

will not measurably improve the missile or space launch capabilities of the People's Republic of China.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 2008.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 362

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 362.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later in the week.

NATIONAL ENERGY SECURITY INTELLIGENCE ACT OF 2008

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6545) to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a national intelligence assessment on national security and energy security issues.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6545

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Energy Security Intelligence Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT ON ENERGY PRICES AND SECURITY.

Not later than January 1, 2009, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a national intelligence assessment on national security and energy security issues relating to rapidly escalating energy costs. Such assessment shall include an assessment of—

(1) the short-term and long-term outlook for prices, supply, and demand for key forms of energy, including crude oil and natural gas, and alternative fuels;

(2) the plans and intentions of key energy-producing and exporting nations with respect to energy production and supply;

(3) the national security implications of rapidly escalating energy costs;

(4) the national security implications of potential use of energy resources as leverage against the United States by Venezuela, Iran, or other potential adversaries of the United States as a result of increased energy prices;

(5) the national security implications of increases in funding to current or potential adversaries of the United States as a result of increased energy prices;

(6) an assessment of the likelihood that increased energy prices will directly or indi-

rectly increase financial support for terrorist organizations;

(7) the national security implications of extreme fluctuations in energy prices; and

(8) the national security implications of continued dependence on international energy supplies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 6545.

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

There was no objection.

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

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAZAYOUX) for sponsoring this important and timely piece of legislation. Gas prices are at a record high at more than \$4 a gallon. As a result, the price of our everyday needs are going up as well. Things like food and consumer goods need to be transported long distances before they reach store shelves in our neighborhoods. Moreover, high fuel costs strain our military operations and increase the taxpayer dollars required to move our troops, ships and planes around the world.

The recent escalation in prices serves as a reminder of the fact that the United States relies on the global energy market. About 65 percent of our oil is imported from other countries, and the price of oil fluctuates with global events. Although much of the oil we import comes from Canada and Mexico, our western hemisphere allies, our oil consumption impacts the global oil market. Many other oil-producing countries are hostile to the United States and are plagued by corruption or instability. The list of the top ten holders of oil reserves includes Iran, Iraq, Venezuela, Russia and Nigeria. For the past few years, 20 to 30 percent of Nigeria's oil output has been disrupted by rebel attacks; Iraq's production hovers below pre-invasion levels and is by no means stable; and Iran's nuclear activities have raised concerns around the world.

In addition, over the past few years global oil reserves have declined while global demand for oil has increased. Some estimate that global demand will increase by 46 percent over the next 25 years. If supply cannot keep pace with demand, the market becomes increasingly volatile and disruptions have a much greater effect.

We must understand the national security implications of the global energy market. Some countries are beginning to use energy as a leverage to

achieve their foreign policy goals. For instance, 40 percent of the world's oil flows through the Strait of Hormuz in the Persian Gulf. Would Iran try to block the Strait of Hormuz in the event of a foreign policy crisis? The Intelligence Committee should analyze the impact of such a crisis.

The National Intelligence Assessment required by this legislation will allow the intelligence community to work with the best minds in the country, from academia to industry, much like the National Intelligence Assessment on global climate change. The intelligence community will collect data from various sources and then assess the geopolitical aspects.

I also note that the report required by this bill is the same one that would have been required in the motion offered by the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee last week. However, the form in which he offered it would have killed the entire intelligence authorization bill. Unfortunately, when asked, he refused to agree to allow the House to simply adopt this amendment on the spot which would have saved the bill. That forced Members into the uncomfortable position of choosing this report over authorizing full funding and other critical legislation that our intelligence agencies need to do their jobs of keeping us safe.

I am pleased that we passed the intelligence authorization last week, and I will vote to support this legislation. This report will be an important tool for policymakers to understand the current energy crisis and plan for the future. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the renewed enthusiasm for this issue, and I can't tell you how important I think it is. Energy today is a national security issue, and it is incredibly important that we have a full understanding of what the money that we send every single day overseas is doing to our enemies, how it is fueling their ability to do things like buy weapons, improve weapon systems and do other things.

I was struck by one portion of the bill and would make an inquiry to the bill's sponsor, that you made a difference between the National Intelligence Estimate and the National Intelligence Assessment. I am curious why you chose National Intelligence Assessment versus the National Intelligence Estimate on this particular issue.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana to respond.

Mr. CAZAYOUX. As you know, I guess, in an assessment you can consult outside sources where an estimate you cannot. We thought it would be a more comprehensive report as an assessment.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, that's interesting.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Sure.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Just to answer that question, it was the language chosen by Ranking Member HOEKSTRA.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. And I understand that. And I think the gentleman from Louisiana misstated, it is not because it is the most accurate report, it is because it is based on open-source information and something that we could use to project versus the actual intelligence estimate which is more narrow in scope and used confidential, and as you know, classified sources of information.

And I ask the question because I have to be honest, I am very disappointed with my friends this evening on an issue that I think is so important. You know, there is a reason, I think, that we have a 9 percent approval, the lowest this Congress has ever registered. And it is for issues exactly like this.

We stood up in good faith last week. As a matter of fact, Mr. HOEKSTRA introduced this very bill word for word, and then we offered it, the same bill, in a motion to recommit. And this is policy, and we won't spend much time on it, but I have to note that I just think this is an awful way to do business here, and I think the 110th Congress has really sunk to new lows.

There was no reason that you couldn't have picked up the phone and talked with Mr. HOEKSTRA about a bill that he introduced and pioneered to deal with a most serious issue. As a matter of fact, one of the speakers today actually voted against the bill in its form, but today there is a renewed enthusiasm that we are going to pass this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his leadership, and I thank Mr. HOEKSTRA for his excellent idea.

As you will recall on the floor, I indicated we would adopt it immediately on the spot if he would agree to a unanimous consent request to strike the "promptly" and insert "forthwith" so that we would not, in adopting Mr. HOEKSTRA's good idea, kill the bill. He rejected that idea, at which point in time I made the representation that we will introduce that bill as a suspension and bring it to the floor next week.

I tell my friend, that is exactly what we have done. Mr. HOEKSTRA made a determination, very frankly from my perspective, that he was more interested in trying to politically put some people on the hook for a vote on a proposition that he knew and we knew they were for but they did not want to kill the Intelligence bill in the process.

Now people will say it doesn't kill the bill, that is accurate, but it clearly delays the bill. There was no reason to delay the bill because had Mr. HOEK-

STRA agreed, contrary to the advice he was receiving, to yes, I will strike "promptly," insert "forthwith" so that my proposition can be adopted immediately, which would have been the case.

□ 1930

So I think any criticism of sinking to a new low, very frankly, if politics had not been played with this proposition, it would be on the authorization bill to the Senate as we speak. This proposition, which Mr. HOEKSTRA came up with, as you recall I said on the floor, we think this is a good idea. Proving that we thought it was a good idea, we have brought it to the floor today for passage.

Mr. HOEKSTRA, who I now see is on the floor, made a determination he did not want to adopt, in the way that we suggested, his proposition last week. So we are going to adopt it this week.

I would hope that all of us would vote for it, because, as I told Mr. HOEKSTRA then and believe now, Mr. HOEKSTRA's idea was a good idea. It is a good idea. We are going to pass it, hopefully, tomorrow morning by an overwhelming majority vote.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. You are very welcome, sir. To the distinguished Member, I am reclaiming my time.

The only real problem with the bill last week was that there was a Republican and not a Democrat. You know what, I say okay. If that's the way this is going to be, I say okay.

Ronald Reagan had a very interesting plaque on his desk, and it said, "It's amazing what you can get done if you don't care who gets the credit." So I am going to offer this tonight, Mr. Distinguished Majority Leader, and then I will let you respond.

We hope that because of this new spirit of great ideas, but it has to be a Democrat idea, I am for that too, because I am more concerned about \$4 a gallon gasoline and people not being able to make it.

So I offer this suggestion, and I will offer this deal tonight, H.R. 3089, please take it. It opens up ANWR and OCS and builds more refineries here in the United States. It's yours. We'll bring it over word for word and let you put a Democrat on it. Let's get it done.

H.R. 2279, which builds new refineries on military bases. Please, take this bill, help those people who are suffering under \$4 a gallon gasoline. I'll bring it over, word for word. Put your name on it. We'll get it done.

H.R. 5656, which repeals the ban on coal-to-liquids as an aviation fuel. Please, for the people who are stopping to go to their children's away games because they can't afford over \$4 a gallon gasoline, take this bill, please. I will bring it over, word for word, it's yours.

H.R. 2208, which provides incentives for the development of coal-to-liquids, please, take the bill. Put your name on it. We'll vote for it. Put it on suspension. We're in.

H.R. 2493, which eliminates expensive and wasteful boutique fuel blends, which is costing Americans real money out of their paychecks. Their food prices are going up. We have volunteer firefighters who no longer can afford to respond to fires in very remote areas of places like Michigan and Texas and, yes, even Louisiana. Please, take the bill. Put a Democrat on it. Call a sponsor, we'll give it to you word for word.

H.R. 6107, it opens up the coastal plains of Alaska, which we know will directly have an impact on the cost of fuel and bring down those prices of people who can't afford over \$4 gasoline today.

H.R. 6108, which opens up our deep oceans as an energy resource. My legislation, H.R. 6161, which will spur the development of clean cars and invest in nuclear power. I give you the bill today, it's mine, it's yours. I'll give it to you. Take it. Put it on suspension.

My complaint here is this. There has been a lot of nothing happening on it. If you are trying to tell the American people you are for lessening their burden at the pump, which is literally killing small towns all across America, then let's do something about it. If it's just the fact that Republicans are on these bills, we give you all of them, every single one of them. Let's do this together, so the people who are paying the pain at the pump get some relief.

Now, this bill is pretty serious, I think, and I believe the reason we need this American-made energy plan, and that this helps us understand what the impact of those oil dollars flowing overseas every single day, and every day that we don't do something, means that we are a little bit in danger, is serious. That's why we are going to support this bill. We don't care if your name is on it. We really don't.

We just want to point out we don't care if your name is on all the bills that do the right thing. Every day, think of this, every single day, we send \$840 million to OPEC. We send \$191 million to Saudi Arabia. This is as of April. We send \$155 million to Venezuela, \$52 million to Russia.

Energy is a critical issue, and it's one that we should focus the intelligence community's efforts on. We shouldn't divert our intelligence resources to global climate change, as my colleagues have suggested. It doesn't have a real impact for what we know is fueling our very enemies' ability to buy missile systems, to upgrade their nuclear arsenals, to invest in their conventional forces, and people like Hugo Chavez, spending money, as has been reported in public newspapers, on submarines. We all certainly know what his intentions are with that, with American shipping so close to the coast.

Focusing our intelligence resources on energy security would make clear to the American people that our priorities are focused in the right place again. The press has also reported that Hugo

Chavez has supported the FARC, a terrorist organization that operates in Colombia. Wouldn't it make sense to track the rising oil prices, which results in greater income to Chavez's now nationalized oil companies, and to assess whether these funds are being used to collude with terrorist organizations? Is it merely coincidence that Chavez has reportedly traveled to Russia today to buy arms in the wake of rapidly rising oil prices? I think we all know the answer to that. It's helpful to have the intelligence resources focused on that very serious problem.

We need to have a better idea of how rapidly escalating energy costs are directly or indirectly increasing funds available to terrorist organizations so that this Congress can make informed decisions about the policy going forward. If there is a direct or even an indirect correlation between rising energy prices and increased financial support to terrorist organizations, we need to know, and we need to take action.

What are the security implications of Iran leveraging energy resources against the United States? Iran is the world's fourth largest producer of crude oil and as oil prices continue to rise, we must consider the potential for Iran to leverage energy resources and the potential effects of such actions.

These are questions our intelligence professionals should be analyzing and answering. We have done a lot of things here. We have played a lot of games. I think there was even a bill last week they called the DRILL Act. It stuns me a little bit. There was actually no drilling in the bill.

We need to have an honest discussion, not only with ourselves, but with the American people. We haven't really done that. Every day, it presents a national security issue that we spend about \$1 billion a day overseas to people who want to do us harm, every single day.

Every day that we don't open up our own American-made energy resources, shame on us. We are just only adding fuel to what we will have to deal with in one way or another.

In addition to the economic aspects of having increased domestic energy supply here in America that frees us up, provides jobs here at home, and provides energy security and reduced prices and makes us competitive in a worldwide market when we are talking about the competitiveness of energy prices, and the manufacturing of goods here in the United States. The greatest thing of all, if you do a comprehensive package that includes conservation and alternative energy, and American-made and American-drilled oil, it means that we walk away from the ability to have to send \$1 overseas. The sad part is, it's doable. It's absolutely doable.

We really don't need the intelligence community to come back and tell us this. We know it, but I am strongly encouraging us to support this bill, because maybe if it's coming from the in-

telligence community and says, hey, folks in Congress, you have a problem, you better do something about it, I am going to be for it. I don't care if it has a Republican name on it or a Democrat name on it. As I have said before, we have got a whole list of great bills we are willing to walk over and have you sponsor as soon as we can possibly get the ink to dry.

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is left, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 17 minutes.

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

First, I understand the issues that my friend from the Intelligence Committee has raised. I just want to point out that this issue we have with the oil crisis and energy crisis did not occur in the last couple of years. This administration has been in office now close to 7½ years, and this is a policy we should have started 8 years ago. And now we are attempting to resolve it.

I want to respond to one of your issues, though, about the drilling. The oil companies should explore the more than 68 million acres of Federal land that we have already leased to them. It just boggles my mind, this has not been used.

But maybe I found a reason why they don't want to do this. In today's Baltimore Sun, July 22, an Associated Press article, Big Oil Big on Dividends and Buybacks, and this is a quote: "Giant oil companies such as ExxonMobil and ConocoPhillips are set to report what will probably be another round of eye-popping quarterly profits. Which raises the question: Just where is all that money going?"

"The companies insist they're trying to find new oil that might help bring down gas prices, but the money they spend on exploration is nothing compared with what they spend on stock buybacks and dividends.

"It's good news for shareholders, including mutual funds and retirement plans for millions of Americans, but no help to drivers making drastic cutbacks to offset high fuel bills.

"The five biggest international oil companies plowed about 55 percent of the cash they made from their businesses into stock buybacks and dividends last year, up from 30 percent in 2000 and just 1 percent in 1993, according to Rice University's James A. Baker III Institute For Public Policy.

"The percentage they spend to find new deposits of fossil fuels has remained flat for years, in the mid-single digits."

Is this why we are not drilling, they are not drilling the 68 million acres? Based on this article, and based on the evidence before us, they have not drilled. They have improved their profits. They have done it for their stockholders, but it has hurt the American public as a result of that policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAZAYOUX) the sponsor of H.R. 6545, the National Energy Security Intelligence Act.

Mr. CAZAYOUX. Thank you, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6545, the National Energy Security Intelligence Act of 2008. This bill will task the Director of National Intelligence to provide to Congress accurate and timely information on the effect of the current energy crisis on national security.

Since I joined Congress almost 3 months ago, there has been a lot of discussion in this body about energy supply, energy prices, how our energy needs affect our place in the world and what effect worldwide demands for energy have on America.

I introduced this legislation so that we will have a better understanding of these critical issues. This was an idea that was discussed last week during the vote on the Intelligence authorization bill, which was just referenced, which I voted for. In fact, this would have already been passed if not for the choice of wording on the motion to recommit in politics, but a good idea is a good idea. I, along with my colleagues, who supported me on this legislation, thought this was important enough to bring it up for a vote.

This bill will require the DNI to submit to Congress no later than January 1, 2009, a national intelligence assessment on the national security implications of rapidly escalating energy costs and the short and long-term outlook for prices, supply and demand for energy sources like crude oil, natural gas and alternative fuels.

In addition to better understanding our short-term and long-term energy situation, the report will also examine the geopolitical consequences of our dependence on foreign energy sources, especially in regards to the relationship between the U.S. and adversarial oil-producing nations.

Specifically, the report asks for an assessment of plans and intentions of key energy-producing and exporting nations with respect to production and supply. It will address the national security implications of potential use of energy resources as leverage against the U.S. by Venezuela, Iran, and other potential adversaries as a result of increased energy prices.

This assessment will also analyze whether increased energy prices will directly or indirectly increase financial support for terrorist organizations.

I believe this report is important, and I urge its passage by my colleagues. There are no two issues more current and more salient than our energy situation and our national security. Additionally, there are few other issues as intertwined and interconnected as energy and national security.

By conducting this national intelligence assessment, we will have a better understanding of how our long-term

energy needs will affect our national security. This report is needed and will help lawmakers and officials develop sound policy on these critical issues.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for my friend from Maryland. I enjoy his service on the Intelligence Committee, but I think we have had this debate before. I can't tell you, you are a great guy but how wrong you are on this one.

You know, you talked about Big Oil. Let's all be mad at Big Oil. I am mad at Big Oil. I have friends who run small stores who literally have had tears in their eyes because the fuel costs don't allow them to do deliveries of food, deliveries of flour for what they used to do.

I know mid- and small trucking firms who have had to actually park their trucks, because anything over \$4 takes away all their margin. This is hurting the poorest Americans first, the middle class second, and, beyond that, people are adapting. But the folks who have played by the rules are getting killed with these oil prices, these gasoline prices.

□ 1945

So what you are telling me is you are mad at them. You say they are not drilling on any of the leases. Not true, they have got 4,700 onland leases. But they are telling us, this is where we know the oil is. Please let us get it.

And we said, no, we are mad at you because you are making money because oil is \$145 a barrel.

Okay. I am mad at them too. But every day that you stay mad and you don't take action means that we send \$840 million to OPEC every day. That really makes me mad.

How about \$191 million to Saudi Arabia? What should that be doing to you?

How about \$155 million to Venezuela, Hugo Chavez, who we know is in collusion with the Iranians, who we know is investing in munition plants, who we know, by press reports, is buying submarines to intimidate U.S. shipping, who we know is buying munitions for the FARC in Colombia. We finally have them at rope's end, and we don't care that we are going to fund them through this sham of a government in Venezuela?

Or the \$52 million we sent to Russia. And by the way, they are retrofitting their nuclear missile systems that are targeted at the United States. And they couldn't do it before. Just a few years ago they couldn't afford to do it, we had to give them money to dismantle their nuclear program. And because oil is at \$145 a barrel because we refuse to increase the supply in the world, they are going to go out and buy missile systems targeting us.

It is crazy, it is madness, and we can do something about it. If you are mad at oil companies, increase the supply of oil and watch the prices fall. That is the best way to get them. And guess who benefits? The single mom who is right now trying to debate if she can

keep that job because it is a little bit too far at \$4.19 a gallon in my hometown. I have talked to those people and they are at wits' end.

We have to stop this. I said, we don't care if it is Republican or Democrat. And if that has been the concern, quite obviously tonight maybe that was the big issue. We again, I will offer again, you can have every bill that we have; I will bring it over, to stop sending money to foreign oil overseas at the expense of our people at the pump.

You can bring up Big Oil all night long. You can be mad at them, you can tax them, you can try to regulate them, but you and I both know that prices aren't going to go down at the pump for any of those causes. They will if we have an American-made domestic supply that actually impacts the world market and starts bringing prices down.

I'm going to plead with all of you for those people who don't have a voice and they don't have fancy lobbyists and they can't afford to fly to Washington, DC because they are barely making it right now, please, let's have an American-made energy supply that keeps Americans alive, keeps them employed, has an impact on our national security, has an impact on our economic security, and the best benefit of all, it takes care of our environment in the process, because what we are proposing is conservation, alternative energy and American-made sources of energy, including oil. And there is more conservation in our bills than there is production. Who isn't for that?

I haven't heard any discussion of nuclear with zero emissions. You talk about sun, solar and wind. That is great. But that, in and of itself, won't do it.

Take our comprehensive bills, the all-of-the-above energy plan. Take it all. Get it done. Make a difference for the future generations of America. We will all stand up together and celebrate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to respond to my good friend, who I respect. Former law enforcement.

I am not mad at the oil companies. I am disappointed in the oil companies on behalf of the American people.

I think you have talked about where we buy our oil. It seems to me that this administration has been in office for about 7½ years, have set the oil policy, and now we are paying for it. And we are attempting to do whatever we can on this side of the aisle to resurrect it.

And to come up with an issue of drill, drill, drill. We keep saying, and the facts are there, we have 83 million acres that the oil companies have under license, and they have not chosen to put money into the drilling of those 83 million acres, both onshore and offshore. That is number one.

What really concerns me, and what I am upset about though is the fact that

we, this Congress, when the Republicans were in the majority, that we gave oil companies billions of dollars of grants to do research. And yet I haven't seen any of that money go to drilling or doing what you are suggesting that we should do now.

What I see is what I read in that article in the Sun paper about the fact that the oil companies are making outstanding, the highest profits they have ever made in their history. And you know why? Because they are putting the money, the grants that we gave them, the American dollars, not in to drilling and trying to help bring the oil prices down, but to the bottom line of their stockholders and also to really having the American people suffer because of that strategy.

So I would just say that this is an issue we must move forward with. We are talking about drilling when this is an intelligence bill, and we should stand behind this bill, as Americans, as Republicans and as Democrats.

Now I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Rhode Island, Congressman KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY. I just want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to mention the point about whether it didn't matter whether the big oil companies were really making a profit or not making a profit, whether they were using their profits right for good or not, or reinvestment or not.

I just want to make it really clear what they actually are doing, just to correct any misperceptions and to clarify what has already been said by my good friend, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, from Maryland.

Last year oil companies made 286 percent profit. Domestically, in this country, they cut capital reinvestment by 11 percent. So if you make money, usually, as a business, you reinvest in your capital and infrastructure so that you can go on and make more money.

This is a unique business. Not only do they take their profits, but they don't reinvest it in the business, even though they know they are coming to a point where they are going to be in a limited supply mode, or they should be thinking that somewhere down the line they might be. But of course, they don't care because they have an incentive to keep oil prices high right now.

So this notion that there is some incentive for them to go out there and take their profits and go explore, and that we shouldn't be harping on them for going out there and doing what they already are doing, they aren't doing it. That is why we are trying to make them do it, because they are not doing it.

This notion that they are already out there exploring all these things is nonsense. They cut their domestic exploration by 11 percent last year. That is nonsense that they have actually been out there exploring these leases.

How can you take home 286 percent profit and say that you made an honest attempt at finding oil in this country? You haven't made an honest attempt.

So the fact of the matter is, they are to blame when you take home that kind of money and you leave Americans out in the cold and you leave Americans high and dry because of these high gas prices. And that is where the blame should be is on big oil.

And the blame should be the administration. Where was DICK CHENEY when he had his energy meeting at the beginning of the administration?

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. For all we know, DICK CHENEY had a bunch of oilmen, along with the President, who is also an oilman, in a meeting and they said, let's think about how we are going to drive up the price of oil over the course of President Bush's presidency so that we all make millions and million of dollars, because certainly that is the way it has worked out. And DICK CHENEY and President Bush, two oilmen, and all of their rich oilmen friends from Texas have certainly made millions and millions of dollars while they have been in office.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. How much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6½ minutes. The gentleman from Michigan has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I reserve.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Well, I gave a good chunk of my time to the majority leader, and I was going to do that. I know if I run over, you will give me a little bit of that time back. I won't be long.

I think we have certainly debated this. If you are mad or you are disappointed, and I am very disappointed with the remarks from the gentleman. To accuse somebody of something like that is, well, I won't even get into it and I will tell you why, because we have in the power of our hands in Congress to fix this through conservation, through alternative energy research and through an American-made energy plan.

Mr. KENNEDY. You cut the budget for conservation.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I would like some regular order, sir.

What we are talking about is conserving energy to get ourselves off foreign oil that actually has an economic impact, a positive economic impact.

The statistics you made up from the oil companies I have never heard them before. They are absolutely outrageous. And who cares? I am mad at them, so let's do something about it. Let's do a conservation, alternative energy and American-made oil so that we can stop punishing the very people who are struggling to make it every day.

You can be disappointed and mad and kick the chair and say we hate them, and that is great. It doesn't do anything for somebody who is paying more for milk or bread or gasoline.

I would request unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Michigan will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to my friend.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Again, we can be mad. We can kick. We can scuffle. The most important people in this debate aren't being heard right now. Americans back home are saying help us out. Give us an American-made energy plan. Give us conservation. Give us alternative energy. All of those things are in the bills we are willing to give you tonight.

I would hope and urge, for the very pressure that is being put on those families, we would stand united, with your name on the bills, and take care of those people, because right now they are at the back end of the heel, and all they hear is their disappointment in a very, very, very inactive Congress on the issues that matter to them the most.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. The President has an opportunity now to release the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We have billions and billions of barrels of oil buried in this country that we have been burying for over 3 decades since the energy crisis in the 1970s in case of an emergency.

The President says this isn't an emergency. I don't know where he is living, but it is an emergency in my district. He should release 10 percent of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, burst the speculative bubble on oil, bring the prices down, bring relief to our consumers, and use the profits of that to help generate the proceeds to fuel the costs that are going to be incurred by investing in this renewable energy technology that the gentleman is speaking about, which, by the way, the Republicans completely cut the funding for every year that they ran this House. They cut this technology by 23 percent on average. And I am on the Appropriations Committee and I know that for a fact.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I will close.

First, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana and the other sponsors of H.R. 6545 for introducing this important piece of legislation.

Energy and the availability of fuel affects every aspect of our lives. It impacts our security. It impacts our economy, and it impacts our wallets. We need the best information available and the best analysis possible on energy security. The intelligence community is in a unique position to give it to us.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6545.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are able to consider this legislation today. H.R. 6545, the National Energy Security Act is an important proposal to ensure that policymakers get a comprehensive analysis of the way our national security and energy security are affected by rising energy costs.

I applaud the gentleman from Louisiana for introducing this bill, and believe that is the right way to address this proposal. Last week, the ranking member of my committee proposed this idea. But his motion made it clear that this was just a tactic to de-rail the intelligence authorization bill. I said that this report was a good idea, and that we deserve to know the information that this bill requires. But I could not agree to the form of his request then because it would have sent the bill back through the committee process, effectively killing this bill, and would have denied critical funds that the men and women in the intelligence community need to uncover and disrupt terrorist plots—funds that he agreed were crucial to our national security.

I hope that the House will pass this proposal now. It is important for us to understand the energy security implications of rising prices. I would note that the intelligence community has already done some work in this area. Last March, the intelligence community produced an unclassified report called, "Energy Security Dynamics Transforming International Politics", which covered some of the issues in this bill, but that report was not at the same level of rigor and coordination as the assessment required by this bill.

This National Intelligence Assessment will provide a short-term and long-term assessment of the outlook for prices, supply, and demand for key forms of energy. The intelligence community can help us understand the plans for production and supply of energy sources from key energy-producing and exporting nations. It can also help us understand how potential adversaries who are energy suppliers will use dollar diplomacy or energy supply as leverage to achieve their goals. We also need to understand whether increased energy prices are going to fund terrorists. The format of this report will allow the intelligence community to consult with the best minds in industry and academia.

I would also note that this assessment is similar to one on the national security implications of global climate change that was included in last year's House-passed version of the intelligence authorization bill. We received that report last month, and the intelligence community management subcommittee held

an excellent hearing on it. Both energy security and global climate change have serious implications for national security. But both energy security and global climate change require solutions that cannot be solved by our military or intelligence community. The next President will have to deal with these challenges, and deserves the best judgment of our intelligence community.

This bill ensures that the next President will have that advice. I urge my colleagues to adopt the resolution.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6545, the National Intelligence Assessment of Energy Security Act. This bill would require the National Intelligence Director to submit to Congress a national intelligence assessment on the national security and energy security issues related to energy costs.

Our national security is threatened by our dependence on foreign countries that do not share our views on democracy or our commitment to combat radical Islamist terrorists. By relying on oil from OPEC in the Middle East and countries like Venezuela and Nigeria, we place our national security in the hands of authoritarian governments.

I believe our energy policy should be a bipartisan approach that reduces our demand by increasing conservation, including getting better mileage from cars, minivans, SUVs and trucks, and making electric appliances and lighting more energy efficient, increases the use of renewable fuels such as solar, wind, geothermal and biofuels, reduces speculation in the oil futures market, and increases our domestic supply of oil, natural gas and nuclear power.

The national intelligence assessment required under this bill will show us the national security threats likely to increase should a long term, bipartisan plan not be implemented.

It is critical we understand the consequences of our increasing energy demand and take strong action to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Well over half of our energy derived from oil and natural gas comes from foreign producers. Our energy consumption not only fuels our homes, our transportation and our industry, but also transfers our wealth to countries and foreign interests that would do us harm. Our national security requires us to be energy independent, and I urge support of H.R. 6545.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 6545, the National Energy Security Intelligence Act of 2008, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Representative DON CAZAYOUX. This legislation is an important step in ensuring that rising energy costs do not endanger American lives.

It is obvious that the steep incline in energy prices that has been plaguing our citizens cannot be tolerated much longer, as it has led to rising food costs, transportation costs, and inflation. In addition to these economic issues, energy prices also negatively impact national security.

One key step in managing this situation is assessing the future supply and demand for crude oil, natural gas, and alternative fuels. By doing so, we limit the unpredictability of the energy market and its impact on daily lives. This will prevent energy and food crises like the one we are currently experiencing from occurring in the future.

Additionally, investigating the effects that rapidly escalating energy costs and extreme

price fluctuations could have on national security is absolutely crucial. The possibility of energy sales being used to fund terrorist organizations or other adversaries of the United States, cannot be ignored. Americans cannot allow the money we spend on travelling to work or school everyday to end up in the hands of those who mean us harm. This is why we must know the implications of increasing funding through energy revenue to potential adversaries of the U.S., and we must also understand the intentions of key energy-producing and exporting nations with respect to energy production and supply.

This legislation will allow us to decide which countries are trust-worthy business partners, and which countries we must limit our energy trade with. It is also necessary to examine the national security implications of America's dependence on international energy supplies in order to further determine the benefits of exploring alternative energy supplies.

By requiring the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a national intelligence assessment on national security and energy security issues relating to rapidly escalating energy costs, H. Res. 6545 assures that these issues will be examined and addressed.

As Members of Congress, and representatives of the people, it is our duty to ensure the safety and well-being of Americans. I urge my fellow Representatives to join me in support of H. Res. 6545, which is an essential step for national security.

□ 2000

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN A. BOEHNER, REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

Pursuant to Section 214(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15344, I am pleased to reappoint Mr. Thomas A. Fuentes of Lake Forest, California to the Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors.

Mr. Fuentes has expressed interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill his request.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

FREE EGYPTIAN BLOGGER KAREEM AMER

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon Egypt to demonstrate it is a force for tolerance in the Arab world by releasing Kareem Amer from prison.

While other prisoners of conscience languish in Egyptian jails, the most troubling case is that of a young human rights blogger, Abdel Kareem Nabil Soliman. Kareem Amer, as he is

known on the blogosphere, was sentenced to 4 years in prison in February 2007 solely for what he wrote on his blog—condemning Islamic extremism and the treatment of women.

Tomorrow, Egypt celebrates Revolution Day, a holiday during which the Egyptian President customarily releases prisoners. I strongly urge President Mubarak to release Kareem Amer, who now has served 17 months of his sentence.

Egypt is one of the largest recipients of U.S. taxpayer aid, and we should ensure that the partners of ours of this magnitude are also dedicated to the freedom of expression. The release of Kareem Amer, the first blogger arrested in the Arab world simply for what he wrote on his blog, would demonstrate Egypt's commitment to Internet freedom and to human rights.

ENERGY PRICES

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Bush removed the executive ban on offshore drilling. After the announcement was made, crude oil futures plunged. Prices fell \$6.44 in the biggest one-day drop since the Gulf War. The next day, prices dropped another \$4.50 to \$134. This is not a coincidence.

The Democratic majority says it will take years to produce oil from offshore drilling and that it won't affect energy prices.

If Congress lifts the ban on offshore drilling, we will continue to see oil prices fall. Energy traders do take government policies into account. Deciding to develop our American energy resources can immediately lower the cost per barrel of oil and can provide relief at the gas pump.

Democratic Party leaders should heed the will of the American people and should schedule a vote to increase our American energy supply.

THE 34TH COMMEMORATION OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, July the 20th marked the 34th commemoration of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. That invasion claimed the lives of 5,000 Greek Cypriots while an additional 200,000 were forced from their homes. Today, nearly 36,000 Turkish soldiers, 1 soldier for every 2 Turkish Cypriots, are embedded in Cyprus, occupying 35 percent of the island. It is one of the most militarized areas in the world.

The Turkish and Greek Cypriots, themselves, live in harmony, making the occupation all the more unacceptable and unnecessary. There have been