

Rahall	Sensenbrenner	Tierney
Ramstad	Serrano	Towns
Rangel	Sestak	Tsongas
Regula	Shays	Turner
Rehberg	Shea-Porter	Udall (CO)
Reichert	Sherman	Udall (NM)
Renzi	Shimkus	Upton
Reyes	Shuler	Van Hollen
Reynolds	Shuster	Velázquez
Richardson	Simpson	Visclosky
Rodriguez	Sires	Walden (OR)
Rogers (AL)	Skelton	Walsh (NY)
Rogers (KY)	Slaughter	Walz (MN)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Ross	Smith (TX)	Waters
Rothman	Smith (WA)	Watson
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Watt
Ruppersberger	Solis	Waxman
Ryan (OH)	Souder	Weiner
Ryan (WI)	Space	Welch (VT)
Salazar	Speier	Weldon (FL)
Sánchez, Linda	Spratt	Weller
T.	Stupak	Wexler
Sanchez, Loretta	Sutton	Whitfield (KY)
Sarbanes	Tanner	Wilson (OH)
Saxton	Tauscher	Wilson (SC)
Scalise	Taylor	Wittman (VA)
Schakowsky	Terry	Wolf
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Woolsey
Schwartz	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Scott (GA)	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Scott (VA)	Tiberi	

NAYS—69

Akin	Fox	Miller (FL)
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Paul
Barton (TX)	Goode	Pearce
Boehner	Goodlatte	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Poe
Broun (GA)	Herger	Radanovich
Burgess	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Inglis (SC)	Roskam
Buyer	Issa	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Sali
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Sessions
Carter	Jordan	Shadegg
Conaway	King (IA)	Stearns
Culberson	Kingston	Sullivan
Davis, David	Kline (MN)	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Lamborn	Thornberry
Duncan	Latta	Walberg
Feeney	Marchant	Wamp
Flake	McHenry	Westmoreland
Forbes	Mica	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews	DeGette	Rush
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Schmidt
Blackburn	Gerlach	Stark
Bono Mack	Lewis (KY)	Wilson (NM)
Cramer	Mack	Wu
Crenshaw	Meeks (NY)	Wynn
Cubin	Myrick	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1728

Mr. SULLIVAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 70, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution on the budget, S. Con. Res. 70, be instructed to increase negative budget authority and outlays in section 101(19), function 920 (Allowances) of the House amendment, by \$2.02 billion over the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

First off, Mr. Speaker, I would like to celebrate the fact that we are here in this well talking about this motion to go to conference, and I want to compliment our chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, the gentleman from South Carolina. And I mean this in a very sincere way.

The budget process doesn't work if you don't have a budget, and I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina for making it 2 years in a row for actually bringing forward and getting through a budget resolution. It looked like it wasn't going to happen. We won't be supporting it, but the fact that the budget chairman is keeping the budget process intact speaks very good to this institution, good to the process, and I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina for doing that.

Now, on to the motion to instruct. Everyone agrees, Mr. Speaker, that we need to reduce our reliance on foreign oil. But frankly, if we really want to move forward with greater energy independence, we should increase our petroleum supply by increasing our domestic production of oil. The motion accomplishes just that.

The Republican motion calls on the conferees to increase the receipt levels in the final budget resolution by expanding leasing in Federal areas in the West, in the Outer Continental Shelf and in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in an environmentally sound manner.

Yesterday, the House voted overwhelmingly to suspend the purchase of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as a means to increase oil supply and reduce gasoline prices. It's unclear whether this will have any impact on oil prices, much less gas prices.

This motion would accomplish that result. It would, No. 1, increase domestic oil production and put downward pressure on oil prices and gasoline prices; No. 2, it would reduce our reliance on foreign oil; and, No. 3, it would reduce the deficit.

More than a year ago, the Democratic majority pledged to bring gasoline prices down. On January 4, 2007, the day the Democratic majority took

control of the House, the price of gas was an average of \$2.33 a gallon. Today Americans are paying an average of \$3.76 per gallon to put fuel in their cars. Just 2 days ago in Kenosha, Wisconsin it was \$3.95. It's \$4 in some areas. This is an increase of at least \$1.43 a gallon.

Republicans are seeking to tap into America's great natural resources in an environmentally sound and effective way to provide the consumers the relief at the pump that they deserve, while reducing our reliance on foreign oil.

This Republican motion is a step in the right direction to enhance our energy security and put in place a long-term plan to provide relief at the pump. These are the steps we need to take to assist families, communities, small businesses, those that are suffering with soaring prices of oil and gasoline.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the chairman for yielding.

This is about energy and about the budget, and this is about the Arctic wildlife range in Alaska.

We have voted 12 times on this floor; in fact, I think Mr. SPRATT voted for it, Mr. DINGELL voted for it, or will vote for it, to try to open the last great known elephant in oil fields in the continental United States. If we were to do so today, we would deliver to the American public 1 million barrels of oil for 30 continuing years—a day. Thirty years, 1 million barrels a day. That's the very minor estimate.

But more than that, it would provide, this year, if we were just to lease it, \$191 billion in revenue for the budget, \$191 billion for the lease and the development of ANWR. And in 3 years I can deliver to the American public 1 million barrels a day or more. That's more than Venezuela. That keeps Venezuela from jacking the prices around.

If we were to do it, my good friends, it would drop the price of oil about \$10 a barrel immediately; not because we're delivering it, but it would be the first time this Congress has worked on the supply side, and the speculators would stop speculating if they saw that Congress was serious about developing our national and our Federal lands in fossil fuels. Why we don't do that I cannot understand.

Yes, we do have to change our modes of transportation in a period of time. But there's no way you can bridge the ability of not using fossil fuels in the short-term.

Now, you think about the consumer today in Alaska, and you think about the consumer in the rest of the Nation and what they have to do at \$4 a gallon, maybe \$5. And I have estimates it may go as far as \$10 by the end of the year, and that's going to be on your watch.

We're here talking about the budget. But if we want to solve the budget problems, let's create some dollars. But more than that, let's create less dependency on foreign oil.

How we can sit here as a body and send dollars overseas, and the billions of dollars; to give you some idea, the average tax for every man, woman and child, everybody listening to this station tonight is paying \$2,085 per every man, woman and child in tax to the foreign countries, burning their oil. Seventy percent of their oil.

And some people say, well, it's the oil companies. Nonsense. This is about demand globally and supply. We're not the only buyers anymore. America's not the only ones that have automobiles. America's not the only one using fossil fuels. China is burning more barrels of fuel today than we are, and that drives the price up. We're no longer the only buyer, and the seller can ask for the price they're going to get.

The only way you can relieve that is start developing our national, on Federal lands, our oil for the good of the American people. Why we're not doing this, I don't know.

And remember, you heard me before on this, well it's not your fault, it's not our fault, it's this fault, the body of this Congress. We've got to stop pandering for those who say no to developing our fossil fuels. We have to stop pandering for those saying it's going to be a total climate change because it is going to happen in this world. They will be burning oil, and we'll be unable to take and support our people until we develop our fields as we should develop them.

I'm hoping America's listening. I hope America will wake up to the fact. We have the ability to do it here today. We have the ability to solve the budget problem, but we have a better ability to solve the energy problem in America.

I'm asking my fellow colleagues, let's do it. Let's do it today. Let's do it in the future. Let's solve the problems of energy in this Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on March 13, we passed the budget resolution. It's a good resolution. It moves the budget to balance by the Year 2012 and, along the way, it accumulates less debt than the Bush budget. It limits spending to a reasonable level.

But I can truthfully say that this bill does more for education, more for the environment, more for energy, more for science and innovation than the President's budget or the Republicans' resolution. And also, critically important, it avoids the deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that are provided for, called for in the President's budget. And it protects the middle income tax cuts; provides AMT relief for middle income families for whom it was never intended.

Therefore, we have the outline of a good budget for the coming fiscal year,

and we need to pass it, send it to conference, bring the conference report back. We have an excellent chance, I think, of passing the first conference report, back to back, since the year 2000.

What my friends on the other side of the aisle have introduced is, to my way of thinking, a distraction, a red herring. ANWR is never mentioned in our resolution. And to my recollection it was not mentioned in your resolution. So the topic here is wholly out of the scope of the resolution on either side, particularly ours, and wholly outside the jurisdiction of our committee. We don't assume ANWR revenues, we don't preclude ANWR revenues because we don't have the authority to prescribe that.

The most we can provide for in a budget resolution is a certain revenue floor, a certain amount of revenues be collected over the year to be applied against the expenditures that we broadly distribute in something called the 302(a) section of our bill and the 302(b), providing for 302(b) allocations.

So this budget resolution, this resolution to instruct, motion to instruct conferees, goes off on a tack that is totally different from what the resolution's all about, what the committee's jurisdiction is. If you want to debate this, there's another forum for debating it. There's another committee, the Resources Committee.

We don't have the authority to do what you would call upon us to do. We don't take a position for ANWR or against ANWR in the budget resolution because it's not the place for that kind of policy resolution. There are other places here for that to be established.

So we've got a good budget resolution. We do not need this resolution, this motion to instruct conferees, to do anything towards balancing the budget. You've got a very nominal sum of money in here when it comes to a 5-year period of time.

And one question I would leave with you, is you call for an increase in negative budget authority and outlays. If I didn't know what that meant, I wouldn't know what it meant when I first saw it on the printed page here. But I would take it that not only does oil revenues fall under this rubric, but so would forest products, national parks and things of that nature.

So it's not clear exactly what you're calling for here. I can only say it's a distraction. It's a red herring, it's not needed, and it does not really belong in the budget resolution process.

I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 23 minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina has 26½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will yield myself 30 seconds simply to say, using the chairman's argument, then there's no money in this budget for veterans,

no money in this budget for science, no money in this budget for education if you use that line of argument. There's only money for discretionary spending in here.

A budget resolution is a series of numbers, and we're saying, let's adjust the numbers to accommodate the policy we're talking about here, drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the Outer Continental Shelf, the Intermountain West.

At this time I'd like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Before I speak in favor of the Ryan motion to instruct conferees on the budget, let me give you a post-SPR suspension update. The price of oil went up \$1.73 on the mercantile market yesterday after we voted to suspend shipments into the SPR. At some point in time I sure hope it does come down and we'll work together, hopefully, in a bipartisan basis to bring oil and energy prices down. But our symbolic vote yesterday had the opposite effect of what it was intended because prices went up.

Let me speak now in favor of this motion to instruct. I would point all the Members in the body to the quote above the Speaker's rostrum by Daniel Webster. It says, the very first part of that quote, "Let us develop the resources of our land." And this motion to instruct is a direct descendant of that sentiment.

We are not helpless, we are not hopeless in this country in terms of energy. If we will develop the resources of our land, we could, in all probability, within 5, maybe 6, 7 years, double the amount of oil or oil equivalent that we're producing right now in the United States.

We're currently producing somewhere between 6 and 7, maybe a little over 7 million barrels. As Congressman YOUNG has just pointed out, if we were to drill in ANWR, it would start out with a production capacity, in all likelihood, of about 300,000 barrels a day. And in the optimum case, it could be ramped up to about 2 million barrels a day within 5 or 6 years.

We have over a million barrels a day of production off the coast of California. We have 2 trillion barrels of oil equivalent in the shale oil deposits in Wyoming and Colorado.

□ 1745

We haven't even inventoried what is off the coast of the east coast of the United States. We have the Chinese drilling between Cuba and Florida, and yet we're not allowed, because of moratoria, to drill there.

So we're not hopeless. We can also develop our coal resources. Congressman SHIMKUS has a bill on coal-to-liquids that is very helpful, and yet we stand here and refuse to adopt any supply-side policies at all as prices go higher and higher and higher.

If you live in an urban area where you don't depend on an automobile, you may not feel those high prices. But if you live in a suburban or rural area, well, you have to drive to work and drive to shop. If you work for a trucking company, if you work for an airline company and you see the price of diesel and the price of aviation fuel go higher and higher and higher, you feel it. It's not an academic exercise.

This motion to instruct simply says let's have some domestic development of our resources. Let's try to bring those prices down not with just the conservation component, but with the supply component. And with world markets where they are today, production of oil is somewhere around 85 million barrels a day. The consumption of oil is somewhere around 85 million barrels a day. The demand for oil in the United States in the last 2 months in a row has gone down, but the demand for oil in the rest of the world has gone up. And it's gone up more in the rest of the world than it's gone down here in the United States.

But if we were to be producing another 1 million, 2 million, 3 million barrels of oil a day in the United States, that would create a cushion that would take some of the heat out of the market and the price would go down.

I can't imagine any Member of this body that doesn't have a constituency that's concerned about higher food prices, higher energy prices, and higher prices of living.

Let's vote for the motion to instruct and try to get a supply component to our energy policy.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. There is a certain absurdity to this debate that the poor oil companies have had their hands tied. We've had a President from Texas, an oil man; a Vice President from Texas, an oil man; the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee was from Texas; the chairman of the subcommittee on energy was from Texas; the majority leader was from Texas, all over the time that the Republicans controlled the House, the Senate, and the Presidency.

So during that time, by the way, and this is the good news, the Bush administration actually gave to the oil and gas industry 268 million acres of American land to drill on for oil and gas. Said, You just go and drill there. And guess what we got? Last year, ExxonMobil, the other four big companies, they reported \$142 billion worth of profits. Pretty good tipping the American people upside down.

How much of it do they put into renewables? How much do they put into the supply side, the new energy sources: wind, solar, all of the new technologies? ExxonMobil: \$10 million. They made \$42 billion. They put \$10 million into renewables. And what else do they say? When we come and say,

How about giving back some of those tax breaks so we can give them over to wind and solar, the oil executives said, You can't touch our tax breaks, and by the way, we're also not going to invest in renewables.

Well, there's our future. Our future is saying let's go to the most pristine parts of the country. Let's go drill there. Let's not invest in solar; let's not invest in wind; let's not reinvest. That's the plan.

By the way, the price of oil under the Bush watch has gone from \$30 a barrel to \$126 a barrel. It's gone from \$1.45 a gallon to \$3.72 a gallon. And the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, when the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is filled and ready to go so we can deploy it, the President says he doesn't want to use it.

Well, here's the spigot, Mr. President. It's on top of the White House. You just have to turn it, deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the price of a barrel of oil will begin to drop immediately.

This is a phony debate.

Mr. RYAN from Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. SHIMKUS.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. I always love following my friend from Massachusetts.

You know, most countries view their resources as a strategic advantage. But we in this country in the majority view our resources as an environmental hazard. This motion to instruct is critical. If we can get a million barrels out of ANWR at today's prices, do you know how much money goes into the Federal Treasury? \$192 billion. Go tell that to your Blue Dogs who are holding up emergency supplemental bills because of PAYGO.

That's just ANWR. Let's talk about the other resources that we have.

Here is the reality. It wasn't President Bush that promised in 2006 that the Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices. That was Speaker PELOSI. In fact, she made the same mistake today. She claimed numerous times that the ag bill would lower prices, gas prices.

Now, I voted for it. I'm an ethanol guy. I'm a cellulosic guy. But if we don't bring more supply into the market, we're not going to lower prices. The demand from China and the demand from India and the demand from Europe just overwhelms us and is overwhelming the market. It was \$58 when this majority came into power, \$125 today.

I haven't used this for a while, but the Pelosi Premium, \$2.33 when you came into the majority, Speaker PELOSI said, We're going to lower gas prices. \$3.77 today. Chairman DINGELL is here. He's pulled this bill off the table, but climate change would add 50 cents a gallon. \$4.20 is what we would be paying under climate change and current gas prices.

What's the solution? The great Outer Continental Shelf. Billions of barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas. There are. You can't deny it. The eastern gulf, off-limits by appropriation bill. Not resources bill. It's an appropriation bill that puts this off-limits. It's the OCS off the western coast. Billions of barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet; we can't have it.

What would we do with the \$192 billion from ANWR royalties? Let's go and take American coal, United Mine Worker jobs, let's build coal-to-liquid refineries, operating engineer, building-trade jobs. Let's build pipelines. Major organized labor jobs. And let's use it to lower the cost of jet fuel so we don't have the aviation industry going bankrupt. \$192 billion would go a long way to do the solar, to do the wind power, to do everything we want to do.

We want more supply, not less. Environmental resources is a national advantage for our country, but we won't take use of it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't really surprise me that our good friends on the other side of the aisle have yet another drilling solution to our energy problems. Because it seems that with every energy problem, they have never found an energy problem that drilling won't solve. When will our colleagues in the minority get it into their heads that we cannot drill our way out of our energy problems?

What I think is amazing is that they have actually finally realized that there is a problem that needs to be addressed. Some of them have finally acknowledged that global warming is a problem. But they still refuse to let go of the tired direction that they continue to want to travel in, which is to prop up their wealthy corporate interests, prop up the oil industry, which is the most profitable industry in this country, with billions of dollars in oil subsidies.

And today's solution, in this motion to instruct, is that we should drill for more oil in a pristine environmental track in Alaska, go off the coast of Florida and the Outer Continental Shelf, drop some oil drills so that we can really severely negatively impact the tourism across the coastal regions instead of trying to make sure that we can truly invest in alternative energy research. Which part of "No, we need an alternative" don't they understand?

Well, consistently the voters have said they want to move this country in a new direction. They want to make sure that we invest in alternative energy research and wean ourselves truly off of our dependence on oil. Not just hear more talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, drilling is not the answer. It is inappropriate to suggest that we should have more drilling in ANWR, in Wyoming, off the coast of Florida. We need to make sure that we

can finally step up and make a bipartisan commitment that we will invest in alternative energy research so that we can finally end this energy crisis that we find ourselves in.

I'm glad to see that the Republicans finally acknowledge it's a problem.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity.

Let's look at this in perspective.

We just learned from Mr. SHIMKUS that over the lifetime of ANWR, if we just opened up that area to produce, that we could provide revenues of up to \$192 billion on the lease bids and royalties. And we always seem to be looking, at least the bills that keep coming forward from our friends from the other side of the aisle, from the majority, always seem to be trying to raise revenues. And certainly the \$6 billion per year that we could get just from the ANWR royalties in bids would pay for the GI Bill that they're going to raise taxes for tomorrow.

Not only is this a bonus that we raise revenue. By the way, we have a deficit that we're running. So I think where we can raise revenues without raising taxes is somewhere we could look.

But over the weekend, I had the opportunity to sit down with a trucking company in Omaha. They were telling me that the average price of diesel across the Nation is \$4.50. It's costing them almost a dollar per mile. What does that mean to the consumers? Well, it means that your family budget is going in the tank, literally. That means that when you go to the grocery store, that you're paying higher prices for food, not because some portion of corn is being used for ethanol; what it means is that the transportation costs of the food from the farm to the grocery stores is so high and is being absorbed in the prices at the grocery store.

So that's why your milk is going up, that's why the eggs have gone up, that's why your grain-related foods, like cereals and bread, have gone up. Yes, we need to focus on demand here. But we can also win-win by focusing on supply.

Let's do the right thing. And good job, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his work on putting forward a budget that brings us to balance and that is fiscally responsible.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a repeat of what we heard during the 12 years that our friends on the Republican side of the aisle tried to push forward a very failed policy as our friend, Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts, mentioned with regard to ANWR.

This is a policy that was tried over the years by a Republican Congress with a Republican President, and never

once did it pass because of the flaws and challenges that it would present.

What I think we have here is a classic case of what many of us will recall from the George Foreman-Muhammad Ali fight: a case of rope-a-dope where you're trying to deflect what's really going on on this floor tonight. And that is the fact that this budget presented by this Congress will bring us to a balanced budget faster than the President's budget at the same time that it's providing for some fiscal responsibility when it comes to tax cuts, energy policy, how we treat our kids in school, what we do for our kids when it comes to health care. All of that's done in a way that not only brings us to a point of having fiscal sanity in the way we do things, but it does it without having to deal with these gimmicks that we have now with ANWR.

The reality is that if you don't divert the American public's attention to what's going on in this budget, they would be very happy. The fact that we are restoring fiscal responsibility by making sure that anything we propose to do that costs money will be paid for so that we don't continue to see rising budget deficits is phenomenal and it's new.

What we see here is an effort to devote resources to energy that's renewable sources that provides with renewable sources on energy, that provides us with efficient sources of energy that moves us towards solar, towards wind; and we put money there, and we do it in a fiscally responsible way.

□ 1800

We don't cut the moneys that the President never provided for his No Child Left Behind education program. We provide the money. We do all those things, and we do them in fiscally responsible ways.

That's the story in this budget. You don't need to do rope-a-dope to get past that. This is a time for us to move in a different direction. We intend to do so. I urge Members to vote against this motion to instruct.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13½ minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina has 20½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the chairman of the Resources Committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, for yielding me the time.

While the Republicans continue to argue that opening more land is essential to lowering gasoline prices, the facts prove otherwise. We simply cannot drill our way to lower prices at the pump, and let's look at those facts.

Since 2000, the amount of drilling on Federal lands has steadily increased.

Between 1999 and 2007, drilling permits on public lands has increased more than 361 percent; yet gas prices, as we all know too acutely, have risen dramatically. There is simply no correlation between the two.

Despite the Federal Government's willingness to make public lands available to energy production, of the 42 million acres of onshore Federal lands currently being leased by oil and gas companies, that's the red column here, only about 12 million are actually in production or producing oil and gas. The industry has this much available to them, and this is all they're using right here. They are obviously stockpiling these leases, and it's been evident for at least the past decade.

In 2007, for example, the government issued 7,561 permits to drill. Yet only 4,704 wells were started. Over the past 4 years, there have been 9,800 more permits issued than the wells drilled.

Today, the oil and gas industry holds in excess of 3,000 permits for onshore oil and gas development that they are not using to increase domestic production.

Now, here's the most important point for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Some would argue that the entire Outer Continental Shelf should be opened to oil and gas development. This is a specious argument as drilling off the coasts of California, Florida or Virginia has been consistently and repeatedly opposed by both parties.

And for those on the minority side who may want to vote for this motion to recommit, just remember: This will be viewed as a vote to allow oil and gas drilling off your shores.

According to the Department of the Interior, the parts of the OCS, primarily the Gulf of Mexico, that are currently open to drilling contain 79 percent of the oil and 82 percent of the natural gas that exists on the entire OCS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RAHALL. And as is the case with onshore, out of the 40 million acres currently being held by oil and gas companies, under lease, in the Outer Continental Shelf, the oil and gas industry has put less than 7 million of those acres into production. It's already there. It's available to them. Yet they're not using it, and they want to go elsewhere to drill.

In a nutshell, the industry has access to most of the estimated technologically recoverable natural gas that's occurring in the Federal OCS, in fact four times as much as is estimated by the Minerals Management Service to occur in the moratoria areas, but the industry is not developing it.

You cannot drill your way to lower gas prices at the pump. The industry has plenty available to them. Let them use what they already have before going into other pristine areas like ANWR.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I hope we will defeat this motion to recommit. I sit on the Energy and Commerce Committee. I've done a lot of work on oil and gas, and I was in my office when I heard all these myths coming from the other side, and I thought we had to come down and refute this.

My friends on this side of the aisle keep saying Congress needs to open more areas to domestic drilling. The U.S. has already increased domestic drilling, and gas prices have continued to climb.

Since 2000, the number of wells drilled on Federal lands has increased by 66 percent, from 3,000 to nearly 5,000 wells. During that same time, the price of gas has doubled.

According to the Federal Government, 79 percent of the oil in the Outer Continental Shelf is already available for leasing. Eighty-two percent of the gas in the Outer Continental Shelf is available for leasing. And still, we open up more lands to leasing in 2006. The U.S. cannot drill its way out of high energy costs.

The other fact that my friends always try to put forth is that environmental laws are stopping oil companies from building refineries. Completely false. In the 2005 Energy Policy Act, we actually put in there a section that, as Secretary of Energy Bodman said, eases the constraints that have strangled new refinery construction. We put that in in 2005; yet no one has ever come forward and said we want to use that provision to put forth more refineries.

The U.S. has actually shut down its refineries. Since 1981, there were 324 refineries. Now, there are only 149 refineries. As chairman of Oversight and Investigations, we have the memos from Texaco, Chevron, Mobil that all said in order to raise our prices we have to shut down refineries, and they've shut them down.

Mergers in the oil industry have affected prices. In 2004, the Government Accountability Office found more than 2,600 mergers in the U.S. petroleum industry since the 1990s.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STUPAK. Gasoline inventories actually have a surplus. March 7, 2008, we had a surplus of 22 million barrels of gas more than the previous year. Gas supplies are up. Oil gas demand is actually down. And what do we have? We have a 51 percent increase in that same period of time. Gas went from \$3.10 to \$3.61 since April 1.

Look, we've had mergers. We've had refineries not being built. We have more exploratory. We have more sup-

ply. Supply is up, demand is down, the prices have gone sky-high. Why is that? Look at the profits.

ExxonMobil, first quarter of 2008, \$10.9 billion; Royal Dutch Shell, \$9.1 billion; BP, \$7.6 billion, up 63 percent from last year; Chevron, \$5.2 billion; Conoco Phillips, \$4.1 billion. That is almost \$40 billion in their first quarter. That's why gas prices are so high. That's why this Congress must act to lower gas prices.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Well, I don't know what it's going to take, Mr. Speaker. Indiana is right up there with the rest of the country pushing about \$4 a gallon. We'll get people out on the road for vacations this summer, and I don't know what it's going to take for Congress to take dramatic action to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

I've got to tell you I was little bit encouraged last night, Mr. Speaker. The Democrat majority brought a bill to the floor that actually endorsed the idea that the cost of oil and gasoline is affected by supply and demand. We voted to suspend purchases by the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, therefore lessening the demand on global oil, believing that the price would come down.

Well, today, this motion to instruct conferees is all about increasing the supply. Look, we hear a lot about oil profits; we always have. And no one respects the previous speaker more than me. But who in the world thinks that raising taxes on oil companies is going to lower their prices at the pump?

I mean, for heaven's sakes, we understand as Americans that commodities and the price of commodities are dictated by supply and demand. We simply have to take those measures in an environmentally responsible way to explore and further exploit the resources that we have in the ground, and I speak specifically of the Alaska National Wildlife region and the other areas that are affected by this motion to instruct conferees.

As long as we are going to continue to look at the most volatile area of the world for the majority of our energy needs, we are going to continue to see the extraordinary per barrel prices that we're seeing today, and Americans and Hoosiers are going to be suffering at the pump.

Let's get real. Let's do something about the supply. Let's lessen our dependence on foreign oil. Vote for this motion to instruct conferees so that America can begin to realize on the vast natural resources that this country has.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, a number of folks have mentioned on the

other side, brought up stories about talking about the Speaker and what Democrats claim.

In 2005, when the Republican Congress passed the President's energy bill, let me tell you what some folks said. The minority leader at that time says, "This will lower energy prices for consumers." The minority whip, Mr. BLUNT, said, "Vote for lower gas prices and increase energy independence for America." This is what was offered and was sold when you did your energy bill. That's what you claimed.

My colleague from Illinois, Congressman SHIMKUS, says, "I do believe that it will help us become more independent of foreign oil, will expand our use of renewable fuels, and will make our electricity production and transmission more reliable. All of which will help slow price increases."

That hasn't been accomplished by any stretch of the imagination. When you passed it at that point, gasoline was at \$59 a barrel. Today, as you know, it's 124 bucks a barrel. So it hasn't accomplished any of that goal. This is all what you claimed in your marketing at that point when you had an energy bill on the floor in 2005 because you only had one strategy. You didn't want to do anything about conservation. You didn't want to do anything about renewable energy sources and investment in future technologies. And you didn't want to do anything, as my colleague from West Virginia told you, that there were over 9,800 permits out there, force American companies to start drilling in those permits rather than holding those permits here in the United States where we have some of the energy. There's plenty of that to go around.

What we've done is put a budget together that breaks with the past. It offers a change in the sense it puts our budget in balance. It invests in education over what the President does. It invests in energy technologies for the future, and also, it ensures that the middle class gets a tax cut. This is a budget that's not only in balance but is in balance with our values and our priorities here.

Now, you all have come up with a unique slogan, change you deserve. That's what you've marketed. All you've offered is more of the same, more of the same of \$3 trillion of debt, the largest increase in debt in the shortest period of time in American history. That's the change America deserves?

You've offered 10 million children without health care to go walking. Is that change you can deserve?

You've offered an energy policy that has continued to rely on just drilling without looking at conservation, without looking at future technology. Is that change you can deserve?

The American people deserve better, and they're offered here in a budget that is in balance with our priorities, balance with our economic goals. We put resources towards our education,

towards energy technology and towards, in fact, making sure the middle class get a tax cut.

In 2005, when you controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, you put together an energy bill that led America to where it is today. I think the American people deserve a change.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield 4 minutes to a senior member of the Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON from Michigan.

□ 1815

Mr. UPTON. I thank my friend, Mr. RYAN.

You know, gas prices yesterday in Kalamazoo, Michigan hit \$3.99 a gallon. You know, I can remember when our imports from other countries for oil and gas crossed the 50 percent threshold. And then it was 60 percent. In a few years, it's going to be 88 percent of the oil that we consume is going to come from overseas. Sadly, I report that this country is woefully unprepared for the future for a country that's going to need 50 percent more energy by the year 2030.

Now, we've done some things on conservation. We've done some CAFE standards, but that's not overnight, it's going to take a number of years. We've done some things on building standards and appliance standards, lighting. Those things kick in a few years from now. But you know what? I think all of us here, based on last night's vote, believe in the theory of supply and demand.

Worldwide, the demand is going up dramatically. China and India, 10, 15 percent annual growth rates. Our demand has actually declined because of the price by about a percent over the last year, but the supply has stayed the same. Yes, you can talk about more wells drilled, but the old existing wells aren't producing the oil that they used to. From the nineties to now, Alaskan oil has declined by 50 percent. And yet Bill Clinton, when he vetoed the ANWR bill 10 years ago, said, that's 10 years off, we don't need that now. Well, guess what? Ten years later, we need that oil. We need greater supply.

Last night's vote, taking oil out of SPR, 60,000 barrels a day, a lot of us voted for it because that means that the supply is going to go up for consumers by 60,000 barrels a day. So we're onto that. That passed overwhelmingly here in the House. But whether it's Alaska, whether it's offshore drilling—I don't know how many of you here know that China is drilling off Cuba, 45 miles off the Florida coast. China is drilling off Florida, yet we can't do that. I think we have a limit of 100 miles. Eighty-five percent of our offshore drilling is off-bounds. We need to reverse that.

Last year in this House, we had a vote that prevailed by six votes that took land in our BLM lands, public lands out in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, it took it off so that we can't

allow the permits to get oil shale. The oil shale reserves there are expected to exceed a trillion barrels. That's more than the Saudis. And we can't even allow the permitting for companies to go in and explore and perhaps increase the supply so that we can decrease the price with such a provision. I look forward to a revote on that same amendment perhaps this year.

The Canadians. I met with a Canadian Minister of Energy a couple of weeks ago, with a Canadian ambassador. They are now successfully extracting a million barrels a day from oil shale in Alberta. And because of a certain section that was in the energy bill offered successfully last year, we can't take that in this country. If you want to increase the supply so that the price can come down, we have to look at domestic resources, whether they be off our shores, whether they be in our own lands and we know that we can produce it safely, or in Alaska as well, ANWR.

We want the oil here. And we want to help have some decreasing pressure on that price that is costing consumers in lots of ways, not only their transportation, but food and all those different things.

So I would like to think that we can adopt this resolution, looking for more receipts for the domestic industry.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio).

Mr. DEFazio. Well, here we have the Republicans engaging in fuzzy math again.

Unlike the eight budgets submitted by George Bush, which are taking this country toward bankruptcy, they're so incredibly out of balance, unlike the 12 budgets given to us by the Republican majority here, this budget gets us to balance by 2012. And guess what? It has nothing to do with the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge, it's not an issue in the budget. You want to have that debate, let's have that debate in the Resources Committee and other appropriate venues.

But if you want to have that debate, I've got a few things to say. I serve on the Resources Committee. We have 6,669 leases that are out there with the oil and gas industry that aren't producing; 30 million acres of land that's covered by that and offshore. We have nearly a quarter of a million acres in the Naval Petroleum Reserve. Bill Clinton leased our Naval Petroleum Reserve to the oil industry. Guess what? They're not yet developing the Naval Petroleum Reserve. There is a tremendous amount to be developed there. But you want to jump and leapfrog somewhere else for imaginary bits of oil.

Under the most optimistic estimates, there's 100 days in ANWR. Now, we could do better if every American properly inflated the tires on their cars and their trucks and their SUVs. Try and find an air pump these days, they're darn hard to find. You want to do

something? Let's have a Federal program to put air pumps out there and get people to fully inflate their tires. There is a sustainable way to cut demand. But the fantasy of ANWR, which the Republicans want to engage in, is to distract us from the speculation, the profiteering by the oil companies, speculation of the commodity markets driving up prices 50 cents a gallon—legislation they passed for Enron, now bankrupt and defunct. And then we have the issue of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We have come together on a bipartisan basis to say let's lower the price of gas at the pump by not buying the most expensive oil in history. They don't agree with us on going after the OPEC countries.

So, you know, let's not talk about something that's potentially 10 years out, that doesn't have anything to do with the budget. Let's talk about real measures on energy. And let's talk about a real budget to get this country back on the path to fiscal sustainability and responsibility.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I'm delighted today that we're talking about energy. I think it's vital because I want to tell you something; if we don't get a lid on energy prices in America, there will be no level of government with a budget that will balance. The cost to heat our schools, the cost to heat our hospitals, the cost to do everything is going to explode. The cost to move goods and services is exploding. And it's about time, Americans.

I had a young lady say to me last week, she said, Mr. PETERSON, I make \$320 a week. I used to spend \$90 to drive to work, now I'm spending \$140. How do I pay my bills? What she doesn't know is she heats her home with natural gas, and the natural gas that we're putting in the ground today for next winter's heating is \$11.50. Last year, it was running between \$6.50 and \$7. She's looking at a 50 percent increase in home heating costs next year, which she cannot meet.

Folks, the average working American is struggling to pay their bills because of energy costs. Our State governments, our county governments and our hospitals and our schools are going to take money away from the classroom to heat those facilities. If this Congress does not address the energy issue, we're going to collapse the economic viability of this country.

Energy runs this country. We've had \$2 gas and \$10 oil most of our lifetime, with a few spikes in the seventies, eighties and nineties. Folks, we have \$125 oil, \$11.50 gas. We have not had a storm in the gulf in 2 years that always causes spike prices. We've not had a major country that supplies oil to us all tip over or have a coup that took away the government and took away that supply of oil.

I'm predicting that countries like China, who are amassing energy all around the world, we'll read one of these days where they have purchased all the oil and gas that one of the major contributing countries can produce for the next decade and we won't get any of it.

Folks, if we have a storm in the gulf this summer like they're predicting, and they're predicting them, if we have any kind of terrorist attack on a supply system, \$125 oil will seem cheap to us. I'm not sure this economy can handle \$125 oil.

I am for every renewable there is, but let's look at the Energy Department's prediction: Oil, gas, coal, nuclear, renewables, hydro and non-hydro, that's their prediction. We've spent \$30 billion for renewables. Folks, if we double wind and solar—and I wish we could double it every year—but if we double it, we will still be less than three-quarters of 1 percent of our energy needs.

Where is the renewable coming? The renewable that's grown the fastest is wood waste. With pellet stoves heating hundreds of homes, with factories heating their factories with wood waste, wood waste has been the fastest growing energy renewable.

Folks, America better get serious. And we'd better open our Outer Continental Shelf, we'd better do ANWR, we'd better do the Midwest. Coal-to-liquid, coal-to-gas, wind, solar, we need it all, folks. America is in an energy crisis.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me say again, but say more emphatically, what I said at the outset, and that is that ANWR is never mentioned, never mentioned in the budget resolution, never mentioned in the report that accompanies the resolution. So it's wholly out of scope; it has nothing to do with the budget resolution before us. And it's also outside the jurisdiction of our Budget Committee. The jurisdiction over this drilling in Alaska, or wherever in the continental United States, belongs to the Resources Committee, not to the Budget Committee. So if you want to do what they're proposing to do here, you're in the wrong place before the wrong committee with the wrong proposal.

Revenues from ANWR are not provided for in this budget resolution, they're not precluded in this resolution. The Budget Committee does not have the jurisdiction, as my good friend, Mr. RYAN, knows to tell the Ways and Means Committee or any other committee that has the power to produce revenues exactly how to do it. We simply tell them how much, not by what policy. We don't make policy prescriptions as to revenues in our committee. We simply tell the Budget Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, or the other committees that have the capacity to raise revenues or offsetting receipts, or what we have here called negative budget authority.

In addition, if you read the cryptic language of this resolution, you will

find it doesn't mention oil, or ANWR either, anywhere in it. You have to make some mighty extrapolations to get to the conclusion that this is talking about ANWR drilling and ANWR oil. It simply says we should issue instructions to increase negative budget authority, which could apply, in my estimation, to selling parkland, selling other assets of the United States which would be negative budget authority just like the revenues coming from a lease for drilling in ANWR.

In any event, this is a red herring when it comes to the resolution before us. It has nothing to do with our budget resolution. Our budget resolution should be looked upon on its own four legs, and let it stand or fall on those merits. I think we've got a budget resolution.

As I also said at the outset, we come to balance by the year 2012. And along the way we accumulate less debt than the President's budget. We limit spending in a reasonable fashion, but we provide more for education, more for the environment, more for energy, more for science and innovation than the President's budget. We protect the income tax cuts for middle-income Americans, we provide tax relief from the AMT for middle-income Americans, for whom it was never intended.

This is a good budget outline for our country and will move us over time, if we adhere to it—and we do adhere to the PAYGO rule throughout the resolution—if we further adhere to it, it will move us to a balanced budget within the foreseeable future.

Therefore, we do not have to vote for this motion to instruct conferees. It's not necessary. We need to go to conference and come back next week with a conference report that we can put to work so the House can get on with its business.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I'll begin by stating what I said in the beginning, which is, as a person who believes in having a strong and intact budget process, I want to compliment the chairman for getting us to a Budget Resolution, for doing it 2 years in a row. It's not an easy accomplishment. So on behalf of the institution, it's important that we pass these budget resolutions.

□ 1830

The problem is we're not going to pass a good budget resolution. The reason the gentleman's budget resolution achieves a balanced budget is because it contains the largest tax increase in American history. It cuts the child tax credit in half. It repeals the relief for the marriage penalty, raises income taxes across the board, raises capital gains and dividends taxes, brings the death tax back in, and puts us on a path for the largest tax increase in American history by replacing the al-

ternative minimum tax. So, yes, the gentleman's budget does balance because it only increases spending by \$280 billion while it increases taxes by \$683 billion. That's how the gentleman balances the budget.

But more to the point here, today the House voted to waive PAYGO to give farm subsidies to millionaires. Tomorrow the House is going to support PAYGO. They're going to enforce PAYGO to raise taxes on small businesses.

So this is what we're doing here in this Congress. Whenever it's time to keep PAYGO in place to control spending, it's out the door. It's waived. It's swept under the rug. It's baseline shopping, number cooking, gimmicking, cliffs. But whenever the time comes to raise taxes, that's when we enforce PAYGO.

Mr. Speaker, PAYGO doesn't exist. PAYGO is not in place. It is not being enforced. It is a sham. The only thing that PAYGO does today is give the majority an excuse to raise taxes. It doesn't cut spending. It doesn't reduce the deficit. It just raises taxes to fuel more spending.

Watch what happens tomorrow. Today millionaires get agriculture subsidies because we waived PAYGO; tomorrow, taxing small businesses to create a new entitlement program.

But to the point of this motion to instruct, what we are trying to achieve with this motion to instruct is to try to make this budget a little bit better, a little bit better by talking about the issue of the day, which is people are not being able to spread their paychecks as far as they were before. They can't get as much out of their paychecks because of \$4 gasoline.

Why do we have \$4 gasoline? Because we don't have an energy policy in this country. And what we are simply saying is one of the reasons is we have so much supply we're not getting: 16 billion barrels at ANWR; 2 trillion barrels in oil shale in Wyoming and Montana; 86 billion barrels in the Outer Continental Shelf.

Let me say that one more time: 16 billion barrels in Alaska, 2 trillion barrels in shale in the Intermountain West, and 86 billion barrels in the Outer Continental Shelf. All off-limits.

If we just did ANWR, according to the CRS, the Federal Government would see a surge in revenues, no new taxes, not even cutting spending, \$191 billion; \$191 billion, according to the CRS, from just doing ANWR. That's the smallest of all of our reserves. Think what we could do with \$191 billion. We could reduce the deficit. We could create a Manhattan Project for research and development for renewable energies to put fossil fuels out of business.

But, no, we're doing none of this. So this is the economic equivalent of shooting yourself in the foot, of cutting off your nose to spite your face. This is not an energy policy.

This is a bad budget resolution that raises taxes on the American workers

and families and businesses. The worst time we should be raising taxes is when we are possibly in an economic recession, and the last thing we ought to be doing is raising taxes on people. Furthermore, with high food prices, high gas prices, we shouldn't be raising people's taxes. That's what this budget does.

So to try to make it a little bit better, let's get some of our own oil and gas from our own country instead of being so reliant on foreigners for it. We're giving the wrong people our money, people who are not our friends overseas.

So pass this motion to instruct. Make this budget a little bit better, and open up production so we can actually truly do something to lower the price of oil and make us less dependent on foreign oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4040, CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4040) to establish consumer product safety standards and other safety requirements for children's products and to reauthorize and modernize the Consumer Product Safety Commission, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR.
WHITFIELD OF KENTUCKY

Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitfield of Kentucky moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4040 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

On December 19 of last year, this body spoke with a resounding voice of approval for our Consumer Product Safety Modernization Act. The measure passed by a unanimous vote of 407-0.

I would like to thank Chairman DINGELL; Ranking Member BARTON; Chairman RUSH; and my predecessor, Mr. STEARNS, for the great job that they did in getting this bill through the House.

H.R. 4040 is a bipartisan product. We worked for 4 months and in the end came up with a stringent but reasoned approach to strengthen the Consumer Product Safety Commission and to vastly improve the safety of our children's products. The result was a bill that creates the toughest lead standard in the world and imposes mandatory safety standards on products for young children. To ensure such standards are met, we require third-party testing and certification of children's products and we nearly double the Consumer Product Safety Commission budget over 4 years to ensure both the new safety standards and the testing and certification requirements are met.

All the new standards and increased enforcement in the world will not help parents unless they also know about dangerous products. We therefore require improved public notice of recalls as well as tracking labels on all children's products so parents can identify recalled toys when they hear about them. We also loosened restrictions to allow the Consumer Product Safety Commission to release critical product safety information to the public when people face an imminent health and safety standard.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 4040. I know that this is a work product that will maximize our opportunity to protect children from dangerous toys and products, and I urge and hope that the House managers will stand by the provisions which passed this Chamber unanimously only 5 months ago and insist upon the measures of H.R. 4040, as passed by the House.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the motion to instruct under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on behalf of the thoroughly bipartisan legislation underlying this motion. I begin with a commendation to my good friend from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and to my colleagues on

both sides of the aisle, including Mr. BARTON, the ranking minority member, and the other members of the subcommittee and full committee who have worked so hard on this legislation on both sides of the aisle.

I would observe that this is a thoroughly bipartisan piece of legislation. It passed out of the committee 51-0, and it passed the House 407-0. It is one of the most important consumer protection bills to come before this House in this Congress. It is crucially important for us to have such legislation signed into law this year. And I want to point out that without it, people will remain at risk from dangerous products and from an important Federal regulator who will remain both underfunded and incapable of acting properly to take care of consumers' legitimate concerns with regard to the safety of all manner of products from toys from the very beginning of life right through the time that we enter the graveyard.

On December 19, 2007, the House passed this legislation then without a dissenting vote. It represents extraordinary work by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and it shows how bipartisanship can function, and it shows how an excellent staff on both sides of the aisle working together can bring before us legislation that is in the broad overall public interest. The Senate substituted its version of the bill on March 6, 2008. Some elements of the Senate bill are problematic, but others are indeed worthy of serious consideration by the conference committee. The differences between the two bills are outweighed by their similarities. There is no reason why the House conferees should not return here in short order with a workable, balanced, and strong conference report deserving the full support of the House and upon which I intend to work closely with my good friends on the minority side, as we have so far.

I want to remind my colleagues what the House bill does. It bans lead beyond the most minute amount in products intended for children under 12 years of age. It mandates premarket testing by certified laboratories for lead and other hazards in children's products, and it sees that those laboratories are properly qualified and able to carry out their important responsibilities. It places requirements on manufacturers to enhance recalls. It empowers the Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC, to share information about dangerous products immediately. It requires CPSC to provide public access to a database of serious injuries and deaths caused by consumer products, but it does so requiring also that the information be truthful, correct, and properly verified. It prohibits the sale and export of recalled products. It ensures that CPSC effectively shares information with the States. And it bans industry-sponsored travel by CPSC Commissioners and their staff.

I want to observe that the motion is a good one. I support it. I commend my