

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.