

for enabling this to move forward in such an expeditious manner.

On 9 separate occasions, Congress has established a commission or a joint committee to celebrate the life and accomplishments of one of our Nation's Presidents or First Ladies. To date, we have honored James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, his wife, Eleanor, Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5235, The Reagan Centennial Commission Act, would create a commission to add Ronald Reagan to that list. Like previous commissions, the Reagan Commission will use the occasion of what would have been President Reagan's 100th birthday in 2011 to call attention to his life and his numerous accomplishments.

The commission will plan activities for the year leading up to the President's birthday. In the past, activities have included essay contests for students, research papers, symposiums, events at particular historical sites, and even joint sessions of Congress.

The commission will be composed of Members of Congress and individuals who have a knowledge or other expertise concerning the life of President Reagan, including his childhood, his career in Hollywood and his political career and legacy. Given the impact of President Reagan on his beloved California, the United States and the world, this is a fitting and a proper tribute.

Madam Speaker, Ronald Reagan transformed our Nation. He spoke of limited government, commonsense values, and the bedrock notion of democracy which built this country. He embodied the optimism, the principles and the determination of our citizens and our Nation. The American people responded to his call, and he led this country back from a decade of decline, transforming politics forever.

As a broadcaster, as an actor, as Governor and as President, he gave voice to America.

I am pleased to support this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to join me.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for introducing this measure. I urge its passage, and I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5235, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON S. 294, PASSENGER RAIL INVESTMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2008

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by direction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I move to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 294) to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The motion was agreed to.

## MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Heller of Nevada moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the 2 houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 294 be instructed to insist on the provisions contained in section 221 of the House amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 6003, the Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act of 2008. This simple motion directs the House-Senate conferees to insist upon section 221 of the House bill, which states that "Amtrak shall be subject to the Buy America Act, the regulations thereunder, for purchases of \$100,000 or more."

Especially during these trying economic times, it is important that Amtrak, a taxpayer-subsidized agency that has never turned a profit, support American businesses and jobs. In fact, one of the most important ways Amtrak could help the American economy is by buying American, especially by buying American oil.

Amtrak runs on diesel fuel, and diesel prices in our Nation are at an all-time high. For the past several months, when I was at home in Nevada, the number one issue on the minds of my constituents was the high price of fuel. I am sure there is no difference than any other district, since fuel costs have reached record highs across this Nation.

In fact, this week some of my constituents were in town and came by the office. In talking with them, I was vividly reminded just how the high cost of fuel, spurred by congressional inaction, is hurting families in my district.

The Anderson family lives in Carson City with their two kids, Steve and Sarah. They are a model American middle class family. The father is a dental lab technician, the mother is a

nurse. Their kids are good students and play basketball and volleyball. But gasoline expenses are hurting their budget. Disposable income for them, just like all Americans, is disappearing as they drop their kids off to play sports or attend their kids' games.

Record high fuel prices are not only crippling family budgets, but also public safety efforts, educational institutions, small businesses, and causing inflation in all manner of products and commodities.

Despite several promises from the majority party, however, we have seen nothing that would truly help consumers with the high cost of fuel today. Yet, April 18, 2006, more than 2 years ago, then Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI stated, "Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices." Again, April 24, 2006, Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI released a statement saying, "Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices."

The parade of bold statements promising help for the American consumers continues. Majority Leader STENY HOYER, October 2005 said, "Democrats believe we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices."

Not to be outdone, Democrat Whip JIM CLYBURN said, "House Democrats have a plan to help curb rising gas prices" in July of 2006.

And Madam Speaker, we haven't seen the results of these plans. The American people would like to see the plan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I welcome the gentleman's motion to instruct. The Buy America provision in Amtrak is comparable to the Buy America provision that I authored, got enacted in the 1982 Surface Transportation Assistance Act, to require all steel in the Federal Aid Highway Program to be made in America, American steel. And we extended that to the transit program subsequently, and to the Corps of Engineers program.

The situation with Amtrak is that there are two Buy America laws. The first was established in 1978. It requires Amtrak to buy U.S.-sourced equipment, U.S. materials, U.S. supplies for purchase in excess of \$1 million.

As time went on, there was concern that there was a good deal of equipment manufacturing moving offshore because our domestic rail transit, rail passenger transit systems were in decline. There was little funding for them, and manufacturers were drying up in America, and the new sourcing was coming from foreign manufacturers. So the Appropriation Bill of 2002 required Amtrak to comply with the Buy America for procurements under \$1 million, pursuant to Amtrak's grant agreements.

Our bill would require Buy America to apply to purchases of \$100,000, being very specific about it, \$100,000 or more. So this motion instructs the managers

to insist, and we are happy to insist on those provisions.

I thank the gentleman from Nevada for his motion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I reserve 5 minutes for the gentleman from Minnesota, Michele Bachmann.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank my colleague from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) for his leadership on buying American, especially as it relates to American energy sources.

I also thank the Speaker, as well, for this 5 minutes. It is important, Madam Speaker, that we do buy American, especially American energy.

Part of the problem that we have had for the last 31 years is that the United States, specifically the United States Congress, has almost made it a decided decision not to purchase American energy.

How do I say this?

I have a voting record in front of me, Madam Speaker, and it says this: When the votes have come on this floor to purchase American energy, this is how the votes have gone over purchasing oil and exploring for oil up in the ANWR region, where Mr. HELLER and myself were this weekend. Republicans voted over 90 percent of the time to buy American, yes, American energy in the ANWR region. Democrats, unfortunately, Madam Speaker, voted "no" to buy American 85 percent of the time.

When you look at purchasing American energy, Madam Speaker, through the coal-to-liquid program, Americans voted almost 100 percent of the time to buy American. Democrats voted "no" almost 80 percent of the time to buy American on coal-to-liquid fuels.

On oil shale exploration, purchasing American energy through this tremendous resource of oil shale exploration of which America is the Saudi Arabia of the world in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, Republicans voted "yes" 90 percent of the time, while Democrats voted "no" to buying American 85 percent of the time.

□ 1800

Sounds like we're on a roll. Sounds like we're on a trend.

Well, unfortunately, Madam Speaker, the Outer Continental Shelf exploration, Republicans also voted "yes" to buy American oil and American natural gas over 80 percent of the time while our Democratic colleagues across the aisle voted "no" 80 percent of the time to buy American energy.

To purchase American energy, Madam Speaker, to increase refinery capacity—this is a crucial issue in our energy capacity—Republicans voted "yes" to buy American energy from refineries almost 100 percent of the time while Democrats voted "no" on increasing energy capacity with refineries 95 percent of the time.

I know it's hard to believe and hard to understand, but there has really been a very clear divide over energy

policy in our country over the last 30 years. And unfortunately, our colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle have made a very clear and distinct decision, and it has been this: No new energy exploration in the United States. They have been very clear about this. They don't want to increase energy exploration in the United States. We need to.

And we aren't choosing just oil, just natural gas, just coal; we want to say "yes" to wind, to solar, to biofuels, to nuclear power, to all of the above. We have to say "yes" to all of the above or America will find itself at an energy deficit.

I know the people that I serve, Madam Speaker, in the Sixth Congressional District in Minnesota are feeling that squeeze right now. I checked today in Minnesota, the average price of regular unleaded gas is \$3.86 a gallon. It's something more than that nationally. But I will tell you the people in Minnesota, especially the people who are living on the margins, are feeling the pain right now of these price increases.

But a wonderful story that Congressman HELLER and I learned when we were on the all-of-the-above exploratory tool is that we have great answers here in the United States. The good news, Madam Speaker, is that we do not have an energy deficit in the United States. We do not suffer from a lack of resources. We have 27 percent of all of the world's coal in the United States. We have 2 trillion barrels of oil just in the United States. We have 88 billion barrels, conservatively speaking, in the Outer Continental Shelf, over 10 billion barrels in ANWR, and also 10 billion barrels near my home State in the Bakken Oil Reserve. We have energy in abundance in the United States. The problem is that Congress has said "no."

So what is standing between \$2 gasoline and the American people, Madam Speaker, especially American-made energy? It's the United States Congress. It isn't the companies that have been bad guys or that the American people have been bad guys for using too much energy; it's the United States Congress, and unfortunately, the Democrat-controlled United States Congress that it's made a clear decision that they don't want to increase American energy. This is nonsense.

Both Congressman HELLER and I learned together this weekend that we have the resources, we have them available, which is why we need to buy American energy now.

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

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, the House has addressed some minor aspects of energy policy. And I have supported several of the measures that the House has debated and voted on, including legislation to address price gouging, halt delivery to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and to address the international energy car-

tels. But only one of these measures is now law.

I just returned, as my colleague from Minnesota mentioned, with a group from the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve and other areas of Alaska which are rich in potential oil and energy resources. Exploration and development of these resources could easily happen in an environmentally sound fashion, quickly brought online, and is something that Alaskans support.

Our group on this same recent trip toured the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado as well. As Nevada is a leader in renewable energy development, I also strongly support renewable energy as a long-term solution to our energy needs. I voted for a renewable portfolio standard and on the House floor have cosponsored legislation to expand renewable energy by extending tax incentives. However, these bills scratch the surface of our fuel crisis, nor are they a substitution for a realistic and truly comprehensive energy policy.

Congress needs to act now on measures that will lower the price of fuel immediately and in the short term. Conservation is one such area, exploration and drilling are another. Long-term solutions—alternative fuels, renewable fuels, and even the expansion of mass transit—are simply not going to help our constituents this month, this summer, or probably even this year. They are very likely several years off. So this Congress must act to address the short-term needs of drivers today. Currently, the current approach by Congress to date has done little or nothing to address the crisis on fuel prices now gripping my district and the Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, we have no other speakers on our side, and I reserve my time.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, Americans are now paying on average \$1.67 more per gallon than they were when the 110th Congress began. In Nevada, since the 110th Congress began, gasoline has increased about \$1.50 per gallon. So far this year, crude prices have increased 40 percent.

Since passage of H.R. 6, a so-called comprehensive energy bill, in December of 2007 gas prices have risen nearly 10 percent, diesel prices have risen more than 16 percent, oil has reached all-time highs. Clearly this bill was not the answer to our fuel problems. Clearly whatever the House majority is doing, badgering corporate executives, berating the President, holding hearings after hearings wasting time, is not working. It's not the commonsense plan we were promised. Tax increases on fuels are not part of the commonsense solution and are not a substitute for a real energy policy.

I have spoken to more than 100,000 households in Nevada during the course of some telephone/town hall meetings and have asked, Do you support the proposed 50 cent per gallon gas tax?

Eighty-two percent oppose this tax increase sending a clear message that the people of Nevada oppose these outrageous plans.

Additionally, tax increases that affect oil companies also hurt retirees, seniors, and pension funds. In 2004, more than 2,600 pension funds run by Federal, State, and local governments held almost \$64 billion in shares of U.S. oil and natural gas companies. These funds represent the major retirement security for the Nation's current and retired soldiers, teachers, and police and fire personnel at every level of government. Fourteen percent of shares are held in IRAs and other personal retirement accounts. Forty-five million U.S. households have IRAs and other personal retirement accounts.

The effects of a punitive windfall profits tax on the energy industry would likely be the same as when it was tried last in the 1980s reducing investment in domestic oil production. The windfall profits tax during the Carter administration drained billions of dollars from the industry which was money not spent on U.S. exploration and production. Furthermore, the windfall profits tax failed to raise a fraction of the projected revenue.

Consequently, like most of the House and Senate Republicans, I have voted against billions in tax increases on energy companies which have only been passed along to consumers in the form of higher prices. With billions in tax increases being put forth in the House, not one of them has passed the Senate. Clearly this approach is not consensus and is not part of a commonsense plan to address high fuel prices.

While speculation may have a significant effect on oil prices, this process can work in reverse as well. Merely the announcement that Congress is willing to allow full debate on the issues or that certain moratoria will be lifted will cause energy prices to react accordingly. In fact, I have requested a hearing on this issue at the Financial Services Committee on which the committee has some jurisdiction.

A real energy policy will address a variety of measures, including the very basic cause of high prices, supply, and demand. Congress desperately needs to address refinery expansion, coal-to-liquid technologies, lifting offshore moratoria, oil shale, and other areas that will address skyrocketing gasoline and diesel prices.

Our Nation hasn't built a new refinery in more than 30 years, yet demand for refined petroleum has continued to increase. Estimates show the world's energy needs will be 50 percent higher in 2030 with 55 to 65 percent of demand from conventional oil and gas.

The last time Congress opened access of a large oil field to develop was in 1973. The Congressional Research Service notes that 86 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas are classified as undiscovered resources right here in this country and are offshore. Yet Congress has imposed

moratoria on much of the Outer Continental Shelf since 1982. This oil represents about 33 percent of Saudi Arabia's proven reserves.

ANWR holds billions of barrels of oil that we intentionally refuse to develop. The U.S. is the only Nation that closes off its own reserves, its own natural resources and willfully subjects its economic future to the whims of oil dictatorships like Venezuela.

Russia and the volatile Middle East can hold sway over the American economy not because they can but because we allow them to. China, a Communist country, is exploring for oil with the consent of Cuba, another Communist country right off our shores. In what economic world does that make commonsense?

Simply put, we cannot conserve, tax, or regulate our way out of this problem. Nor should we cajole our way out by begging foreign nations for help. Renewable and alternative sources of energy, which enjoy bipartisan support, are simply not a realistic, cost-effective option today.

The reality today is that our Nation, now and into the foreseeable immediate future, runs on gasoline, diesel fuel, and other petroleum products. Recognizing this reality and doing something about it is critical to our economy, public safety, education, tourism, and other areas.

The House should encourage buying American oil just as we encourage buying American products. In the meantime, this House should have a real broad, open, and forthright energy debate, not a series of small-bore suspension calendar bills that merely tinker around the edges. Congress must address all of the energy and fuel issues gripping this Nation the way the American people understand.

Let the will of the House work in a fashion that our constituents can follow and appreciate. The American people, like the Andersons and so many others in my district and nationwide, are demanding answers and demanding action. We should respond accordingly.

Support this motion to instruct and support buying American, including American energy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman, and Madam Speaker, I wanted to respond to some of the points that have been raised regarding what is going on with the gas prices right now in the country.

I am talking to constituents, just as my colleague on the other side is talking to constituents, and there is no question that people are hurting with the gas prices that are out there right now. That's one of the reasons the Democrats here in Congress have tried to take some very constructive steps to bring down the cost of gas at the pump.

Among those, we're pushing very hard on the President to cease putting oil into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. He finally came around on that. So I think that made a difference.

Secondly, the push in recent legislation to try to curb the speculation in the oil and gas industry by interests, frankly, that don't know much about that industry but are in it to make a buck and have been driving the price up and up, and we want to crack down on that.

Finally, among the more immediate measures that we can take—you know, I'm privileged to serve, as is my colleague, on the Natural Resources Committee here in Congress. So we bring a very thoughtful analysis to what is happening with our Federal and public lands and making sure we're using our natural resources wisely.

One of the ways we do that is to have issued from the agencies that have responsibility for it, permits and leases so that the oil industry can explore right here in the United States. And I'm going to repeat the figure which has been repeated many times because it's an accurate one, and that is that there are 68 million acres right now for which the oil industry, oil and gas industries hold permits and leases where they are not producing, where they are not pursuing those leases.

So we hear a lot about we should be trying to buy American resources and buy American and buy American oil. Well, we have the opportunity to buy American oil only if we're producing American oil.

□ 1815

And the industry, for one reason or another—and it's kind of hard to figure out the industry—has not taken advantage of those permits that they have.

We tried to put through legislation last week. It was defeated in large part because of the opposition on the other side, a bill where we would basically force the oil industry to either use these permits or lose these permits, which we think is the right thing to do in order to take advantage of the natural resources that we have here right in our own country.

I'm trying to figure out why the oil industry doesn't want to drill, and then it occurred to me that, if you're an oil company, the current state of things isn't so bad. You know, people are paying \$4, more than \$4 a gallon for gas at the pump. The oil industry last year pulled down \$100 billion worth of profits. So why would they think there's any problem? That's why we've got to push them, and the other side hasn't taken advantage of the opportunity here legislatively to try to push the oil industry to take advantage of these leases and permits that they already have.

Not only that, there are leases and permits out there with respect to the Outer Continental Shelf in terms of exploring our natural resources there, as well as the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

You know, we've heard a lot about this visit that a contingent of Republican lawmakers took to visit the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge last week. They went to the wrong place. I mean, why not go to the place where you can actually get some oil and get it quick, if we would take advantage of the fact that permits and leases can be issued? We've already done the analysis on the NPRA, on this National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, and the evidence is that we could get more oil from that location, for which we already have the authority to issue permits and leases to drill, than we could from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

So I want to caution Americans not to be misled by some of this rhetoric that we're hearing from the other side.

We need to break our addiction to oil. The President of the United States himself has admitted that we're addicted to oil. If you're addicted to something, you don't solve your problem by just going and finding a new supply of the same thing that you're addicted to. You try to move to something else. You try to transition, and we need to move over the long term to smarter policies with respect to energy and finding alternative sources of energy and renewable sources of energy. We can do that. We have the ingenuity in this country; there's no question about that, if we're given the tools and the right kind of policies to pursue it. And we can break this addiction.

In the meantime, there's going to be a transition, absolutely, and it's not like tomorrow we're going to wake up and we're not going to need oil anymore. I understand that. Everybody in this body understands that. So you have got to have a plan to transition, and during that transition, we absolutely should be taking advantage of the resources in our own country. They can provide some of the energy.

And that's why, again, I come back to wondering out loud why it is that our Republican colleagues are so adamant in opposing these efforts to try to get the oil industry to drill on lands and in waters where they already have permits.

So, I'd just like to say that what the American people are looking for right now is not a lot of rhetoric, not a lot of double-talk. They want to know that we're trying to create smart policy here in Washington. The Democratic leadership has been doing that, both with respect to the steps we can take in the immediate near term to deal with the price of gas at the pump, but also to show that we've got an idea of where we're headed so that we can move away from this oil dependency and addiction.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 5 minutes to my colleague from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank my colleague, Mr. HELLER.

I am so grateful that the majority brought this issue up of use-it-or-lose-

it because this is something that the American people have been subjected to now for the last couple of weeks, this canard, that there are 68 million acres, and they somehow want the American people to believe that companies are risking their capital on leases that they're not using.

And what I challenge the majority to do is produce even one lease, even one lease in the U.S. where there is an acre of land that has been leased that is not in some stage of production or exploration. Not one. We haven't seen proof of even one lease where a company has bid for that lease and that lease is not in some stage of either production or exploration.

Again, let's look at Congress and Congress' complicity in this area because Congress has set artificial timelines, delayed timelines, for permitting. The leases are 10 years' long, and there are no less than 11 different stop points in that 10-year lease period where private parties can file lawsuits to stop the drilling. So, if a lawsuit is filed, for instance, by Friends of the Earth, by Sierra Club, by Earth Justice, the oil company, or whatever business it is, has to respond to the lawsuit. The lawsuit will end up in Federal district court. Then it may get kicked up to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. There's one case where a decision wasn't rendered for 2 years. Well, who made that scenario? The United States Congress.

The companies have bid on these leases. They've put money down on the barrel head to actually lease the land. They've got a 10-year timeline that Congress has given them, and there are artificial delays built in for the permitting and also 11 different points for private lawsuits to be filed. So those delays, again, are ones that Congress has allowed to occur.

There aren't companies that are sitting or dallying on a lease. I challenge this majority to produce even one, even one lease on even just 1 acre, where a company has a lease and they're not in some stage that Congress created of either producing or exploring on the land. Let alone defying any common sense of any businessman or -woman who puts their money on the line, their capital, they're not going to dissipate capital.

But you will hear the Democrat majority, Madam Speaker, rant and rail that there're somehow dilatory companies out there that are sitting on leases. They haven't produced one, they haven't shown one example that they can parade around this Chamber where a company is not producing on the land. It's just a patently false statement and, in fact, one that shouldn't be used.

I tell you, the real use-it-or-lose-it, Madam Speaker, it's this. When Congressman HELLER and I were recently up in ANWR this weekend, we learned a very sobering fact, and the sobering fact is this. Thirty-one years ago, the largest oil field in the United States

was up in the North Slope of Alaska, Prudhoe Bay. Today, the largest oil field in the United States remains up in Prudhoe Bay.

This Congress has made a decision not to increase its oil fields. When the Trans-Alaska Pipeline was built in Alaska in the mid seventies, when oil production first began, 2.1 million barrels a day was flowing through that 800 miles of pipeline, 2.1 million barrels a day. Do you know what that is today, Madam Speaker? We are now down to 700,000 barrels a day flowing through that pipeline, 700,000 barrels a day. We have diminished by more than half the amount of oil that we are sending down to the lower 48 from that wonderful energy lifeline in Alaska.

Here's the sobering news, Madam Speaker. We learned this weekend that once we get down to 300,000 barrels a day flowing through that pipeline, the pipeline won't work anymore. This pipeline is a marvel of modern human engineering, a marvel. It's an incredibly valuable asset. I was told this weekend, Madam Speaker, that if we had to rebuild that pipeline today, we could be looking at a \$15 billion investment.

What's the window of opportunity that we have? If we don't open up new oil fields, potentially within 10 years' time, that pipeline will be of no use to us because what we were told is, if you don't use it, you lose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank my colleague for that additional minute.

I just want to conclude by saying this. If you want to talk about a real use-it-or-lose-it, Madam Speaker, you're talking about one of the most valuable resources we have. It is the American energy lifeline that runs through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline that brings the valuable oil down to the lower 48. If we lose this pipeline, and if we lose it on this Democrat-controlled Congress' watch, we will lose our lifeline for any future oil development, which is all the more reason why we need to begin drilling here in the United States so we can buy American energy and buy it now.

If we fast track the permitting, if we pull out all of the unnecessary lawsuits, we could literally within just a few years' time build a 74-mile spur into ANWR, get that oil down to the United States, and increase American energy reserves by 50 percent.

I thank the gentleman for yielding that time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 22 minutes. The gentleman from Nevada has 7½ minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. In the interest of fast-tracking Amtrak, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I have some final thoughts I'd like to share with this body, and I want to thank the chairman for his patience on this particular issue.

It was well-addressed by the gentlewoman from Minnesota, the amount of time and the time and the energy we spent up in ANWR, but I want to talk a little bit about the energy renewable laboratory in Golden, Colorado, where we also spent some time.

I found the statistics and the issues there very, very interesting. I'm one who thinks that we have a three-pronged chair here that's very important in our energy future. We want, of course, to be in conservation, which I believe the American people understand that conservation is a critical part. Renewable energy is also the third leg of that chair which is very critical. And also finding additional sources of energy through our natural resources is very critical.

I want to talk about the National Renewable Energy Lab that we spent some time with out there. We saw and drove in electric cars. We saw and drove in hydrogen cars, and obviously, we saw the hybrid cars, also.

I just want to mention briefly that renewable energy is the future, but I believe it's a long-term future. Let me give you an example.

Five or 6 years ago, I drove in a hydrogen car down in Las Vegas. I got a phone call from the other end of the State, come on down, drive this hydrogen car. I thought it was a great idea, went down there, drove in a hydrogen car, went around the block, got out of the car, and I asked the gentleman: So what does it cost? How much does it cost for a consumer to buy this hydrogen car? He told me it was \$1 million, \$1 million for this hydrogen car.

Well, Madam Speaker, I drove a hydrogen car last week, drove it around the block, got done, opened the door, asked the gentleman: So how much does this car cost? And the car still cost \$1 million dollars, \$1 million for a hydrogen car. I don't have very many constituents that are willing to go out today and buy a \$1 million car.

So we drove the electric car, drove it around the block, ran fine, asked the question: How far does the car go? He said, well, about 70 miles on a charge. How long does it take to charge? About 6 minutes. How much does this car cost? Very expensive, over \$100,000. I said, well, what would it take, what would it take to get an electric car that goes 300 miles at 60 miles an hour that charges in 10 to 15 minutes and costs less than \$30,000 but it will go 60 miles an hour? That's what the consumers want here in this country, and they say we're not even close. We're not even close to that.

□ 1830

Renewables are incredibly important; the technology isn't there today. So that is the purpose that we continue to go up to ANWR, take a look at ANWR, talk about additional oils.

I will tell you, what struck me on my trip up to ANWR was this; that if we conserve—and the American people are conserving and they'll do more to conserve—if we build renewable energy, look for cars, look for opportunities, the technology for renewable energies, and meet our goals—our goal here in this Congress I believe is 15 percent by the year 2020—if we meet those goals, we are still going to need an additional 10 million barrels a day of oil by the year 2025. Even if we conserve, even if we do all the renewable efforts—and the American people are doing that—we're still going to go from 15 million barrels of oil a day to 25 million barrels a day by the year 2025. That's why it's critical. That's why we went up to ANWR. That's why we want to take a look at the opportunity to open up the Outer Continental Shelf, to look at the northern shore of Alaska. I think these principles are critical, that's why we did that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I appreciate the thoughtful presentation of the gentleman from Nevada, very structured and supported by documents and references to specific facts.

The energy issue really consists of three elements; supply, demand, and a regulatory function. We need to deal with all three of those.

On the supply side, one of the elements we're supplying is the Maglev project that was authorized in the current SAFETEA legislation that the gentleman from Alaska and I worked on to connect Los Angeles with Las Vegas. I know that's of great interest to the gentleman from Nevada. And I'm very hopeful that we will see that project take root and go into operation. It will be a great addition to our surface transportation system and will reduce energy costs.

I heard the gentleman's reference to the electric car. There is a small, family-owned firm in my district that's making a very small electric car, selling for under \$120,000, maybe \$115,000. It's not an Escalade, but it's a very nice vehicle. It can get people from one point to another very efficiently for about the cost of what it takes to run your refrigerator for a year. So there is progress being made in all of these arenas.

In Amtrak, we will be able to make an enormous contribution, an alternative to air travel, intercity passenger rail more fuel efficient than car and air travel, consuming less energy than a car or airplanes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield myself an additional minute.

And with the new energy-efficient equipment that Amtrak and the freight rail network are using, we will see more fuel-efficient switching locomotives, more energy-efficient auto train vehicle carriers, and the regenerative braking system with Acela.

We need to move ahead with this legislation and make our contribution in our little corner of the world in transportation through accelerating the work on Amtrak, which has been a bipartisan product of our committee.

Section 221 of the bill requires Amtrak to comply with the Buy America Act, and the regulations thereunder, for purchases of \$100,000 or more.

Amtrak is currently subject to two separate Buy America laws. The first was established in 1978 and requires Amtrak to procure U.S.-sourced equipment, materials, and supplies for purchases in excess of \$1 million. The second was established in the appropriations bill of 2002 and requires Amtrak to comply with Buy America requirements for procurements under \$1 million, pursuant to Amtrak's grant agreements in effect with the Department of Transportation.

Our bill ensures that Amtrak would be subject to one set of Buy America requirements for procurements of \$100,000 or more.

This motion instructs the House managers in the conference to insist on the provisions contained in Section 221 of the bill. The Senate-passed Amtrak reauthorization bill does not contain a similar Buy America requirement for Amtrak. We feel this provision is important, so we support the motion.

#### ENERGY BENEFITS OF AMTRAK

Amtrak and intercity passenger rail helps fight global warming. Our transportation sector produces one-third of the nation's greenhouse gas emissions (and one-twelfth of the world's). The average intercity passenger train produces 60 percent less carbon dioxide emissions per passenger mile than the average automobile, and 50 percent less carbon dioxide emissions per passenger mile of an airplane.

Amtrak and intercity passenger rail reduces highway and aviation congestion. Gridlock is becoming a shared experience for tens of millions of motorists every day, which impacts communities across the country. Over the past decade alone, travel growth on the nation's highways has averaged 2.2 percent annually. In 2007, congestion forced Americans to waste 2.9 billion gallons of fuel and cost Americans a staggering \$78 billion. One full passenger train can take 250 to 350 cars off the road. Further Amtrak as a whole removes 8 million cars from the road and eliminates the need for 50,000 fully-loaded passenger airplanes each year. In conjunction with metropolitan transit systems, the city-center to city-center service offered by intercity passenger rail can also support dense, transit-oriented development in downtown areas, helping to reduce highway travel demand for both local trips and intercity trips.

Amtrak provides an alternative to air travel. Intercity passenger rail is competitive with air travel of 500 miles or less, and more than 80 percent of all trips exceeding 100 miles in length are less than 500 miles. For example, Amtrak service controls 56% of the air/rail market from Washington, DC to New York City and 43% of the air/rail market from New York City to Boston, MA.

Amtrak and intercity passenger rail is more fuel efficient than automobile and air travel. The Department of Energy's Transportation Energy Data Book reports that intercity passenger rail consumes 17 percent less energy per passenger mile than airlines and 21 percent less per passenger mile than automobiles.

Amtrak and intercity passenger rail consumes less energy than automobile and air

travel. Amtrak's British Thermal Unit, (or, "BTU," standard unit of energy) per passenger mile was 2,650 in 2006. This compares to the 3,264 BTUs for air travel and 3,445 BTUs for highway travel in 2006. New energy efficient equipment is further improving conservation (e.g., in addition to Acela Express trains' regenerative braking system, Amtrak has acquired new more energy-efficient Auto Train vehicle carriers and is evaluating more fuel efficient switching locomotives). Amtrak's BTU per passenger mile improved from 2,800 in 2003 to 2,760 in 2004, 2,709 in 2005, and 2,650 in 2006.

Amtrak is taking steps to further reduce its greenhouse gas emissions. After Amtrak restored electrified service to the 104-mile Philadelphia-Harrisburg line in October 2006, it replaced 9 diesel powered roundtrip trains per weekday with 12 roundtrip trains powered by electricity. Today, most of the electric power Amtrak uses between New York and Washington is generated from non-fossil fuel sources.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's comments and his commitment to renewable energies.

I just want to mention, living in a district that's 105,000 square miles—and I mention that every time I get a chance to speak—

Mr. OBERSTAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Absolutely.

Mr. OBERSTAR. My district is 30,000 square miles. I sympathize.

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. It takes me 15 hours to get from one end of my district to the other.

So what I'm looking for, as I mentioned earlier—and I appreciate your commitment to electric cars because we're all there. The fact is I want a car that goes 300 miles and recharges in 5 to 10 minutes because if you live in Elko, Nevada and you have an electric car, it takes you 300 miles roundtrip to get anywhere. And if it takes you 6 hours to plug it in, it's certainly going to cost you more to reserve time in a hotel in order to get back. But again, I want to thank the chairman.

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

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

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 motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 6493, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1311, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1202, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### AVIATION SAFETY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6493, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6493, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Childers	Foster
Ackerman	Clarke	Fox
Aderholt	Clay	Frank (MA)
Akin	Cleaver	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Allen	Coble	Gallegly
Altire	Cohen	Garrett (NJ)
Andrews	Cole (OK)	Gerlach
Arcuri	Conaway	Giffords
Baca	Conyers	Gilchrest
Bachmann	Cooper	Gillibrand
Bachus	Costa	Gingrey
Baird	Costello	Gohmert
Baldwin	Courtney	Gonzalez
Barrett (SC)	Cramer	Goode
Barrow	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bartlett (MD)	Crowley	Gordon
Barton (TX)	Cubin	Granger
Becerra	Culberson	Graves
Berkley	Cummings	Green, Al
Berman	Davis (AL)	Hall (NY)
Berry	Davis (CA)	Hall (TX)
Biggert	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Bilbray	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Davis, David	Hayes
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Lincoln	Heller
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Hensarling
Blumenauer	Deal (GA)	Herger
Blunt	DeFazio	Herseth Sandlin
Boehner	DeGette	Higgins
Bonner	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bono Mack	DeLauro	Hirono
Boozman	Dent	Hobson
Boren	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hodes
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Boyd (FL)	Dicks	Holden
Boyd (KS)	Dingell	Holt
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Honda
Brady (TX)	Donnelly	Hooley
Braley (IA)	Doyle	Hoyer
Broun (GA)	Drake	Inglis (SC)
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Inslee
Brown, Corrine	Duncan	Israel
Buchanan	Edwards (MD)	Issa
Burgess	Edwards (TX)	Jackson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Butterfield	Ellison	(TX)
Buyer	Ellsworth	Jefferson
Calvert	Emanuel	Johnson (GA)
Camp (MI)	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Campbell (CA)	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Cantor	English (PA)	Johnson, Sam
Capito	Eshoo	Jones (NC)
Capps	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Fallin	Jordan
Cardoza	Farr	Kagen
Carnahan	Fattah	Kanjorski
Carney	Feeney	Kaptur
Carson	Ferguson	Keller
Castle	Finer	Kennedy
Castor	Flake	Kildee
Cazayoux	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Chabot	Fortenberry	Kind
Chandler	Fossella	King (IA)
King (NY)		
Kingston		
Kirk		
Klein (FL)		
Kline (MN)		
Knollenberg		
Kucinich		
Kuhl (NY)		
LaHood		
Lamborn		
Larsen (WA)		
Larson (CT)		
Latham		
LaTourette		
Latta		
Lee		
Levin		
Lewis (CA)		
Lewis (GA)		
Lewis (KY)		
Linder		
Lipinski		
LoBiondo		
Loebach		
Lofgren, Zoe		
Lowey		
Lucas		
Lungren, Daniel E.		
Lynch		
Mack		
Mahoney (FL)		
Maloney (NY)		
Manzullo		
Marchant		
Markey		
Marshall		
Matheson		
Matsui		
McCarthy (CA)		
McCarthy (NY)		
McCaul (TX)		
McCollum (MN)		
McCotter		
McCrery		
McDermott		
McGovern		
McHenry		
McHugh		
McIntyre		
McKeon		
McMorris		
Rodgers		
McNerney		
McNulty		
Meek (FL)		
Meeks (NY)		
Melancon		
Mica		
Michaud		
Miller (FL)		
Miller (MI)		
Miller (NC)		
Miller, Gary		
Miller, George		
Mitchell		
Mollohan		
Moore (KS)		
Moore (WI)		
Moran (KS)		
Moran (VA)		
Murphy (CT)		
Murphy, Patrick		
Murphy, Tim		
Murtha		
Musgrave		
Myrick		
Nadler		
Napolitano		
Neal (MA)		
Neugebauer		
Nunes		
Oberstar		
Obey		
Oliver		
Pallone		
Pascarell		
Pastor		
Payne		
Pence		
Perlmutter		
Peterson (MN)		
Petri		
Pickering		
Pitts		
Platts		
Pomeroy		
Porter		
Price (GA)		
Price (NC)		
Pryce (OH)		
Putnam		
Radanovich		
Rahall		
Ramstad		
Rangel		
Regula		
Rehberg		
Reichert		
Reyes		
Reynolds		
Richardson		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Ruppersberger		
Ryan (OH)		
Ryan (WI)		
Salazar		
Sali		
Sánchez, Linda T.		
Sarbanes		
Scalise		
Schakowsky		
Schiff		
Schmidt		
Schwartz		
Scott (GA)		
Scott (VA)		
Sensenbrenner		
Serrano		
Shadegg		
Shays		
Shea-Porter		
Sherman		
Shimkus		
Shuster		
Sires		
Skelton		
Slaughter		
Smith (NE)		
Smith (NJ)		
Smith (TX)		
Smith (WA)		
Snyder		
Souder		
Space		
Speier		
Spratt		
Stark		
Stearns		
Stupak		
Sullivan		
Sutton		
Tancredio		
Tanner		
Tauscher		
Taylor		
Terry		
Thompson (CA)		
Thompson (MS)		
Thornberry		
Tiberi		
Tierney		
Towns		
Tsongas		
Turner		
Udall (CO)		
Udall (NM)		
Upton		
Van Hollen		
Velázquez		
Visclosky		
Walberg		
Walden (OR)		
Walsh (NY)		
Walz (MN)		
Wamp		
Wasserman		
Schultz		
Waters		
Watson		
Watt		
Waxman		
Weiner		
Welch (VT)		
Weller		
Wexler		
Whitfield (KY)		
Wilson (NM)		
Wilson (OH)		
Wilson (SC)		
Wittman (VA)		
Wolf		
Woolsey		
Wu		
Yarmuth		

NOT VOTING—42

□ 1859

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.