Energy Secretary Steven Chu stated: “Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.”

Well, Madam Speaker, at the time of that statement, gasoline prices in Europe were $8 to $10 a gallon. Last week, the Energy Secretary made headlines when he seemed to say the administration’s goal was not to lower gas prices. Considering the goal is not to lower gas prices, this may be the first time that the administration’s energy policies made sense.

Now, despite the President’s rhetoric about the need for increased domestic production of fossil fuels, to date, this administration has seemingly done everything it can to block production. But the purpose of these remarks is to highlight not the administration’s statements but, instead, their policies.

Let’s look at the record, starting with some positive things that happened just before President Obama took office. In November of 2009, the administration rescinded oil shale lease plans put in place back in 2008, and in June of 2010, the House Democrats passed a cap-and-trade national energy tax, which would have dramatically increased gasoline prices.

In November of 2009, the administration unilaterally shortened lease terms on the Continental Shelf leases. Well, this policy not only discouraged oil and natural gas production, but also decreased much needed government revenues.

In June of 2010, the House Democrats passed a cap-and-trade national energy tax, which would have dramatically increased gasoline prices.

In November of 2009, the administration unilaterally shortened lease terms on the Continental Shelf leases. Well, this policy not only discouraged oil and natural gas production, but also decreased much needed government revenues.

In March of 2010, the administration canceled the remaining lease sales in seas off the Alaska coast, eliminating development of reserves that the government estimates could be as large as 65 billion barrels of oil.

In May of 2010, the administration canceled the Virginia offshore lease sale, which had bipartisan support from the Virginia Governor and the Virginia congressional delegation. The administration also canceled the remaining 2010 Gulf of Mexico lease sales.

In December of 2010, the administration extended the moratorium on leasing off the western and eastern Gulf of Mexico through 2017.

In January 2012, President Obama rejected the Keystone XL pipeline. Estimates show that the Keystone XL pipeline would add 1.1 million barrels a day of friendly Canadian oil to our Gulf of Mexico refineries.

Madam Speaker, moving forward with a credible energy policy can only be achieved if we all have a shared understanding of the facts. Global demand for oil and gas is increasing dramatically due to developing economies such as China and India. In the United States, our demand is down 6 percent year after year, and prices are still skyrocketing. And it’s going to stay that way. Even if half of the world’s energy consumption comes from hydrocarbons—oil, coal, and natural gas. While renewable energy is needed and new consumption efficiencies should be encouraged to meet future energy demands, hydrocarbons will be the dominant source of fuel for the world’s economy for many decades to come. No one can deny that before we can create an energy supply that is substantially more diversified, we are going to need more fossil fuels to get us there.

We’re not running out of Natural Gas. In 2000, shale gas represented just 1 percent of American natural gas supplies. Today, it is 30 percent and rising.

We are not running out of oil. Former CEO of Shell Energy, and former Energy Secretary, said that oil will produce 10 for decades to come. Let’s go back to 10. We know we are not running out of oil. We are not running out of Natural Gas. In 2000, shale gas represented just 1 percent of American natural gas supplies. Today, it is 30 percent and rising.

STOP BEING ACCESSORIES TO CRIME
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, dropped dramatically, one can deny that before we can create an energy supply that is substantially more diversified, we are going to need more fossil fuels to get us there.

We’re not running out of natural Gas. In 2000, shale gas represented just 1 percent of American natural gas supplies. Today, it is 30 percent and rising.

We are not running out of oil. Former CEO of Shell Energy, and former Energy Secretary, said that oil will produce 10 for decades to come. Let’s go back to 10. We know how to produce 10. We have the oil to produce 10 for decades to come.

Unfortunately, this Administration is preventing the U.S. from developing additional energy supplies to meet our demand. As a result, families are struggling with rising energy costs and higher gas prices at the pump.

Madam Speaker, these are the facts and the solutions are within our reach.

I decided last night in my elections to come—and I’ve got a primary and a general—I’ve always bought billboard advertising and Clear Channel has almost had a monopoly in my city on billboards, and they have Rush Limbaugh on their network, that until they drop Rush Limbaugh, I’m not going to buy billboards for my campaign.
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words. He was on an inappropriate topic. And Mitt Romney certainly didn’t rise to the occasion when he said they weren’t the words he would have used. It wasn’t an area that anybody should have brought up or even thought about.

Limbaugh said that the woman wanted to be paid for sex because she, in his thoughts, wanted contraception so she could have sex without the fear of pregnancy. It’s funny, Rush Limbaugh never questioned anybody getting a vasectomy, for what’s the use of a vasectomy, that’s covered by insurance, but to have sex without the fear or possibility of pregnancy. He said because she wanted sex paid for by the taxpayers that he ought to be able to watch it. Well, I wonder if he wants to watch all the men who had vasectomies have their sex.

There’s something wrong in the country, and the advertisers and the radio are responsible, and they need to take appropriate moral and ethical action and not continue to be accessories to the fact and support such trash.

CONTINUING IRANIAN THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to speak about the continuing Iranian threat to the United States and Israel.

Just as the President of Iran continues to spew vile poison into the civil discourse of the United Nations, the regime of the Ayatollah issued a threat of violent aggression 2 weeks ago against Israel through the deputy head of the armed forces.

Through its actions, Iran has proven that it will never work with the peaceful nations of the world community. In fact, yet another affront to diplomacy, Iran recently offered to allow inspectors from the IAEA into the country only to refuse them entry into the most important facilities to examine those nuclear sites in dispute.

The threat of a nuclear-armed Iran is not only a threat to Israel; it is also a direct threat to the United States and to the entire world community. Just this week, the chief of the International Atomic Energy Agency said there were unspecified activities at an Iranian military site which inspectors wanted to visit.

The Iranian regime has publicly threatened to close the Strait of Hormuz, a major shipping route for Middle Eastern nations to export oil and supply the world’s energy needs. This threat by Iran amounts to economic warfare, as the closure of the Strait of Hormuz would trigger spikes in crude oil, gasoline bottlenecks in the supply chain, increased prices for all manufactured goods, and would likely lead to massive increases for gas here in the United States.

At a time when our domestic economy is struggling to recover, the last thing hardworking Americans need is for gas prices to soar even higher.

While drastic reductions in the supply of crude oil would be devastating to the world economy, the threat of theocratic, unstable Iranian regime bent on the destruction of Israel and its allies can mean that a nuclear Iran will not care about economic sanctions. A nuclear Iran will not care about diplomacy. A nuclear Iran will not negotiate in good faith. And a nuclear Iran will not be a friend of the United States.

Perhaps the greatest threat to peace and security in the world is the refusal to heed the warnings of the most violent and dangerous regimes when they tell us what their exact intentions are. My hope is that it will not be a mistake of this Nation, one that this Nation makes with this regime in Tehran. Again, my hope is that it will not be our mistake not to pay attention to the signals from the regime in Tehran.
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THE AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY DRAFT REPORT ON VIEQUES, PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss a subject of great importance to me, to the people I represent, and to many of our fellow citizens around the country, and that is the health of Vieques each year between 1983 and 1998.

Training operations on Vieques ceased in 2003, in part due to concerns about the risks to safety, health, and the environment posed by decaying nuclear and military equipment. The Navy is now administering the cleanup of Vieques with the support of other Federal and local agencies.

In 2005, the EPA listed Vieques as one of the most hazardous sites in the U.S. To date, over 35,000 munitions on Vieques have been recovered and destroyed, including at least 19,000 live munitions.

Unfortunately, numerous studies have shown that residents of Vieques have higher rates of cancer and other chronic illnesses than residents of mainland Puerto Rico, raising serious questions about whether there may be a link between those health problems and the island’s long use as a military training range.

In December, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, an agency within HHS, released a draft report that addresses whether there is a link between the identified health problems and the Navy’s activities. ATSDR examined five “pathways” through which residents of Vieques might have been exposed to harmful contaminants: air, soil, plants, drinking water, and food.

The conclusion reached by ATSDR in its draft report is generally the same as the conclusion reached by the agency in a series of controversial public health assessments it conducted on Vieques about a decade ago, specifically, that the available data does not establish that the contaminants in these pathways, some of which can be linked to military activities, were at levels expected to cause the reported health problems.

The draft did raise many crucial questions unanswered, today I’m filing extensive comments that I urge ATSDR to address before its report is finalized. My comments are intended to be constructive, because my constituents deserve a meticulous evaluation of the draft report aimed at producing concrete action by the Federal Government.

In my comments, I note that ATSDR repeatedly acknowledges that its conclusions are not about contamination, but about what it has been able to conclude about contamination.

Given the health problems on Vieques and the potential link between those problems and military activities, such an action is misplaced. Therefore, I have urged ATSDR to recommend a comprehensive biomonitoring investigation. More generally, I have encouraged ATSDR and other Federal agencies to work cooperatively with independent researchers, to take a more active and assertive role in designing, implementing, and especially funding the additional studies that are still needed to determine the nature and potential causes of the health problems being experienced by residents of Vieques.

It is unacceptable that more than a decade after ATSDR completed its first public health assessments on Vieques, fundamental questions about the safety of the island’s environment and the health of its residents remain unanswered. My constituents deserve better.