

says. I say, "they must pay." They must be held accountable. And the deal that is struck is one in which they will pay only a portion of the damages and the taxpayers will pay the remainder.

The House Republican energy bill fails to address this Nation's record gas prices. And according to the Bush administration's own Energy Department would actually cause gas prices to increase, and that at a time when they are increasing. This energy bill we are now going to be considering in conference will do nothing to cause containment of that increase in gas prices. Instead of giving real relief to consumers, this Republican bill gives loads of new tax breaks and loopholes to special interests. And the worst example of these special interest giveaways is the complete liability shield for MTBE manufacturers, a shield that will shift billions of dollars in cleanup costs from MTBE manufacturers to the American taxpayer.

MTBE is responsible for polluting groundwater in so many communities across this country. Cleanup costs are estimated in the billions, \$28 billion to maybe as high as over \$50 billion. MTBE manufacturers are now being held accountable in court, but this provision would end that accountability. I would remind Members that it was the special protections granted to MTBE manufacturers that brought this bill down in the last Congress. Senate leaders have made it clear they are not including this grossly unwanted get-out-of-jail-free card for the MTBE this year either.

So I know many Members of the House have school boards, have water districts or towns with lawsuits against MTBE manufacturers, and those lawsuits are going to be voided. Null. They are not going to be able to proceed under this energy bill. Your constituents would lose their right to hold these manufacturers of MTBE accountable for the pollution in their groundwater. And the billions in MTBE cleanup that your communities face will be shifted from the oil companies, who have record profits and who caused the problem, to your constituents, who have to live with the problem.

Make no mistake, that is what this vote is all about. By voting for the motion to instruct conferees, you will be saying that it is not okay to make your constituents pay for pollution that they did not cause, but that was caused by MTBE manufacturers. The special protection in this bill for MTBE manufacturers is completely unwarranted and it will cost your constituents a fortune.

So I urge you to vote for the motion to instruct conferees. Vote for the Capps motion.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). 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 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1445

DEFICIT CONTINUES TO SHRINK

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this morning the President announced some very good economic news: Our economy continues to grow and our deficit continues to shrink. That is good news. Why is that happening?

Number one, we gave tax relief to the American people so they can keep more of what they earned, and that has helped create an awful lot of new jobs, and this year we put the brakes on Federal spending when we wrote our budget and passed our spending bills this year. We actually spend less money next year than we did last year. Spending goes down. When we take out homeland security and defense, discretionary spending is reduced.

Mr. Speaker, that is what every American family has to do. They write a budget and then they stay within the budget, and we did just that. That is great news for the American taxpayers, that is why the economy continues to grow. That is why interest rates are down. That is why jobs are up and unemployment is down.

That economic news is something we have been waiting to hear. When you give tax relief and put the brakes on Federal spending, good news happens and the economy is growing.

SHRINKING BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget just released their deficit figures today. It is very telling.

A year ago, we projected the Federal budget deficit would be \$521 billion. This year we projected the deficit would be \$427 billion. Well, the budget deficit just came in at \$333 billion. Down \$94 billion this year, down \$188 billion from last year. This is progress.

Mr. Speaker, why did this happen? Two reasons. When we cut taxes 2 years ago almost to this day, we increased economic growth in jobs. Many people said when we were going to cut tax, by

cutting taxes on families and small businesses and job creators, we would blow a hole through the deficit and increase the deficit.

What happened? Tax receipts from those taxes went up. Taxes receipts are up. There has been a 41 percent increase in corporate tax revenues, 17 percent increase in individual income tax revenues. Because we lowered the tax on workers and people, we grew jobs and have more tax revenues coming in.

The next thing we have to do is watch our spending. That is why it is important we kept the level on spending as we have done this year. We need to stay on this course to get rid of this budget deficit once and for all by growing the economy, keeping taxes low and keeping the lid on pending.

KARL ROVE HAS COOPERATED

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with concern and in opposition to the partisan attacks on Karl Rove. I think we see too many efforts now where people quickly rush to judgment, rush to call for the most bizarre solutions to problems that are problems which are often just created in their own minds.

Karl Rove has fully cooperated in any investigation and, for more than a year now, has permitted investigators to talk to him. I think The Wall Street Journal put it best today when, in an editorial that I will submit as part of my remarks, and to quote directly from that editorial, the editors summed up this episode by stating: "In short, Joe Wilson hadn't told the truth about what he discovered in Africa, how he'd discovered it, what he'd told the CIA about it, or even why he was sent on the mission. The media and the Kerry campaign promptly abandoned him, though the former never did give as much prominence to his debunking as they did to his original accusations. But if anyone can remember another public figure so entirely and thoroughly discredited, let us know."

Mr. Speaker, I will submit The Wall Street Journal editorial for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 2005]
KARL ROVE, WHISTLEBLOWER

Democrats and most of the Beltway press corps are baying for Karl Rove's head over his role in exposing a case of CIA nepotism involving Joe Wilson and his wife, Valerie Plame. On the contrary, we'd say the White House political guru deserves a prize—perhaps the next iteration of the "Truth-Telling" award that The Nation magazine bestowed upon Mr. Wilson before the Senate Intelligence Committee exposed him as a fraud.

For Mr. Rove is turning out to be the real "whistleblower" in this whole sorry pseudoscandal. He's the one who warned Time's Matthew Cooper and other reporters to be

wary of Mr. Wilson's credibility. He's the one who told the press the truth that Mr. Wilson had been recommended for the CIA consulting gig by his wife, not by Vice President Dick Cheney as Mr. Wilson was asserting on the airwaves. In short, Mr. Rove provided important background so Americans could understand that Mr. Wilson wasn't a whistleblower but was a partisan trying to discredit the Iraq War in an election campaign. Thank you, Mr. Rove.

Media chants aside, there's no evidence that Mr. Rove broke any laws in telling reporters that Ms. Plame may have played a role in her husband's selection for a 2002 mission to investigate reports that Iraq was seeking uranium ore in Niger. To be prosecuted under the 1982 Intelligence Identities Protection Act, Mr. Rove would have had to have deliberately and maliciously exposed Ms. Plame knowing that she was an undercover agent and using information he'd obtained in an official capacity. But it appears Mr. Rove didn't even know Ms. Plame's name and had only heard about her work at Langley from other journalists.

On the "no underlying crime" point, moreover, no less than the New York Times and Washington Post now agree. So do the 36 major news organizations that filed a legal brief in March aimed at keeping Mr. Cooper and the New York Times's Judith Miller out of jail.

"While an investigation of the leak was justified, it is far from clear—at least on the public record—that a crime took place," the Post noted the other day. Granted the media have come a bit late to this understanding, and then only to protect their own, but the logic of their argument is that Mr. Rove did nothing wrong either.

The same can't be said for Mr. Wilson, who first "outed" himself as a CIA consultant in a melodramatic New York Times op-ed in July 2003. At the time he claimed to have thoroughly debunked the Iraq-Niger yellowcake uranium connection that President Bush had mentioned in his now famous "16 words" on the subject in that year's State of the Union address.

Mr. Wilson also vehemently denied it when columnist Robert Novak first reported that his wife had played a role in selecting him for the Niger mission. He promptly signed up as adviser to the Kerry campaign and was feted almost everywhere in the media, including repeat appearances on NBC's "Meet the Press" and a photo spread (with Valerie) in Vanity Fair.

But his day in the political sun was short-lived. The bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee report last July cited the note that Ms. Plame had sent recommending her husband for the Niger mission. "Interviews and documents provided to the Committee indicate that his wife, a CPD [Counterproliferation Division] employee, suggested his name for the trip," said the report.

The same bipartisan report also pointed out that the forged documents Mr. Wilson claimed to have discredited hadn't even entered intelligence channels until eight months after his trip. And it said the CIA interpreted the information he provided in his debrief as mildly supportive of the suspicion that Iraq had been seeking uranium in Niger.

About the same time, another inquiry headed by Britain's Lord Butler delivered its own verdict on the 16 words: "We conclude also that the statement in President Bush's State of the Union Address of 28 January 2003 that 'The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa' was well-founded."

In short, Joe Wilson hadn't told the truth about what he'd discovered in Africa, how

he'd discovered it, what he'd told the CIA about it, or even why he was sent on the mission. The media and the Kerry campaign promptly abandoned him, though the former never did give as much prominence to his debunking as they did to his original accusations. But if anyone can remember another public figure so entirely and thoroughly discredited, let us know.

If there's any scandal at all here, it is that this entire episode has been allowed to waste so much government time and media attention, not to mention inspire a "special counsel" probe. The Bush Administration is also guilty on this count, since it went along with the appointment of prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald in an election year in order to punt the issue down the road. But now Mr. Fitzgerald has become an unguided missile, holding reporters in contempt for not disclosing their sources even as it becomes clearer all the time that no underlying crime was at issue.

As for the press corps, rather than calling for Mr. Rove to be fired, they ought to be grateful to him for telling the truth.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

RULING BY JUDGE YOUNG

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues and the people of this country are not aware that the shoe bomber that was on the plane that was going to blow up that plane and kill all those innocent people was recently convicted and sentenced. People across this country did not see on television the judge's decision or hear what the judge said, so I want to read to the American people and my colleagues part of what Judge William Young said in that decision in putting that man in jail for two or three life sentences.

He said, We are not afraid of you or your terrorist conspirators, Mr. Reid. We are Americans. We have been through the fire before. You are not an enemy combatant, you are a terrorist. You are not a soldier in any war. You are a terrorist. To give you that reference to call you a soldier gives you far too much stature.

Whether it is the officers of government who do it or your attorney who does it, or if you think you are a soldier, you are not. You are a terrorist, and we do not negotiate with terrorists. We do not meet with terrorists.

We do not sign documents with terrorists. We hunt them down one by one and bring them to justice, so war talk is way out of line in this court. You are a big fellow, but are not that big. You are no warrior, I have known warriors. You are a terrorist, a species of criminal that is guilty of multiple attempted murders.

In a very real sense, State Trooper Santiago had it right when he first took you off the plane and into custody and you wondered where the press and TV were, and he said, You are no big deal. You are no big deal. What your able counsel and what the equally able United States attorneys have grappled with, and what I have as honesty as I know how, have tried to grapple with is why you did something so horrific. What was it that led you to this courtroom today?

I have listened respectfully to what you have had to say, and I ask you to search your heart and ask yourself what sort of unfathomable hate led you to do what you are guilty of doing and what you admitted you were doing. And I have an answer for you. It may not satisfy you, but as I search this entire record, it comes as close to understanding as I know. It seems to me that you hate the one thing that to us is most precious. You hate our freedom. Our individual freedom. Our individual freedom to live as we choose, to come and go as we choose, to believe or not believe as we individually choose.

Here in this society, the very wind carries freedom. It carries it everywhere from sea to shining sea. It is because we prize individual freedom so much that you are here today in this beautiful courtroom so that everyone can see, can truly see that justice is administered fairly, individually, and discretely.

It is for freedom's sake that your lawyers are striving so vigorously on your behalf and have filed appeals, will go on in their representation of you before other judges.

We as Americans are all about freedom. Because we all know the way we treat you, Mr. Reid, is the measure of our own liberties. Make no mistake though. It is yet true that we will bear any burden, pay any price to preserve our freedoms. Look around this courtroom and mark it well. The world is not going to long remember what you or I say here today. The day after tomorrow, it will be forgotten. But this, however, will long endure.

Here in this courtroom and courtrooms all across America, the American people will gather to see justice, individual justice, justice, not war, individual justice is, in fact, being done.

The very President of the United States, through his officers, will have to come into courtrooms and lay out evidence on which specific matters can be judged and juries of citizens will gather to sit and judge that evidence democratically, to mold and shape and refine our sense of justice.