill went to the Rules Committee. The minority was entitled to bring amendments to, I think, all but two of those bills. This was our first effort. This was our first initiative to claim the attention of the American people.

We allowed the minority at that time to offer 154 amendments. And in that period, 48 of the minority's amendments were accepted. Now we have been here almost 1½ months, and we are being allowed the ability to amend only those bills on which there is no controversy.

I agree with the minority: the Speaker of the House should be protected. I agree with the minority that whether she is protected or not is an important issue for this Congress. But I do not agree that the minority isn't entitled to debate the expenditure of public funds, as we are doing here. I do not agree that this is an issue where, if the White House says it is a silly issue, we are not supposed to raise it. If that is the rule in this House, then I think there are a lot of things the White House is saying that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are challenging.

And it seems to me that if you are unhappy with this debate, then you need to look at the context in which this debate occurs. And I would suggest to you that next week when we begin a debate on the war in Iraq and a debate on the war against the jihadis who threaten our lives in America, who threaten world security, I only hope, I dearly hope, that you will give us an open rule or a rule that allows each of the alternatives to be debated, because if you don't do that, if you continue to repress the rights of the minority, then you are going to have to expect this kind of debate by us whenever we can

raise it. It is our duty to our constituents. It is our obligation.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some of us on this side of the aisle are not at all upset that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to debate this particular issue. We hope it goes on forever and that the American public is tuned in to watch just what motivates that side of the aisle.

The fact of the matter is that the debate that they are having is between them and the White House. When people ask that the Speaker come down to present a case as to why there should be protection of the Speaker of the House, they miss the point that the people motivating that are the White House, who decided after 9/11 that the Speaker of the House, then a Republican, Mr. HASTERT, should, in fact, have the kind of the security that Americans would expect for the person who is two heartbeats away from the Presidency of the United States and that the President in this instance is consistent in that, in believing that no matter what party is holding the Speaker of the House position ought to also have that protection.

I don't think that they can propose a safer way to get the Speaker from Washington to California and back so that she can conduct the considerable responsibilities of her position and get back to do those in a timely fashion other than to fly back and forth.

But because some of my friends on the other side of the aisle apparently still don't understand it and don't understand whom they are debating with, and I understand that sometimes it is difficult to understand what is coming out of the White House, but just one more time so that even they can get it, I would like to yield to my colleague from Tennessee and ask him to read once again the other side of the debate as presented by the President of the United States in his own words.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Once again from the White House: "This is a silly story. I think it's been unfair to the Speaker."

And let me tell you what else is silly. It is silly for the party that inherited the biggest surplus in our Nation's or world's history and then turned it into a deficit, the biggest deficit in history, to come in here and try to be fiscally conservative.

And let me tell you what is even more silly about that. What is even more silly about that is they have a silly amendment that has been accepted; yet they want to continue to talk about the silly amendment, pretending to be fiscally conservative, although it is costing the American taxpayer to keep this RECORD going even though this amendment, silly amendment, has been accepted. And that is what is silly about this.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, re-claiming my time, I am not going to

take too much longer except to say that I for one hope that they continue to debate this silly amendment that has already been accepted, that the American public tunes in so they understand exactly what is going on here and they reconfirm the reason why the majority has shifted to this party that is now in the majority of the House.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I have only been here a few terms. We are operating under an open rule, is that correct?

Mr. TIERNEY. Yes, to the gentleman. We are operating under an open rule, which, I think, equals the number of times that the other majority of the last session had open rules during their entire session.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would further yield, I think it is a reasonable expectation, when we have open rules in the future and we are all done debating security arrangements for the Speaker, I do not know what our colleagues are going to be talking about. I mean, they had months and months and months of leadership in the Republic Party to generate virtually nothing but standstill. Many of the people that are here on the floor from the Republic Party were shot down continually when they came to the floor trying to cut out wasteful spending. More wasteful spending happened under their leadership than, frankly, anytime in history.

The Republic Party showed such an inability to govern this country that they were vanquished into the minority arguably for the foreseeable future. The Republic Party was repudiated, but this is how they want to use their debate time, on a measure that we have accepted, on what protection to provide the Speaker.

I doubt very much, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the American people are tuning in with rapt attention to see how we are going to provide security to the Speaker. But if that is really what they think we should be having this debate about, I for one, Mr. TIERNEY, disagree. I think we should be figuring out how to do the people's business. We have already lowered their cost of college. We have increased the minimum wage. We have put an ethics plan into place. We have shown again and again we are doing the business of the American people; and the Republic Party seems, based on this debate, to be obsessed with how we provide security for the Speaker.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, based on that, I would say to my colleague from New York that that is exactly why I hope the conversation continues on this amendment that has been accepted so that we can drive home the point again that this is the choice.

But in winding up, I would just say since we have accepted this amendment that perhaps if there is going to be more conversation, it ought to be fo-

cused on how Members suggest that they protect the Speaker of the House who has to get from Washington to California and back in some manner safely other than what the President proposes, and then they can put that information to the White House and continue the debate with the President.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I find it ironic. What we are trying to do over here is to save the taxpayers what could be up to \$15 million, and we are accused of wasting the time and taxes of the American people by engaging in a debate to save \$15 million.

The purpose of the House of Representatives, the purpose of the people on this side, is to save money. This whole debate is about saving money. This could be easily resolved if the Speaker of the House would say: I am willing to take the smaller aircraft to land halfway in Kansas or Illinois or anywhere else, fuel up again, and head on to San Francisco. That would probably save the taxpayers \$10 million. It would be a much smaller aircraft, and it would inconvenience her by about an hour to 1½ hours. This is what this is all about.

But what really bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that those of us who are engaging in debate, this is the type of debate that the American people want because it is the type of debate that saves them money. It is all about saving the taxpayers' money. If this is not the debate that should take place, I really don't know what should take place.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. I will yield, absolutely. But first I want to ask you a question because you didn't yield to me.

Mr. WEINER. Sure.

Mr. MANZULLO. You accused the Republicans of being a do-nothing Congress. The last 3 days Members of Congress have been here with all the lights burning. That costs more money. We got out yesterday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon for six suspension votes, which if the Republicans were in control, we could have done in 3 hours. It took you 3 days.

And you know what, Mr. Chairman? I have heard complaints coming even from the Democratic side that they cannot understand what this calendar is all about because they can't see their children, they can't get back home to be with their constituents, and they wonder why they are here in the city of Washington debating for the last 3 days what could have taken place in 2 hours.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. Of course I will yield.

Mr. WEINER. First of all, let me just say your eloquent explanation of this amendment, perhaps you weren't here for all the discussion. We accept the amendment.

Mr. MANZULLO. I understand.

Mr. WIENER. It could have been law 3 hours ago.

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time, the American people have a right to know what is in the amendment.

□ 1445

Mr. WEINER. If I could just further answer your question, because you asked a good question about the schedule; the gentleman asked a good question about the schedule. I just want, on behalf of all of us on this side of the aisle, to express our apologies for making you all work so hard. It wasn't our intention to inconvenience anybody. We are just trying to get the people's work done.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, getting out at 2 o'clock in the afternoon—when the Republicans were in control, we were here at 10 o'clock, 11 o'clock, midnight, 2 or 3 days a week, working away on all the issues. I just find it absolutely ironic that the new Congress, intent upon coming to Washington, trying to change all the rules, to change everything, says, come back and work 3 days on six bills that could take 1 hour.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in the midst of what has been characterized as a silly debate, and I don't rise so much to disagree with that characterization, but maybe for different reasons.

Let me say, as others have said, I was here on September 11, like many of my colleagues. I do not question the imperative of providing for the physical safety of the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. I strongly supported the decision by the President to provide for private jet travel for the Speaker of the House then and support such transportation now. We must protect those who lead us and we must not play politics with that protection.

But let me say on the subject of whether this is a silly debate around the gentleman from Virginia's amendment, I think it is silly to question the right of the minority to question public expenditures. The gentleman from New York, whom I deeply respect, comes to the floor to question the very act of Congress being Congress. We are asking questions, in the minority, of the majority about the public expenditure of public assets; and that is precisely what Congress and the minority in Congress exists to do. I think it is altogether silly to question the right to question in the Congress.

Let me also say, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a little bit silly, some of the public consternation about a Democrat Speaker's airplane needing to be much bigger than a Republican Speaker's airplane, because to the extent that the airplane itself is a metaphor for government, I believe that we can expect

all of the government will continue to need to be much bigger under a Democrat majority in Congress.

In a very short period of time, we have seen our colleagues bring wage and price controls and raise taxes. So to part of me, with great respect for my colleagues on this side of the aisle, it is not terribly surprising that the plane needs to be bigger too. When we think of the history of entitlements under Democrat control of Congress, we might well anticipate a fleet of planes in a fairly short period of time.

But, of course, I jest. I think it is a bit of a silly debate to question the right to question in this Congress. I think my colleagues know this to be true. But I also think it is a little bit silly for the American people to ever expect government to get smaller under Democrat control.

And it is also rather silly, and I close, to think that Republicans will ever fail to come to this floor to object when government grows needlessly under a Democrat majority. We will rise to that challenge. We will object to the expansion of government, even when it takes the shape of a 757.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. What is silly is pretending to be a fiscal conservative while you are continuing to waste the taxpayers' dollars talking about an amendment that has been accepted. That is what is silly.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's sensitivity. I think the lights were already going to be paid for today, and I didn't have anywhere better to be but down here making the case for the American people for less government, less taxes. This is the role of the minority, to question, to fight for smaller government.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia for his principled stand today.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, almost every day I stand down here and I encourage Members to sign on to my bill that Congress should not be above the law. While this debate was going on, a constituent called and said, why don't you amend that bill to also say that Congress should not be above coach or first-class travel?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot said on this floor today in this debate. Frankly, questions have been raised about the expectations of the American people and what it is that they seek for their Members of Congress to do.

There was one Member on the other side of the aisle who said we ought to get on with the serious business of the day. Well, Mr. Chairman, the ability to

fly on a jumbo jetliner is a privilege never before granted to a Member of Congress. And I know one thing, Mr. Chairman; the American taxpayers do expect us to take seriously the decisions surrounding the expenditure of those dollars. They expect us to respect that those tax dollars do not belong to the Speaker, do not belong to any of us. They are just that, the taxpayers' dollars.

They also expect us to lead by example, and I would want to pose to every speaker that spoke today and ask them, do they really in their heart of hearts support our Speaker having the access to a 42-seat jumbo jetliner?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike what I really hope deep down and pray might be one of the last words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to be practical about this. You know, I sat this morning in the ranking position as a Republican with BART as chairman over there, and we listened to the First Lady. She came before us, everybody was gracious to her, she made a good speech. One of our Members used his rights under the rules to ask her some questions. She graciously answered them. Then we came on over here. I came on over here hoping that this would be about an hour and a half or maybe 2 hours.

I served as ranking member under BART today, and I was ranking as a Democrat under BOEHLERT and SENSENBRENNER, and the only airplane I would like to be thinking about was the one I wanted to be on at 12:30 today heading for Texas.

But really and truly, I don't call anybody silly or anybody's speech that they want to make here, they need to be heard and express themselves. That is just what a lot of people call the music of democracy.

But we started out, I thought, talking about a bill that would direct the EPA, the Department of Energy and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology to initiate an R&D program to make biofuels more compatible with present-day infrastructure and to direct agencies to do so and so, to provide low-cost, affordable and accurate measurements and do all that; and it is going to cost \$10 million to carry this act out.

This bill was introduced in the 109th Congress and was included in Congresswoman BIGGERT's comprehensive energy bill. It passed under suspension of the rules last year. We didn't have all this debate about it. Everybody was for that bill. It encompassed more than what this bill started out with.

Somehow—and I like BART GORDON, and I respect him. I have known very few people from Tennessee I didn't like. If it weren't for Tennessee, there probably wouldn't even be a Texas, and that may be better off for a lot of people. And I wrote BART a letter, what is it, in the Merchant of Venice or Othello, where they said, "O, that mine enemy might write me a letter."

Maybe you should have read it, BART. Maybe you should have answered it.

I wrote him a letter to this effect, that I have conferred with my leadership, who agree that the best way to bring H.R. 547 to the floor is under a unanimous consent agreement. Given the uncontroversial nature of the bill, there is no need for us to go before the Rules Committee. And for some reason, we wound up with an open rule.

Now, I can only guess why that is. I wondered why. An open rule for a bill that everybody is already for? Give me a break. That doesn't make any sense.

So I can only think that perhaps maybe you, BART, or somebody over you, made the suggestion that, well, it looks like we are fair with that bunch of poor people over there that are in the minority now to give them a shot and tell them, yes, we have given you an open rule, probably thinking they wouldn't use it.

Well, I did not think it would be used either, but we have talked all day about everything in the world here. And there is a poem that says, "Maud Muller, on a summer's day, raked the meadow sweet with hay." The last verse lines are, "For of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these, 'It might have been!'"

It might have been that I would be on that airplane if we had taken that unanimous consent, sent this on over and gone about our business. All this other is just the music of democracy. It doesn't bother me 15 cents. And it might be a little cheaper on my government for me to ride the bus from here to Dallas every week, you know. Maybe we could talk about that some afternoon: Why doesn't RALPH HALL ride the bus to Texas and back every year? That would save money for this country.

But I have another feeling about the third person in command in this country. That is the leader, and I think she is entitled to protection and to a good way to go and to cut short the time that she has to spend in the air to get there and get home. Those things don't really bother me.

But what really bothers me is for us to sit here throwing things at one another when there is better work to do. We need to get about our business and pass this bill and let me get strapped in that airplane and go back to my grandchildren, who need me.

My son is a district judge, and I have got to go home and do a terrible thing. I have to go home and file suit against him in his own court. He threatened to spank one of my granddaughters last week. I don't have to stand for that type of thing.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Are you going to answer my letter? See, we can all laugh.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. My friend, the gentleman from Texas, that

is not a contradiction of terms. As usual, you do a good job of putting oil on the water and we thank you for that.

I thank you also for cosponsoring this bill, this bipartisan bill, that went through the hearings, this bill that will be the first real effort to deal with alternative energy.

This is part of the process, unfortunately, and we will go through it. But at the end of the day we are going to have a good bill. I thank you for being a part of that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to my fellow Texan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Let me just add my voice of support for H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuel Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I know, Mr. Ranking Member, my good friend, we have had a colorful discussion on many, many issues. The American people are waiting to pass this bill. I add my support to H.R. 547.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Research and Development Act. H.R. 547 will make biofuels, like E85 ethanol, easier to access and use by developing new technologies that would allow retailers to offer biofuels using existing infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, providing consumers with diverse fuel choices is crucial to the viability of a strong economy and a safe environment. First, creation of alternative fuels through research and development will not only create employment opportunities across the country, but it will also allow consumers to save money previously spent on high-priced gasoline and oil. These savings will fuel the American economy by putting more money in the pockets of consumers which they will spend on other goods and services in their local communities and across the country. Moreover, businesses will be able to reinvest those savings from lower gas and oil prices to reinvest to expand its productivity and profits. Second, investing in clean renewable energy and providing consumers with diverse fuel choices will create a cleaner environment and reverse the terrible trends that have led to the Global warming throughout the world.

H.R. 547 is a vehicle by which we can drive this country in the direction of energy independence. The high costs of oil and gas derive primarily from our overwhelming dependence on foreign oil. The Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States imports nearly 60 percent of the oil it consumes.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot even remotely begin to reduce the high price of oil and gas which has caused many of our citizens to change their standards of living, unless and until we find ways to create a more self-sufficient energy environment within the United States. Investing in clean, renewable energy is an important first step to achieving this goal. For example, replacing oil imports with domestic alternatives such as traditional and cellulosic ethanol can not only help reduce the \$180 billion that oil contributes to our annual trade deficit, but it can also end our addiction to foreign oil. According to the Department of

Agriculture, biomass can displace 30 percent of our nation's petroleum consumption.

Under H.R. 547, costs of fuels will also decrease due to the role that the EPA, the Department of Energy and the National Institute of Standards and Technology will play in the area of research and development. The bill directs the Environmental Protection Agency EPA, in consultation with the Department of Energy DOE and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, to research and develop new technologies that would allow retailers to offer biofuels using existing infrastructure, rather than refurbishing or building new infrastructure—essentially, putting the fuel in consumers' tanks at a savings to both retailers and consumers.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to forge a strong surge ahead to create alternative fuels because:

Alternative fuels like E85 ethanol and some biodiesel blends have different physical and chemical properties that often make them incompatible with much of our existing infrastructure.

These fuels can experience a variety of compatibility issues, such as corrosion of tank and pipeline materials, increased sediment buildup, clogging of filters, water and microbial contamination, varying flow properties, thermal and oxidative instability, and emissions volatility.

The cost of replacing or building new infrastructure is simply not feasible for fuel retailers, most of whom are small businesses.

Even when new infrastructure is installed, those costs may be passed along to consumers.

In 2006, EPA began implementing the transition to Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel—a fuel significantly cleaner, at 15ppm sulfur, than traditional diesel, at 500ppm sulfur. Although this transition has been largely successful thus far, it is still possible that as ULSD moves from the refinery through pipelines, tanks, and trucks, it may absorb enough residual sulfur to exceed the new EPA limit.

However, there is currently no affordable, real-time mechanism for testing the sulfur content of diesel fuel at the pump.

H.R. 547 directs EPA and NIST to develop an affordable, portable, quick, and accurate way to test the sulfur content in diesel fuels.

If our country wants to decrease our dependence on foreign oil, we must get serious about creating the infrastructure necessary to distribute and dispense alternative fuels. H.R. 547 will help achieve these goals using research and development for alternative fuels and new technologies.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 547 is a sound bill that has been endorsed by the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, National Association of Convenient Stores, Renewable Fuels Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, NATSO representing travel plaza and truckstop owners and operators, the Coalition of E85 Retailers, and the American Petroleum Institute.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 547.

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE OF FLORIDA

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

**SEC. . REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the program under this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall transmit a report to Congress containing suggestions for any Federal incentives that could help such program be more successful.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, after the technologies are developed that are needed to transport safely ultra-low sulfur diesel company products, we need to have a follow-up here. The implementation will be slow without some sort of incentive to do so.

My amendment is very simple: It directs the Secretary of Energy to provide a report to Congress within 1 year, with recommendations for Federal incentives to implement the technologies developed through this program.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that Congress is slow at improving programs that we create and helping the markets in which they would thrive. Hopefully, this amendment will make it a little bit faster, and I urge all Members to support the amendment.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her constructive amendment to this good bipartisan bill, and we will accept that amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TIERNEY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Ms. ESHOO of California to the amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas (as amended or not).

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. WELLER of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

Amendment by Mr. CANTOR of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]  
AYES—242

Abercrombie	Doggett	Larson (CT)	Rush	Slaughter	Velázquez
Ackerman	Donnelly	Lee	Salazar	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Allen	Doyle	Levin	Sánchez, Linda	Snyder	Walsh (NY)
Altire	Edwards	Lewis (CA)	T.	Solis	Walz (MN)
Andrews	Ellison	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Space	Wasserman
Arcuri	Ellsworth	Lipinski	Schakowsky	Spratt	Schultz
Baca	Emanuel	Loebssack	Schiff	Stark	Waters
Baird	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz	Stupak	Watson
Baldwin	Eshoo	Lowey	Scott (GA)	Tanner	Watt
Barrow	Etheridge	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Tauscher	Waxman
Bartlett (MD)	Farr	Mahoney (FL)	Serrano	Taylor	Weiner
Bean	Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Sestak	Thompson (CA)	Welch (VT)
Becerra	Filner	Markey	Shays	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Berkley	Frank (MA)	Marshall	Shea-Porter	Tierney	Wilson (OH)
Berman	Giffords	Matheson	Sherman	Towns	Woolsey
Berry	Gilchrest	Matsui	Shuler	Udall (CO)	Wu
Bishop (GA)	Gillibrand	McCarthy (NY)	Sires	Udall (NM)	Wynn
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	McCullom (MN)	Skelton	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Blumenauer	Gordon	McDermott			
Bordallo	Green, Al	McGovern			
Boren	Green, Gene	McHugh			
Boswell	Grijalva	McIntyre			
Boyd (FL)	Gutierrez	McNerney			
Boyda (KS)	Hall (NY)	McNulty			
Brady (PA)	Hare	Meehan			
Braley (IA)	Harman	Meek (FL)			
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)			
Butterfield	Herseth	Melancon			
Capps	Higgins	Micahaud			
Capuano	Hill	Miller (NC)			
Cardoza	Hinchey	Miller, George			
Carnahan	Hinojosa	Mitchell			
Carney	Hirono	Mollohan			
Carson	Hodes	Moore (KS)			
Castle	Holden	Moore (WI)			
Castor	Holt	Moran (VA)			
Chandler	Honda	Murphy (CT)			
Christensen	Hooley	Murphy, Patrick			
Clarke	Hoyer	Murtha			
Clay	Inslee	Nadler			
Cleaver	Israel	Napolitano			
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)			
Cohen	Jackson-Lee	Norton			
Conyers	(TX)	Overstar			
Cooper	Jefferson	Obey			
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Olver			
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz			
Courtney	Jones (NC)	Pallone			
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Pascarella			
Crowley	Kagen	Pastor			
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Payne			
Cummings	Kaptur	Perlmuter			
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Peterson (MN)			
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Pomeroy			
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)			
Davis, Lincoln	Kind	Rahall			
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Ramstad			
DeFazio	Klein (FL)	Rangel			
DeGette	Kucinich	Reyes			
Delahunt	Lampson	Rodriguez			
DeLauro	Langevin	Ross			
Dicks	Lantos	Royal-Allard			
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger			

NOES—185

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Alexander	Gallagher	Paul
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Bachus	Gerlach	Pence
Baker	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Petri
Biggert	Gohmert	Pickering
Bilbray	Goode	Pitts
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Poe
Blackburn	Graves	Porter
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hayes	Putnam
Bono	Hensarling	Regula
Boozman	Herger	Rehberg
Boustany	Hobson	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Ingles (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Loebssack	Buchanan	Rogers (MI)
Lofgren, Zoe	Burgess	Rohrabacher
Lowey	Burton (IN)	Ros-Lehtinen
Lynch	Buyer	Roskam
Mahoney (FL)	Calvert	Royce
Maloney (NY)	Camp (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Markey	Campbell (CA)	Sali
Marshall	Cannon	Saxton
Matheson	Cantor	Schmidt
Matsui	Capito	Sensemanbrenner
McCarthy (NY)	Carter	Sessions
McCullom (MN)	Chabot	Knollenberg
McDermott	Coble	Shadegg
McGovern	Cole (OK)	Shimkus
McHugh	Conaway	Lamborn
McIntyre	Crenshaw	Simpson
McNerney	Cubin	Smith (NE)
McNulty	Culberson	Smith (NJ)
Meehan	Davis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Meek (FL)	Davis, David	Tancredo
Meeks (NY)	Deal (GA)	Tancredo
Melancon	Dent	Tanner
Micahaud	Diaz-Balart, L.	Terry
Miller (NC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Thornberry
Mitchell	Doolittle	Tiaht
Mollohan	Drake	Tiberi
Moore (KS)	Dreier	McCaull (TX)
Moore (WI)	Duncan	Turner
Moran (VA)	Ehlers	McCotter
Murphy (CT)	Emerson	McCrary
English (PA)	Everett	McHenry
Murphy, Patrick	Fallin	McKeon
Murtha	Feeley	McMorris
Nadler	Ferguson	Rodgers
Napolitano	Flake	Rogers
Neal (MA)	Forbes	Weller
Norton	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Overstar	Fortenberry	Whitfield
Obey	Fortuno	Wicker
Olver	Fossella	Wolberg
Ortiz	Foxx	Walden (OR)
Pallone		Wamp
Pascarella		Weldon (FL)
Pastor		Weller
Payne		Westmoreland
Perlmuter		Whitfield
Peterson (MN)		Wicker
Pomeroy		Wolberg
Price (NC)		Walden (OR)
Rahall		Wamp
Ramstad		Weldon (FL)
Rangel		Weller
Reyes		Westmoreland
Rodriguez		Whitfield
Ross		Wicker
Royal-Allard		Wolberg
Ruppersberger		Walden (OR)

NOT VOTING—12

Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Millender-	Rothman
McDonald	Ryan (OH)
Norwood	
Pryce (OH)	

□ 1528

Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan, McKEON, REICHERT, ROSKAM and LATHAM changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. JOHNSON of Georgia, WALSH of New York, McHUGH, BARTLETT of Maryland, CASTLE and KIRK changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to speak to Mr. BLUNT, the Republican whip. I want to put Members on notice early enough so they will know before they run out of here. There are going to be votes, maybe two, at least, revotes when we come out of the Committee of the Whole and into the full House.

There will be at least two votes. In conjunction with the Republican whip, we have agreed that they will be 2-minute votes. The reason I am giving that announcement now, I want all the Members to know they will be 2-minute votes so that we can try to get Members out of here on time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS, AS AMENDED

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—424

Abercrombie	Barrett (SC)	Blackburn
Ackerman	Barrow	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Akin	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Alexander	Bean	Bonner
Allen	Becerra	Bono
Altman	Berkley	Boozman
Andrews	Berman	Bordallo
Arcuri	Berry	Boren
Baca	Biggert	Boswell
Bachmann	Bilbray	Boustany
Bachus	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boys (KS)
Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)	Gerlach	Mack	Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Brown (SC)	Giffords	Mahoney (FL)	Salazar	Smith (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)	Sali	Smith (WA)	Wal (MN)
Brown-Waite,	Gillibrand	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda	Snyder	Wamp
Ginny	Gillmor	Marchant	T.	Solis	Wasserman
Buchanan	Gingrey	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta	Souder	Schultz
Burgess	Gohmert	Marshall	Sarbanes	Spratt	Waters
Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	Matheson	Saxton	Stark	Watson
Butterfield	Goode	Matsui	Schakowsky	Stearns	Watt
Buyer	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff	Stupak	Waxman
Calvert	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt	Sutton	Weiner
Camp (MI)	Granger	McCaul (TX)	Schwartz	Tancredo	Welch (VT)
Campbell (CA)	Graves	McCullom (MN)	Scott (GA)	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Cannon	Green, Al	McCotter	Scott (VA)	Tauscher	Weller
Cantor	Green, Gene	McCrery	Sensenbrenner	Taylor	Westmoreland
Capito	Grijalva	McDermott	Serrano	Terry	Wexler
Capps	Gutierrez	McGovern	Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Capuano	Hall (NY)	McHenry	Sestak	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Cardoza	Hall (TX)	McHugh	Shadegg	Thornberry	
Carnahan	Hare	McIntyre	Shays	Tiahrt	Wilson (NM)
Carney	Harman	McKeon	Shea-Porter	Tiberi	Wilson (OH)
Carson	Hastings (FL)	McMorris	Sherman	Tierney	Wilson (SC)
Carter	Hayes	Rodgers	Shimkus	Towns	Wolf
Castle	Heller	McNerney	Shuler	Turner	Woolsey
Castor	Hensarling	McNulty	Shuster	Udall (CO)	Wu
Chabot	Herger	Meehan	Simpson	Udall (NM)	Wynn
Chandler	Herseth	Meek (FL)	Sires	Upton	Yarmuth
Christensen	Higgins	Meeks (NY)	Skelton	Van Hollen	Young (AK)
Clarke	Hill	Melancon	Slaughter	Vislosky	Young (FL)
Clay	Hinchey	Mica	Smith (NE)	Walberg	
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Michaud			
Clyburn	Hirono	Miller (FL)			
Coble	Hobson	Miller (MI)			
Cohen	Hodes	Miller (NC)			
Cole (OK)	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary			
Conaway	Holden	Miller, George			
Conyers	Holt	Mitchell			
Cooper	Honda	Mollohan			
Costa	Hooley	Moore (KS)			
Costello	Hoyer	Moore (WI)			
Courtney	Hulshof	Moran (KS)			
Cramer	Hunter	Moran (VA)			
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Murphy (CT)			
Crowley	Inslee	Murphy, Patrick			
Cubin	Israel	Murphy, Tim			
Cuellar	Issa	Murtha			
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Musgrave			
Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Myrick			
Davis (CA)	(TX)	Nadler			
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Napolitano			
Davis (KY)	Jindal	Neal (MA)			
Davis, David	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer			
Davis, Lincoln	Johnson (IL)	Norton			
Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Nunes			
Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Oberstar			
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Obe			
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Olver			
Delahunt	Jordan	Ortiz			
DeLauro	Kaggen	Pallone			
Dent	Kanjorski	Pascarella			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur	Pastor			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller	Paul			
Dicks	Kennedy	Payne			
Dingell	Kildee	Pearce			
Doggett	Kilpatrick	Pence			
Donnelly	Kind	Perlmuter			
Doolittle	King (IA)	Peterson (MN)			
Doyle	King (NY)	Peterson (PA)			
Drake	Kingston	Petri			
Dreier	Kirk	Pickering			
Duncan	Klein (FL)	Pitts			
Edwards	Kline (MN)	Platts			
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Poe			
Ellison	Kucinich	Pomeroy			
Ellsworth	Kuhl (NY)	Porter			
Emanuel	LaHood	Price (GA)			
Emerson	Lamborn	Price (NC)			
Engel	Lampson	Putnam			
English (PA)	Langevin	Rahall			
Eshoo	Lantos	Ramstad			
Etheridge	Larsen (WA)	Rangel			
Everett	Larson (CT)	Regula			
Fallin	Latham	Rehberg			
Farr	LaTourette	Reichert			
Fattah	Lee	Renzi			
Feeney	Levin	Reyes			
Ferguson	Lewis (CA)	Reynolds			
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez			
Flake	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (AL)			
Förster	Linder	Rogers (KY)			
Fortenberry	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)			
Fortuño	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher			
Fossella	Loebbecke	Ros-Lehtinen			
Fox	Lofgren, Zoe	Roskam			
Frank (MA)	Lowey	Ross			
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Royal-Allard			
Frerlinghuisen	Lungren, Daniel	Royce			
Garrett (NJ)	E.	Ruppersberger			
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Rush			

Abercrombie	Bartlett (MD)	Bonner
Ackerman	Barton (TX)	Bono
Aderholt	Bean	Boozman
Akin	Becerra	Bordallo
Alexander	Berkley	Boren
Allen	Berman	Boswell
Altman	Berry	Berry
Andrews	Biggert	Boustany
Arcuri	Bilbray	Boyd (FL)
Baca	Bilirakis	Boyd (KS)
Bachmann	Bilbray	Brady (PA)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brown (SC)
Baldwin	Bishop (UT)	Brown, Corrine

Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Salazar	Smith (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Sali	Smith (WA)	Wal (MN)
Sánchez, Linda	Snyder	Wamp
T.	Solis	Wasserman
Saxton	Souder	Schultz
Schakowsky	Spratt	Waters
Schiff	Stern	Watson
McCarthy (CA)	Sutton	Weiner
McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt	Wexler
McCaul (TX)	Schwartz	Whitfield
McCullom (MN)	Scott (GA)	Wicker
McCotter	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)
McCrary	Sensenbrenner	Weller
McDermott	Serrano	Westmoreland
McGovern	Sessions	Wexler
McHenry	Sestak	Whitfield
McHugh	Shadegg	Wicker
McIntyre	Shays	Wilson (NM)
McKeon	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
McMorris	Sherman	Space
McNerney	Shimkus	Sullivan
McNulty	Shuler	Pryce (OH)
Miller, Gary	Shuster	Velázquez
Miller, George	Shuster	Woolsey
Mitchell	Shuster	Udall (CO)
Mollohan	Shuster	Woolsey
Moore (KS)	Shuster	Udall (NM)
Moore (WI)	Shuster	Wynn
Moran (KS)	Shuster	Yarmuth
Moran (VA)	Shuster	Young (AK)
Murphy (CT)	Shuster	Young (FL)
Murphy, Patrick	Shuster	
Murphy, Tim	Shuster	
Murtha	Shuster	
Musgrave	Shuster	
Myrick	Shuster	
Nadler	Shuster	
Napolitano	Shuster	
Neal (MA)	Shuster	
Neugebauer	Shuster	
Norton	Shuster	
Nunes	Shuster	
Oberstar	Shuster	
Obe	Shuster	
Olver	Shuster	
Ortiz	Shuster	
Pallone	Shuster	
Pascarella	Shuster	
Pastor	Shuster	
Paul	Shuster	
Payne	Shuster	
Pearce	Shuster	
Pence	Shuster	
Perlmutter	Shuster	
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	
Peterson (PA)	Shuster	
Petri	Shuster	
Pickering	Shuster	
Pitts	Shuster	
Platts	Shuster	
Poe	Shuster	
Pomeroy	Shuster	
Porter	Shuster	
Price (GA)	Shuster	
Price (NC)	Shuster	
Putnam	Shuster	
Rahall	Shuster	
Ramstad	Shuster	
Rangel	Shuster	
Regula	Shuster	
Rehberg	Shuster	
Reichert	Shuster	
Renzi	Shuster	
Reyes	Shuster	
Reynolds	Shuster	
Rodriguez	Shuster	
Rogers (AL)	Shuster	
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	
Rogers (MI)	Shuster	
Rohrabacher	Shuster	
Ros-Lehtinen	Shuster	
Roskam	Shuster	
Ross	Shuster	
Royal-Allard	Shuster	
Royce	Shuster	
Ruppersberger	Shuster	
Rush	Shuster	

NOT VOTING—15

Boucher	Millender-Hall	Ryan (OH)
Culberson	McDonald	Space
Davis, Jo Ann	Norwood	Sullivan
Faleomavaega	Pryce (OH)	Velázquez
Hastert	Radanovich	
Hastings (WA)	Rothman	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN  
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1537

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELLER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—424

Abercrombie	Bartlett (MD)	Bonner
Ackerman	Barton (TX)	Bono
Aderholt	Bean	Boozman
Akin	Becerra	Bordallo
Alexander	Berkley	Boren
Allen	Berman	Boswell
Altman	Berry	Berry
Andrews	Biggert	Boustany
Arcuri	Bilbray	Boyd (FL)
Baca	Bilbray	Brady (PA)
Bachmann	Bilbray	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Braley (IA)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Brown (SC)
Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brown, Corrine
Baldwin	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,

Burgess	Gingrey	Matheson	Schiff	Spratt	Walz (MN)	Doyle	Kline (MN)	Regula
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	Matsui	Schmidt	Stark	Wamp	Drake	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Butterfield	Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)	Schwartz	Stearns	Wasserman	Dreier	Kuhl (NY)	Reichert
Buyer	Goode	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (GA)	Stupak	Schultz	Duncan	LaHood	Renzi
Calvert	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Scott (VA)	Sullivan	Watson	Ehlers	Lamborn	Reynolds
Camp (MI)	Gordon	McCullum (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Sutton	Tancredo	Watson	Emerson	Langevin
Campbell (CA)	Granger	McCotter	Serrano	Sessions	Wat	English (PA)	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Cannon	Graves	McCrary	Tanner	Tauscher	Waxman	Everett	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Green, Al	McDermott	Stestak	Taylor	Weiner	Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Capito	Green, Gene	McGovern	Shadegg	Shays	Welch (VT)	Feeley	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Capps	Grijalva	McHenry	Terry	Thompson (CA)	Weldon (FL)	Ferguson	Linder	Roskam
Capuano	Gutierrez	McHugh	Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Weller	Forbes	LoBiondo	Royce
Cardoza	Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Westmoreland	Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel E.	Ryan (WI)
Carnahan	Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shimkus	Thornberry		Fortuno		Sali
Carney	Hare	McMorris	Shuler	Tiaht	Wexler	Fossella	Mack	Saxton
Carson	Harman	Rodgers	Shuster	Tiberi	Whitfield	Foxx	Manzullo	Schmidt
Carter	Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Simpson	Tierney	Wicker	Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Schwartz
Castle	Hayes	McNulty	Sires	Towns	Wilson (NM)	Frelenghuyzen	Marshall	McCarthy (CA)
Castor	Heller	Meehan	Skelton	Turner	Wilson (OH)	Gallegher	Sensenbrenner	McCaul (TX)
Chabot	Hensarling	Meek (FL)	Slaughter	Udall (CO)	Wilson (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Sessions
Chandler	Herger	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NE)	Udall (NM)	Wolf	Gerlach	Shays	Sestak
Christensen	Herseth	Melancon	Smith (NJ)	Upton	Woolsey	Gilchrest	McCrary	Shimkus
Clarke	Higgins	Mica	Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Wu	Gillmor	McHenry	McHugh
Clay	Hill	Michaud	Smith (WA)	Velázquez	Wynn	Gingrey	Shuster	McKeon
Cleaver	Hinchey	Miller (FL)	Snyder	Viscosky	Yarmuth	Gohmert	Simpson	McMorris
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Solis	Walberg	Young (AK)	Goode	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Coble	Hirono	Miller (NC)	Souder	Walden (OR)	Young (FL)	Goodlatte		Smith (NJ)
Cohen	Hobson	Miller, Gary	Space	Walsh (NY)		Granger	Mica	Smith (TX)
Cole (OK)	Hodes	Miller, George				Graves	Michaud	Souder
Conaway	Hoekstra	Mitchell				Hall (NY)	Miller (FL)	Stark
Conyers	Holden	Moore (KS)	Boucher	LaTourette	Radanovich	Hall (TX)	Miller (MI)	Stearns
Cooper	Holt	Moore (WI)	Davis, Jo Ann	Millender-	Rothman	Hare	Miller, Gary	Stupak
Costa	Honda	Moran (KS)	Faleomavaega	McDonald	Rush	Hayes	Mollohan	Sullivan
Costello	Hooley	Moran (VA)	Hastert	Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Heller	Moore (KS)	Tancredo
Courtney	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Hastings (WA)	Norwood		Hensarling	Murphy, Patrick	Terry
Cramer	Hulshof	Murphy, Patrick	Hunter	Pryce (OH)		Herger	Murphy, Tim	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Murphy, Tim				Herseth	Murtha	Tiaht
Crowley	Inslee	Murtha				Hill	Musgrave	
Cubin	Israel	Musgrave				Hobson	Myrick	
Cuellar	Issa	Myrick				Hoekstra	Neugebauer	
Culberson	Jackson (IL)	Nadler				Holden	Nunes	
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano				Hulshof	Oberstar	
Davis (AL)	(TX)	Neal (MA)				Hunter	Paul	
Davis (CA)	Jefferson	Neugebauer				Inglis (SC)	Pearce	
Davis (IL)	Jindal	Norton				Issa	Pence	
Davis (KY)	Johnson (GA)	Nunes				Jindal	Peterson (PA)	
Davis, David	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar				Johnson (IL)	Petri	
Davis, Lincoln	Johnson, E. B.	Obey				Johnson, Sam	Pickering	
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Oliver				Jones (NC)	Pitts	
Deal (GA)	Jones (NC)	Ortiz				Jordan	Platts	
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Pallone				Kanjorski	Poe	
DeGette	Jordan	Pascarella				Keller	Pomeroy	
Delahunt	Kagen	Pastor				King (IA)	Porter	
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Paul				King (NY)	Price (GA)	
Dent	Kaptur	Payne				Kingston	Putnam	
Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller	Pearce				Kirk	Rahall	
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy	Pence				Klein (FL)	Ramstad	
Dicks	Kildee	Perlmutter						
Dingell	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)						
Doggett	Kind	Peterson (PA)						
Donnelly	King (IA)	Petri						
Doolittle	King (NY)	Pickering						
Doyle	Kingston	Pitts						
Drake	Kirk	Platts						
Dreier	Klein (FL)	Poe						
Duncan	Kline (MN)	Pomeroy						
Edwards	Knollenberg	Porter						
Ehlers	Kucinich	Price (GA)						
Ellison	Kuhl (NY)	Price (NC)						
Ellsworth	LaHood	Putnam						
Emanuel	Lamborn	Rahall						
Emerson	Lampson	Ramstad						
Engel	Langevin	Rangel						
English (PA)	Lantos	Regula						
Eshoo	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg						
Etheridge	Larson (CT)	Reichert						
Everett	Latham	Renzi						
Fallin	Lee	Reyes						
Farr	Levin	Reynolds						
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	Abercrombie	Boozman	Castle	Brady (PA)	Fattah	
Feeley	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)	Aderholt	Boustany	Chabot	Brown, Corrine	Lantos	
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Akin	Brady (TX)	Coble	Butterfield	Filner	
Filner	Linder	Rogers (MI)	Alexander	Braley (IA)	Cole (OK)	Flake	Larsen (WA)	
Flake	Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Altmine	Brown (SC)	Costa	Capps	Larson (CT)	
Forbes	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Costello	Frank (MA)	Lee	
Fortenberry	Loebssack	Roskam	Bachus	Ginny	Crenshaw	Carson	Giffords	
Fortuño	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross	Baker	Buchanan	Cubin	Castor	Levin	
Fossella	Lowey	Royal-Allard	Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Cuellar	Chandler	Green, Al	
Foxx	Lucas	Royce	Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	Culberson	Christensen	Green, Gene	
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger	Barton (TX)	Buyer	Davis (KY)	Clarke	Grijalva	
Franks (AZ)	E.	Ryan (WI)	Berkley	Calvert	Davis, David	Clay	Lucas	
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Salazar	Biggert	Camp (MI)	Davis, Tom	Cleaver	Gutierrez	
Gallegly	Mack	Sali	Bilbray	Campbell (CA)	Deal (GA)	Clyburn	Harman	
Garrett (NJ)	Mahoney (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Bilirakis	Cannon	DeFazio	Cohen	Mahoney (FL)	
Gerlach	Maloney (NY)	T.	Bishop (GA)	Cantor	Dent	Conaway	Maloney (NY)	
Giffords	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta	Blunt	Capito	Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M.	Markey	
Gilchrest	Marchant	Sarbanes	Boehner	Carnahan	Dicks	Conyers	Matheson	
Gillibrand	Markay	Saxton	Bonner	Carney	Doolittle	Courtney	Matsui	
Gillmor	Marshall	Schakowsky	Bono	Carter	Doolittle	Cramer	McCarthy (NY)	

## NOT VOTING—15

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN  
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1546

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 201, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—226

Ackerman	Crowley	Honda
Allen	Cummings	Hooley
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Hoyer
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Inslee
Baca	Davis (IL)	Israel
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	DeGette	Jackson-Lee
Barrow	Delahunt	(TX)
Bean	DeLauro	Jefferson
Becerra	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Berman	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Berry	Donnelly	Jones (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Kagen
Blackburn	Ellison	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Bordallo	Emanuel	Kildee
Boren	Engel	Kilpatrick
Boswell	Eshoo	Kind
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kucinich
Boysd (KS)	Farr	Lampson
		Lantos
		Larsen (WA)
		Larson (CT)
		Lee
		Gonzalez
		Lipinski
		Loebssack
		Lofgren, Zoe
		Lucas
		McCarthy (NY)
		Matheson
		Matsui
		McCarthy (NY)
		McCollum (MN)
		McDermott

McGovern	Price (NC)	Space	Brady (PA)	Garrett (NJ)	Mack	Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Walberg
McIntyre	Rangel	Spratt	Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Mahoney (FL)	T.	Snyder	Walden (OR)
McNerney	Reyes	Sutton	Braley (IA)	Giffords	Maloney (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Souder	Walsh (NY)
McNulty	Rodriguez	Tanner	Brown (SC)	Gilchrest	Manzullo	Sarbanes	Space	Wal (MN)
Meehan	Ross	Tauscher	Brown, Corrine	Gillibrand	Marchant	Saxton	Spratt	Wamp
Meek (FL)	Royal-Allard	Taylor	Brown-Waite,	Gillmor	Markey	Schakowsky	Stark	Waters
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)	Ginny	Gingrey	Marshall	Schiff	Stearns	Watson
Melancon	Rush	Thompson (MS)	Buchanan	Gohmert	Matheson	Schmidt	Stupak	Watt
Miller (NC)	Salazar	Tierney	Burgess	Gonzalez	Matsui	Schwartz	Sullivan	Waxman
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Towns	Burton (IN)	Goode	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (GA)	Sutton	Weiner
Mitchell	T.	Udall (CO)	Butterfield	Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)	Tancredo	Weldon (FL)
Moore (WI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Velázquez	Buyer	Gordon	McCaul (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Westmoreland
Moran (KS)	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Calvert	Granger	McCollum (MN)	Serrano	Tauscher	Weller
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)	Camp (MI)	Graves	McCotter	Sessions	Taylor	Wexler
Murphy (CT)	Schiff	Wasserman	Campbell (CA)	Green, Al	McCrery	Sestak	Terry	Whitfield
Nadler	Scott (GA)	Schultz	Cannon	Green, Gene	McDermott	Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Wicker
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Waters	Cantor	Grijalva	McGovern	Shays	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (NM)
Neal (MA)	Serrano	Watson	Capito	Gutierrez	McHenry	Shea-Porter	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Norton	Shadegg	Waxman	Capps	Hall (NY)	McHugh	Sherman	Tiabrt	Young (FL)
Obey	Shea-Porter	Weiner	Capuano	Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Shimkus	Tiberi	Wilson (OH)
Olver	Sherman	Welch (VT)	Cardoza	Hare	McKeon	Shuler	Tierney	Wilson (SC)
Ortiz	Shuler	Wexler	Carnahan	Harman	McMorris	Shuster	Towns	Wolf
Pallone	Sires	Whitfield	Carney	Hastings (FL)	Rodgers	Simpson	Turner	Woolsey
Pascarella	Skelton	Wilson (OH)	Carson	Hayes	McNerny	Sires	Udall (CO)	Wu
Pastor	Slaughter	Woolsey	Carter	Heller	McNulty	Skeleton	Udall (NM)	Wynn
Payne	Smith (WA)	Wynn	Castle	Herger	Meehan	Slaughter	Upton	Yarmuth
Perlmutter	Snyder	Yarmuth	Castor	Herseth	Meek (FL)	Smith (NE)	Van Hollen	Young
Peterson (MN)	Solis	Young (FL)	Chabot	Higgins	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez	Young (AK)
			Chandler	Hill	Melancon	Smith (TX)	Visclosky	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich	Christensen	Hinchey	Mica		NOES—6
Boucher	Millender-	Rothman	Clarke	Hinojosa	Michaud	Blackburn	Flake
Davis, Jo Ann	McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Clay	Hirono	Miller (FL)	Feeley	Paul
Faleomavaaga	Norwood		Cleaver	Hobson	Miller (MI)		
Hastert	Pryce (OH)		Clyburn	Hodes	Miller (NC)		

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1555

Messrs. UDALL of Colorado, LYNCH and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CUELLAR changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 6, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—419

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Fallin	Levin	Reynolds	Abercrombie	Barrett (SC)	Blackburn
Ackerman	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	Ackerman	Barrow	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Barrow	Blumenauer	Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)	Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Akin	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Boehner	Filner	Linder	Rogers (MI)	Alexander	Bean	Bonner
Allen	Bean	Bonner	Forbes	Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Allen	Becerra	Bono
Altmore	Becerra	Bono	Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Altmore	Berkley	Boozman
Andrews	Berkley	Boozman	Fortuño	LoBiondo	Roskam	Andrews	Berman	Bordallo
Arcuri	Berman	Bordallo	Fossella	LoBiondo	Ross	Arcuri	Berry	Boren
Baca	Berry	Boren	Fox	Lowey	Royal-Allard	Baca	Biggert	Boswell
Bachmann	Biggert	Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lucas	Ruppersberger	Bachmann	Bilbray	Boustany
Bachus	Bilbray	Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Rush	Bachus	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)
Baird	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)	Frelinghuysen	E.	Ryan (WI)	Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boysda (KS)
Baker	Bishop (GA)	Boysda (KS)	Gallegly	Lynch	Salazar	Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1601

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CANTOR

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 3, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—422

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Fallin	Levin	Reynolds	Abercrombie	Barrett (SC)	Blackburn
Ackerman	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	Ackerman	Barrow	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Barrow	Blumenauer	Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)	Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Akin	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Boehner	Filner	Linder	Rogers (MI)	Alexander	Bean	Bonner
Allen	Bean	Bonner	Forbes	Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Allen	Becerra	Bono
Altmore	Becerra	Bono	Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Altmore	Berkley	Boozman
Andrews	Berkley	Boozman	Fortuño	LoBiondo	Roskam	Andrews	Berman	Bordallo
Arcuri	Berman	Bordallo	Fossella	LoBiondo	Ross	Arcuri	Berry	Boren
Baca	Berry	Boren	Fox	Lowey	Royal-Allard	Baca	Biggert	Boswell
Bachmann	Biggert	Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lucas	Ruppersberger	Bachmann	Bilbray	Boustany
Bachus	Bilbray	Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Rush	Bachus	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)
Baird	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)	Frelinghuysen	E.	Ryan (WI)	Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boysda (KS)
Baker	Bishop (GA)	Boysda (KS)	Gallegly	Lynch	Salazar	Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)

Baldwin

Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)	Gerlach	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Brown (SC)	Giffords	Marchant	T.	Snyder	Waiberg
Brown, Corrine	Gilchrest	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta	Solis	Walden (OR)
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Gillibrand	Marshall	Sarbanes	Souder	Walsh (NY)
Buchanan	Gillmor	Matheson	Saxton	Space	Walz (MN)
Burgess	Gohmert	Matsui	Schakowsky	Spratt	Wamp
Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff	Stark	Wasserman
Butterfield	Goode	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt	Stearns	Schultz
Buyer	Goodlatte	McCaull (TX)	Schwartz	Stupak	Waters
Calvert	Gordon	McCullom (MN)	Scott (GA)	Sullivan	Watson
Camp (MI)	Granger	McCotter	Scott (VA)	Sutton	Watt
Campbell (CA)	Graves	McCrary	Sensenbrenner	Tancredo	Waxman
Cannon	Green, Al	McDermott	Serrano	Tanner	Weiner
Cantor	Green, Gene	McGovern	Sessions	Tauscher	Welch (VT)
Capito	Grijalva	McHenry	Sestak	Taylor	Weldon (FL)
Capps	Gutierrez	McHugh	Shadegg	Terry	Weiler
Capuano	Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Shays	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Cardoza	Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Carnahan	Hare	McMorris	Sherman	Thornberry	Wicker
Carney	Harman	Shimkus	Shimkus	Tiahrt	Wilson (NM)
Carson	Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Shuler	Tiberi	Wilson (OH)
Carter	Hayes	McNulty	Shuster	Tierney	Wilson (SC)
Castle	Heller	Meehan	Simpson	Towns	Wolf
Castor	Hensarling	Meek (FL)	Sires	Turner	Woolsey
Chabot	Herger	Meeks (NY)	Skelton	Udall (CO)	Wu
Chandler	Herseth	Melancon	Slaughter	Udall (NM)	Wynn
Christensen	Higgins	Mica	Smith (NE)	Upton	Yarmuth
Clarke	Hill	Michaud	Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen	Young (AK)
Clay	Hinchey	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Young (FL)
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)			
Clyburn	Hirono	Miller (NC)			
Coble	Hobson	Miller, Gary			
Cohen	Hodes	Miller, George			
Cole (OK)	Hoekstra	Mitchell			
Conaway	Holden	Mollohan			
Conyers	Holt	Moore (KS)			
Cooper	Honda	Moore (WI)			
Costa	Hooley	Moran (KS)			
Costello	Hoyer	Moran (VA)			
Courtney	Hulshof	Murphy (CT)			
Cramer	Hunter	Murphy, Patrick			
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Murphy, Tim			
Crowley	Inslee	Murtha			
Cubin	Israel	Musgrave			
Cuellar	Issa	Myrick			
Culberson	Jackson (IL)	Nadler			
Cummings	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Napolitano			
Davis (AL)	Jefferson	Neal (MA)			
Davis (CA)	Jindal	Neugebauer			
Davis (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Norton			
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Nunes			
Davis, David	Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar			
Davis, Lincoln	Davis, Tom	Obey			
Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Olver			
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Ortiz			
DeGette	Jordan	Pallone			
Delahunt	Kagan	Pascarella			
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pastor			
Dent	Kaptur	Payne			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller	Pearce			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy	Pence			
Dicks	Kildee	Perlmutter			
Dingell	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)			
Doggett	King (IA)	Peterson (PA)			
Donnelly	King (NY)	Pitts			
Doolittle	Kingston	Platts			
Doyle	Kirk	Poe			
Drake	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy			
Dreier	Kline (MN)	Porter			
Duncan	Knollenberg	Price (GA)			
Edwards	Kucinich	Price (NC)			
Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)	Putnam			
Ellison	Lamborn	Rahall			
Ellsworth	Lampson	Ramstad			
Emanuel	Langevin	Rangel			
Emerson	Lantos	Regula			
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg			
English (PA)	Latham	Reichert			
Eshoo	LaTourette	Renzi			
Etheridge	Lee	Reyes			
Everett	Levin	Reynolds			
Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez			
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)			
Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)			
Feeley	Linder	Rogers (MI)			
Ferguson	Lipinski	Rohrabacher			
Filner	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen			
Forbes	LoBiondo	Roskam			
Fortenberry	Loebssack	Ross			
Fortuno	Lofgren, Zoe	Royal-Ballard			
Fossella	Lowey	Roybal-Allard			
Foxx	Lucas	Royce			
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppertsberger			
Franks (AZ)	E.	Rush			
Frelenghuisen	Lynch	Ryan (WI)			
Gallegly	Mack	Salazar			
Garrett (NJ)	Mahoney (FL)	Maloney (NY)	Sali		

specifically if secondary amendments could also be revolted, and the answer from the Chair was all amendments. It appears that the ruling from the Chair or the answer to the whip's parliamentary inquiry is different from an answer previously given to a similar question.

Could the Chair please clarify?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Those amendments adopted in the first degree are able to be voted upon and those in the second degree are not.

Mr. TERRY. So the clarification from the earlier ruling is not all amendments, but all first-degree amendments, even though the question earlier was posed on second-degree amendments. I thank the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The speaker could address that question in the House, which would be preferable to its being addressed by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Are there any further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS of Texas:

Page 5, after line 21, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.

Research and development under this Act shall address issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, earlier during this process, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON) and I offered an amendment, but it did not receive a clean vote. I have redrafted the amendment to more comprehensively addressed emissions from the increased use of biofuels or additives covered in the research and development program in this bill.

Republicans and Democrats should be thought of as being environmentally friendly, and I found myself in the position of arguing for a more stringent standard than some of my Democratic colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, MTBE was an additive. Additives can cause environmental harm. We need to look at this all the way through the fuel cycle, beginning at the R&D phase, through combustion, through emission.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, although this amendment is a bit oddly written, it appears to be repetitious to the previous Burgess amendment, which is repetitious to the previous Eshoo amendment.

With that said, in the spirit of civility, we accept this amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FERGUSON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS:

Page 5, after line 21, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.**

Research and development under this Act shall address issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions, and strategies to minimize emissions from infrastructure.

Mr. FERGUSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection, pursuant to House Resolution 133, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

**PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING**

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further proceedings today in the House, the Chair be authorized to reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any question that otherwise could be subjected to a 5-minute vote under clause 8 or 9 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 547.

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

There was no objection.

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct to state that the standing committees of the House are authorized under rule X of the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

1615

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

And is it also correct that the organization of the standing committees of the House were organized pursuant to previous enacted statutory laws?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They were ordained by the adoption of the rules on the opening day of this Congress.

Mr. TERRY. I am sorry, Madam Speaker, I could not hear you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The adoption of the standing rules on January 4, 2007, put those committees in place.

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

Is it also correct that the Committee of the Whole House is provided for under rule XVIII of the standing rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TERRY. And, Madam Speaker, is it true that the Committee of the Whole is not a standing committee of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

And is it correct that under rule XVIII, the Committee of the Whole House was not created by statute, but instead comes from previous rules of the House adopted in 1789, modified in 1794, and later adopted by the House in 1880?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Rule XVIII was adopted on opening day of this Congress, as well.

Mr. TERRY. One last parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

So under the rule adopted by the House last week giving Delegates and Commissioners voting rights, the standing committees of the House and the Committee of the Whole House have the same legal standing under the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to affirm that. Rules X and XVIII have the same provenance.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I demand a re-vote on the following amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole by those Members of this House duly recognized to vote by the Constitution:

The amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The amendment by Mr. WELLER of Illinois.

The amendment by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

The amendment by Mr. CANTOR of Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute?

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, during the Committee of the Whole, I had a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair about a second-degree amendment, and the response from the Chair may not have been accurate.

So in an effort to clarify for the House, in the Committee of the Whole, if a second-order amendment passes but it is not a decisive vote, meaning that the Delegates and the Resident Commissioners weren't decisive in that passing, can any Member call for a re-vote of a second-degree amendment in the full House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's inquiring in this forum because an earlier response he received about second-degree amendments in the Committee of the Whole, which should not have been given in that forum in the first place, was incorrect.

Under the regular order, the Chair must put the question in the House on amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole. In the instant case, the Committee of the Whole has reported a single amendment in the nature of a substitute on which the Chair will put the question to the House in due course.

In addition, House Resolution 133 included language to allow any Member to seek a separate vote on any amendment adopted to that original-text substitute in the Committee of the Whole. However, this opportunity for separate votes is not availing either in the case of an amendment rejected in Committee or in the case of an amendment to an amendment to the original-text substitute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. So as I understand your answer, Madam Speaker, there is no opportunity for a Member of the House of Representatives to receive a vote in the full House on a second-order amendment from the Committee of the Whole that passed by a nondecisive margin; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

The Chair will designate the amendments on which a separate vote has been demanded in the order they appear in the text.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The text of the amendment is as follows:



Levin	Obey	Shays
Lewis (CA)	Olver	Shea-Porter
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Sherman
Lewis (KY)	Pallone	Shimkus
Linder	Pascrell	Shuler
Lipinski	Pastor	Shuster
LoBiondo	Payne	Simpson
Loebsack	Pearce	Sires
Lofgren, Zoe	Pence	Skelton
Lowey	Perlmutter	Smith (NE)
Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Lynch	Pickering	Snyder
Mack	Pitts	Space
Mahoney (FL)	Platts	Spratt
Manzullo	Poe	Stearns
Marchant	Pomeroy	Stupak
Marshall	Porter	Sullivan
McCarthy (CA)	Price (GA)	Tanner
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Tauscher
McCaull (TX)	Putnam	Terry
McCollum (MN)	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCotter	Ramstad	Thornberry
McCrery	Rangel	Tiaht
McGovern	Regula	Tiberi
McHenry	Rehberg	Tierney
McHugh	Reichert	Towns
McIntyre	Renzi	Turner
McKeon	Reyes	Udall (NM)
McMorris Rodgers	Reynolds	Upton
McNulty	Rodriguez	Van Hollen
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
Meeks (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Melancon	Rogers (MI)	Walden (OR)
Mica	Rohrabacher	Walsh (NY)
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen	Walz (MN)
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Wamp
Miller (MI)	Ross	Waters
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Waxman
Mitchell	Rush	Weiner
Mollohan	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (FL)
Moore (KS)	Salazar	Weller
Moore (WI)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Westmoreland
Moran (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Whitfield
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Wicker
Murphy, Patrick	Schakowsky	Wilson (NM)
Murphy, Tim	Schiff	Wilson (OH)
Murtha	Schmidt	Wilson (SC)
Musgrave	Schwartz	Wolf
Myrick	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wu
Napolitano	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Neugebauer	Sessions	Yarmuth
Nunes	Sestak	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Shadegg	Young (FL)

## NAYS—58

Abercrombie	Hall (NY)	Royer-Allard
Ackerman	Harman	Royce
Baird	Higgins	Sali
Blackburn	Hinchey	Sarbanes
Brown, Corrine	Hirono	Serrano
Capps	Honda	Slaughter
Castor	Inslee	Solis
Clyburn	Jones (OH)	Stark
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sutton
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Taylor
Doyle	Lee	Thompson (MS)
Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Udall (CO)
Farr	Markey	Velázquez
Feeney	Matsui	Wasserman
Filner	McNerney	Schultz
Flake	Meek (FL)	Watson
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Watt
Giffords	Miller, George	Welch (VT)
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Neal (MA)
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	Wexler

## NOT VOTING—22

Boucher	Hastert	Paul
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Calvert	Hinojosa	Radanovich
Davis, Jo Ann	Matheson	Rothman
DeFazio	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Doggett	McDonald	Tancredo
Eshoo	Norwood	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WESTMORELAND (during the vote). Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the parliamentary inquiry related to this vote?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. It is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, could you tell me the reason this vote is being held open and could you read the rule about holding votes open?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not holding the vote open; the Chair is waiting for the clerks to process changes in the well.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Okay. I didn't realize there would be so much confusion about the way they voted.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Speaker close the board and all Members would have an opportunity to re-vote this issue. It might save a considerable amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk is processing changes of votes in the well. The gentleman's request is not in order.

The Clerk will proceed.

## □ 1654

Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. SALI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. KILLPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATERS and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Messrs. SESTAK, HASTINGS of Florida, BOREN, McGOVERN, LANGEVIN, PERLMUTTER, COSTA, CARDOZA, SCOTT of Georgia, COURNEY, PALLONE, COOPER, MEEKS of New York, WYNN, SKELTON, OLVER, ALLEN, LANTOS, BISHOP of New York, JOHNSON of Georgia, CUMMINGS, KAGEN, KIND, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, PAYNE, TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. YARMUTH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the third amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELLER of Illinois:

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to certification by a nationally recognized testing laboratory of

components for fuel dispensing devices that specifically reference compatibility with alcohol blended and other biofuels that contain greater than 15 percent alcohol; and

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 24, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

## YEAS—385

Abercrombie	Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Costa	Hayes
Aderholt	Costello	Heller
Akin	Courtney	Hensarling
Alexander	Cramer	Herger
Allen	Crenshaw	Herseth
Altmire	Cubin	Higgins
Andrews	Cuellar	Hill
Arcuri	Culberson	Hirono
Baca	Cummings	Hobson
Bachmann	Davis (AL)	Hodes
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hoekstra
Baker	Davis (IL)	Holden
Baldwin	Davis (KY)	Holt
Barrett (SC)	Davis, David	Hooley
Barrow	Davis, Lincoln	Hoyer
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Tom	Hulshof
Barton (TX)	Deal (GA)	Hunter
Bean	Delahunt	Inglis (SC)
Becerra	DeLauro	Inslee
Berkley	Dent	Israel
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson-Lee
Biggert	Dicks	(TX)
Bilbray	Donnelly	Jefferson
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Jindal
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Drake	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Blackburn	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Blumenauer	Edwards	Jones (NC)
Blunt	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Boehner	Ellison	Jordan
Bonner	Ellsworth	Kagen
Bono	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Boozman	Emerson	Kaptur
Boren	Engel	Keller
Boswell	English (PA)	Kennedy
Boustany	Etheridge	Kildee
Boyd (FL)	Everett	Kind
Boyd (KS)	Fallin	King (IA)
Brady (PA)	Farr	King (NY)
Braley (IA)	Fattah	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Feeley	Kirk
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Klein (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Flake	Kline (MN)
Ginny	Forbes	Knollenberg
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Kucinich
Burgess	Fossella	Kuhl (NY)
Burton (IN)	Fox	LaHood
Butterfield	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Camp (MI)	Gallagly	Langevin
Campbell (CA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lantos
Cannon	Gerlach	Latham
Cantor	Giffords	LaTourette
Capito	Gilchrest	Levin
Capuano	Gillibrand	Lewis (CA)
Cardoza	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Carnahan	Gingrey	Lewis (KY)
Carney	Gohmert	Linder
Carson	Goode	Lipinski
Carter	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Castle	Gordon	Loebsack
Chabot	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Graves	Lowey
Clarke	Green, Al	Lucas
Clay	Green, Gene	Lungren, Daniel E.
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lynch
Coble	Gutierrez	Mack
Cohen	Hall (NY)	Mahoney (FL)
Cole (OK)	Hall (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Conaway	Hare	



□ 1707

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHIMKUS. In its current form, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Shimkus moves to recommit the bill H.R. 547 to the Committee on Science and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike "biofuels" each place it appears and insert "alternative fuels".

Strike "biofuel" each place it appears and insert "alternative fuel".

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. DEFINITION.**

For purposes of this Act, the term "alternative fuel" has the meaning given that term in section 301 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Page 3, lines 4 and 9, redesignate paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively.

Page 3, after line 3, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) as the Nation's recoverable coal has the energy content equivalent of one trillion barrels of oil, Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel derived from coal-to-liquid technologies will help lessen our dependence on foreign sources of petroleum;

Page 5, line 3, strike "and" and insert a comma.

Page 5, line 4, insert "... and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel derived from coal-to-liquids technologies" after "and Low Sulfur Diesel".

Mr. SHIMKUS (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, last time I spoke on the floor was on H.R. 6, and I challenged my fossil fuel Democrats, my coal Democrats, to not abandon fossil fuels. I know that the majority of the Members of the Democratic

Caucus are anti-coal, but I was assured the interests of coal would not be left out in the future.

Well, here we go again. With this bill we do just that. My motion to recommit would expand the universe of this bill to do what was passed and accepted by a Democratic House in 1992 under EPACT, the Energy and Policy Act.

This bill, as written, does not use the 15-year accepted word of "alternative." By leaving this out, the bill discriminates not only on coal-to-liquid technologies that produce low sulfur diesel and aviation fuel, but also natural gas and hydrogen.

This motion to recommit improves this bill and does not limit science, research and development to not only biofuels but coal-to-liquid, hydrogen and natural gas.

It is my hope that one day the Speaker and all of us will be able to fly back to our districts using aviation fuel produced from coal from U.S. coal mines and U.S. refineries.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I yield to Ranking Member HALL.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I will be brief.

In our drive towards energy independence, we cannot exclude one of our greatest natural resources. I am a fossil fuels guy. I am from Texas, and I am for fossil fuels, but I also know the value of coal. Coal must continue to be part of our energy portfolio, along with alternative fuels and renewable fuels.

The Republican motion to recommit recognizes this fact, and I thank you for it. It ensures that coal is going to continue to have a place at the table by clearly defining coal-to-liquids as an alternative fuel and including ultra low sulfur diesel derived from coal-to-liquids in the bill.

The U.S. is in no danger of running out of coal. At current consumption rates, U.S. recoverable coal reserves are estimated to last for 250 years. The U.S. currently has over a quarter of the world's recoverable coal, more than Russia, over twice the amount of China. This compares to the U.S. oil reserves that are 2 percent of the world's total natural gas which are 3 percent of the world's total. We have plenty of coal. Actually, coal reserves are spread also over 38 of your States. Thirty-eight of you there have coal, and it is important to you.

I would just say this. John McKetta, noted author and writer from the University of Texas, said 14 years ago, We have enough coal in the mid-section of the United States to double the total output of the OPEC Nations all combined if we could but mine it.

Let's don't send our kids overseas to take some energy away from someone when we got plenty right here at home.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I want to concur with my

friend from Texas in terms of his concern about coal being a part of the overall package of dealing with energy independence. He is absolutely right, and I think everyone in this body recognizes that clean coal will be a part of our energy independence.

Unfortunately, though, this amendment does not really deal with clean coal. This amendment is a continuing effort to try to undermine this good bill today dealing with alternative energy. This is a very narrow bill.

This is a bill that was cosponsored by myself as chairman of the Science Committee, the ranking member of the Science Committee, and many others, and passed out of the committee unanimously because we are trying to deal with the problem today. We want to deal today with the infrastructure problems that stop our alternative fuels from being able to be used in existing infrastructure.

Clean coal will be a part of a solution later, but clean coal is not available right now. And so why are we stopping dealing with something we can do today for something that there is no solution for today?

Clean coal will be a part of what we do over in the Science and Technology Committee. We have been in discussions about this. I think everybody should know that. So that is off the table.

The question today on this motion to recommit is, do you want to move forward and do something today about alternative energy? If you do, vote down this amendment. If you do not want to do anything about this today, if you want to talk and talk and talk and come back another day, then vote "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

**RECORDED VOTE**

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the earlier order of the House, the Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 207, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

**AYES—200**

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Brown-Waite,
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Ginny
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Alexander	Blackburn	Burgess
Bachmann	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Bachus	Boehner	Buyer
Baker	Bonner	Camp (MI)
Barrett (SC)	Bono	Campbell (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Bruzman	Cannon
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Cantor
Biggert	Brown (SC)	Capito

Carney	Hunter	Porter	McCollum (MN)	Pomeroy	Spratt	Conyers	Israel	Napolitano
Carter	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)	McGovern	Price (NC)	Stark	Cooper	Issa	Neal (MA)
Castle	Issa	Putnam	McIntyre	Rangel	Stupak	Costa	Jackson (IL)	Neugebauer
Chabot	Jindal	Radanovich	McNerney	Reyes	Sutton	Costello	Jackson-Lee	Nunes
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Rahall	McNulty	Rodriguez	Tanner	Courtney	(TX)	Oberstar
Cole (OK)	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad	Meehan	Ross	Tauscher	Cramer	Jefferson	Obey
Conaway	Jones (NC)	Regula	Meek (FL)	Royal-Allard	Taylor	Crenshaw	Jindal	Olver
Costello	Jordan	Rehberg	Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)	Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Crenshaw	Keller	Reichert	Melancon	Rush	Thompson (MS)	Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Pallone
Cubin	King (IA)	Renzi	Michaud	Salazar	Tierney	Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarella
Culberson	King (NY)	Reynolds	Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Towns	Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
Davis (KY)	Kingston	Rogers (AL)	Mitchell	Sánchez, Loretta	Udall (NM)	Cummings	Jones (NC)	Payne
Davis, David	Kirk	Rogers (KY)	Moore (KS)	Sánchez, Loretta	Udall (CO)	Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Pearce
Davis, Tom	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)	Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Van Hollen	Davis (CA)	Jordan	Pence
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher	Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Velázquez	Davis (IL)	Kagen	Perlmutter
Dent	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Murphy, Patrick	Schiff	Visclosky	Davis (KY)	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaHood	Roskam	Murtha	Schwartz	Walz (MN)	Davis, David	Kaptur	Peterson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lamborn	Royce	Nadler	Scott (GA)	Wasserman	Davis, Lincoln	Keller	Petri
Doolittle	Latham	Napolitano	Ortiz	Scott (VA)	Schultz	Davis, Tom	Kennedy	Pickering
Drake	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)	Sessions	Serrano	Waters	Deal (GA)	Kildee	Pitts
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Sali	Shadegg	Sestak	Watson	Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Platts
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Saxton	Shuster	Shays	Watt	DeLauro	Kind	Poe
Ehlers	Linder	Schmidt	Olver	Shea-Porter	Waxman	Dent	King (IA)	Pomeroy
Emerson	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner	Ortiz	Sherman	Weiner	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Porter
English (PA)	Lucas	Sessions	Pallone	Shuler	Welch (VT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Price (GA)
Everett	Lungren, Daniel	Shadegg	Pascarella	Sires	Wexler	Dicks	Kirk	Price (NC)
Fallin	E.	Shimkus	Pastor	Skelton	Woolsey	Dingell	Klein (FL)	Putnam
Feeley	Mack	Shuster	Payne	Slaughter	Wu	Donnelly	Kline (MN)	Radanovich
Ferguson	Manzullo	Simpson	Perlmutter	Snyder	Wynn	Doolittle	Knollenberg	Rahall
Flake	Marchant	Smith (NE)	Peterson (MN)	Solis	Yarmuth	Doyle	Kucinich	Ramstad
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)			Drake	Kuhl (NY)	Rangel
Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)		Souder	Berman	Harman	Duncan	LaHood	Regula
Fossella	McCotter		Space	Boucher	Hastert	Edwards	Lamborn	Rehberg
Foxx	McCrery		Stearns	Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Ehlers	Lampson	Reichert
Franks (AZ)	McHenry		Sullivan	Calvert	Hinojosa	Ellison	Langevin	Renzi
Frelinghuysen	McHugh		Terry	Davis, Jo Ann	Matheson	Ellsworth	Lantos	Reyes
Gallegly	McMorris		Thornberry	DeFazio	McDermott	Rothman	Emanuel	Larsen (WA)
Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers		Tiahrt	DeGette	McKeon	Ryan (OH)	Emerson	Reynolds
Gerlach	Mica		Tiberi	DeLauro	Millender	Smith (WA)	Engel	Rodriguez
Gilchrest	Miller (FL)		Turner	Doggett	McDonald	Tancredo	English (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Gillmor	Miller (MI)		Upton	Eshoo	Miller, George		Etheridge	Rogers (KY)
Gingrey	Miller, Gary		Walberg				Lee	Rogers (MI)
Gohmert	Mollohan						Everett	Rohrabacher
Goode	Moran (KS)						Fallin	Ros-Lehtinen
Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim						Farr	Roskam
Granger	Musgrave						Fattah	Ross
Graves	Myrick						Feeley	Royal-Allard
Hall (TX)	Neugebauer						Ferguson	Lipinski
Hayes	Nunes						Filner	LoBiondo
Heller	Pearce						Forbes	Loeb sack
Hensarling	Pence						Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe
Herger	Peterson (PA)						Fossella	Lowey
Hill	Petri						Frank (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Hobson	Pickering						Franks (AZ)	Sarbanes
Hoekstra	Pitts						Frelinghuysen	Saxton
Holden	Platts						Gallegly	Mack
Hulshof	Poe						Garrett (NJ)	Mahoney (FL)

## NOES—207

Ackerman	Cramer	Honda	Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Buyer	Hall (NY)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Allen	Crowley	Hooley	Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Camp (MI)	Hall (TX)	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
Altmire	Cuellar	Hoyer	Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Hare	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Andrews	Cummings	Inslee	Akin	Blackburn	Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Snyder
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Israel	Alexander	Blumenauer	Cantor	Hayes	Meek (FL)	Solis
Baca	Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Capito	Heller	Meeks (NY)	Souder
Baird	Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Capps	Hensarling	Melancon	Space
Baldwin	Davis, Lincoln	(TX)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Caputo	Hensarling	Micah	Spratt
Barrow	Delahunt	Jefferson	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Capuano	Herger	Cardoza	Stark
Bean	Dicks	Johnson (GA)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpo	Herseth	Hernan	Stearns
Becerra	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Cardoza	Higgins	Miller (FL)	Steers
Berkley	Donnelly	Jones (OH)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carnahan	Higgins	Moore (KS)	Tanner
Berry	Doyle	Kagen	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carnahan	Higgins	Moore (WI)	Taylor
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kanjorski	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carney	Hill	Miller (MI)	Stupak
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kaptur	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carney	Hill	Miller (NC)	Sullivan
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Kennedy	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carson	Hinchey	Miller (NC)	Sutton
Boren	Emanuel	Kildee	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carter	Hirono	Mollohan	Tanner
Boswell	Engel	Kilpatrick	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carter	Hobson	Mollohan	Tauscher
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kind	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Castile	Hobson	Moore (KS)	Taylor
Boysa (KS)	Farr	Klein (FL)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Terry
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kucinich	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hoekstra	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Braley (IA)	Filner	Lampson	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Brown, Corrine	Frank (MA)	Langevin	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Butterfield	Giffords	Lantos	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Capps	Gillibrand	Larsen (WA)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Capuano	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Cardoza	Gordon	Lee	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Carnahan	Green, Al	Levin	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Carson	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Castor	Grijalva	Lipinski	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Chandler	Gutierrez	Loeb sack	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Clarke	Hall (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Clay	Hare	Lowey	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Lynch	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Herseth	Mahoney (FL)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Cohen	Higgins	Maloney (NY)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Hinchey	Markey	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Cooper	Hirono	Marshall	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Costa	Hodes	Matsui	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Courtney	Holt	McCarthy (NY)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hodes	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)

## NOT VOTING—27

## □ 1732

Mr. WILSON of Ohio and Mr. HILL changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## [Roll No. 92]

## AYES—400

Ackerman	Cramer	Honda	Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Buyer	Hall (NY)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Allen	Crowley	Hooley	Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Camp (MI)	Hall (TX)	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
Altmire	Cuellar	Hoyer	Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Hare	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Andrews	Cummings	Inslee	Akin	Blackburn	Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Snyder
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Israel	Alexander	Blumenauer	Cantor	Hayes	Meek (FL)	Solis
Baca	Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Capito	Heller	Meeks (NY)	Souder
Baird	Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Capps	Hensarling	Melancon	Space
Baldwin	Davis, Lincoln	(TX)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Micah	Spratt
Barrow	Delahunt	Jefferson	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Cardoza	Stark
Bean	Dicks	Johnson (GA)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Becerra	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Berkley	Donnelly	Jones (OH)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Berry	Doyle	Kagen	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kanjorski	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kaptur	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Kennedy	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Boren	Emanuel	Kildee	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Boswell	Engel	Kilpatrick	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kind	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Boysa (KS)	Farr	Klein (FL)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kucinich	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Braley (IA)	Filner	Lampson	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Brown, Corrine	Frank (MA)	Langevin	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Butterfield	Giffords	Lantos	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Capps	Gillibrand	Larsen (WA)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Capuano	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Cardoza	Gordon	Lee	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Carnahan	Green, Al	Levin	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Carson	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Castor	Grijalva	Lipinski	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Chandler	Gutierrez	Loeb sack	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Clarke	Hall (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Clay	Hare	Lowey	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Lynch	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Clyburn	Herseth	Mahoney (FL)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Cohen	Higgins	Maloney (NY)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Conyers	Hinchey	Markey	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Cooper	Hirono	Marshall	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Costa	Hodes	Matsui	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns
Courtney	Holt	McCarthy (NY)	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Carpito	Hensarling	Herseth	Stearns

Udall (CO)	Waters	Wilson (OH)
Udall (NM)	Watson	Wilson (SC)
Upton	Watt	Wolf
Velázquez	Waxman	Woolsey
Visclosky	Weiner	Wu
Walberg	Welch (VT)	Wynn
Walden (OR)	Weldon (FL)	Yarmuth
Walsh (NY)	Weller	Young (AK)
Walz (MN)	Westmoreland	Young (FL)
Wamp	Wexler	
Wasserman	Whitfield	
Schultz	Wicker	

## NOES—3

Flake	Shadegg	Shimkus
-------	---------	---------

## NOT VOTING—31

Berman	Harman	Norwood
Bishop (NY)	Hastert	Paul
Boucher	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Hinojosa	Rothman
Calvert	Matheson	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Jo Ann	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	McKeon	T.
DeGette	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Doggett	McDonald	Tancredo
Dreier	Miller, Gary	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Miller, George	Wilson (NM)

□ 1739

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To facilitate the development of markets for biofuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research and development and data collection."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule, and I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. There will be no votes before 6:30 p.m. as is our practice.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour, and at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m., and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m.

In addition to further suspension bills, a complete list of those bills for the week will be announced later this week, we will consider a small business tax relief bill, and a resolution regarding the war in Iraq.

Because we intend to make sure that every Member who wishes to speak to that matter will have the opportunity to do so, Members should be advised that we will have long days next week, meaning perhaps as late as midnight, and Friday could be a full day in order to complete our work for the week.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that information. I would like to yield again to him to ask when on our side we might be able to see the

resolution in its completed form, or in any form for that matter.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have told our Members that by Monday morning at 10 a.m. we ought to have that resolution available.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would also ask, will we see that resolution go through the Armed Services Committee and be marked up there? Or what will be the process for the resolution? I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. There have been, I would tell the gentleman, some 22 hearings on Iraq by the Government Reform Committee, by the Armed Services Committee, by the International Relations Committee, by the Appropriations subcommittee and by the Committee on Intelligence. There have been extensive hearings on this bill. This is a resolution. It is being done in conjunction with the Armed Service Committee and the International Relations Committee. I do not anticipate that there will be a markup of the resolution.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information. This resolution I guess we have never had a hearing on. But the resolution is going to be put before the body by the leaders. Is that what you anticipate happening, Mr. Leader?

Mr. HOYER. That is what I anticipate, the leaders being Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LANTOS, and others. We expect there to be Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, another question: What about the Republican leaders and Members? Will we have a chance to have amendments to this bill? Will we get a chance to have a substitute? Will there be more than one substitute? What kinds of things are you thinking about in terms of the structure of the debate?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we believe that the issue of the President's policy, which was announced some weeks ago, is an extraordinarily serious question confronting the country and the Congress. We expect the resolution to be very straightforward and very simple.

We expect the resolution to deal only with the proposal the President has made for escalation. We believe we should present that to the House of Representatives as an issue on which they can make their advice to the President of the United States and to the Executive Department.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is that we do not believe, as you have not in the past on similar resolutions, I remember your so-called Murtha resolution, we believe that there will be a direct question propounded to the House which every Member can speak to for 3 to 4 days, and then give their advice on.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, would we have at least the opportunity for a re-committal with instructions? At one time I thought you had announced the likelihood that we would have a sub-

stitute on Tuesday of this week or sometime earlier this week. Am I hearing now you do not any longer believe we will have that, and will we at least have the re-committal opportunity?

Mr. HOYER. We are grappling with this, I will tell my friend. We believe the American public, the American people, have the right to know where their representatives stand on the central and sole issue that the resolution will raise.

There may be other issues that you might want to raise at some point in time. And there are going to be at least three pieces of legislation, as you know, that will be coming down the pike on this issue: the supplemental, the authorization bill, and the appropriation bill for 2008.

We expect all of those bills to be relatively broad in their treatment of various different aspects. But I will tell the gentleman, frankly, because we feel this is such a critically important question and that the clarity of the question and the clarity of the response is so important that we are trying to carefully consider how we can assure that there is no confusion as to the answer that this House gives.

Mr. BLUNT. Of course, I hope that as you grapple with this, you will grapple toward the determination of input into this important debate. I believe, as you do, it is a critically important debate. This is an important issue. You and I have been together to Iraq twice. We both have taken this issue very seriously. We watched and the American people have watched the debate on the other side of this building this week, where the whole process has come to a halt because of the unwillingness of that body to move forward without having options on the table; and even in that debate, the majority offered at least one alternative opportunity to the minority.

And that was not acceptable to that minority on that side of the building. I would hope on this side of the building that at least we would get the offer that if you are working on the other side of the building, you walked away from, which would be one opportunity to express another view.

We are going to have 3 full days of debate. The gentleman said some of them could very well last as long as midnight.

□ 1745

That is enough time to consider more than one point of view and have at least two points of view heard. And I heard the gentleman early in the week; I heard him say today, you are still grappling with that. And I would just encourage you to do your best to try to create the opportunity for this issue to be debated in the fullest possible way at this moment and move on with that.

I would also like to ask, with February 15 being the last day for the current continuing resolution to be in effect, it seems to me possible at least that the Senate is not going to deal