

see there, we told you so. The Americans plan to occupy us for the rest of our lives.

We don't have any plan to do that, and we don't want the Iraqi people to think that we are going to do that, and we don't want the American people to think that we are going to be constantly occupying Iraq. I understand Mr. KING's interest, and most of the time I agree with him, but in this case I can't agree with him because I just think it sends the wrong message not only to the people of Iraq, not only to the people of America, but to the people of other Muslim nations who might say, hey, are we next? Are we going to be occupied? Are we going to have American troops in our streets? We don't want that to happen. We don't want that message delivered across the oceans. I think that we have to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to enter into a colloquy with Mr. MURTHA, and I would invite participation of the chairman if he is so inclined, because I have an issue that I hope the conferees will consider when they meet to work out the final version of the bill.

Specifically, I would like to ask that the conferees examine the need to include funding to provide for the videotaping of interrogations of detainees in U.S. custody.

Now, as Members of this House know, I have before the House a bill that would, if enacted, require that all interactions between detainees at Guantanamo and similar facilities and U.S. personnel be videotaped. Videotaping interrogations would not only help deter any claims of actual or potential abuse of detainees, but just as importantly, it would protect the interrogators from false accusations of abuse.

Indeed, across this country, including in my own district, many police departments routinely videotape interrogations for precisely these reasons. It is a powerful and effective tool for protecting both the interrogator and the one being interrogated.

Additionally, videotaping interrogations would ensure that the maximum possible intelligence value is gained during and after the interrogation sessions. If analysts and linguists have the chance to review videotaped interrogations, they have additional opportunities to evaluate both the quality of the information gleaned from the interrogation, but they will also be able

to look for body language and other clues about the truthfulness of the person being interrogated.

And I should mention that the legislation I have and what we are talking about here has been endorsed by a variety of groups as an effective way to conduct interrogations with the protections of all involved, and I know they would be supportive of the conferees acting on this request. I hope that I can have the cooperation of my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. If the gentleman would yield, is it the gentleman's understanding that such interrogation is not currently being videotaped?

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman is correct. I am informed, well, most recently by a trip to Guantanamo by the Armed Services Committee staff, that videotaping of detainee interrogations has not been conducted consistently and uniformly.

Mr. MURTHA. I can see some merit to what the gentleman is recommending, and certainly I will bring it up to the conferees when we get to conference, and we will see what they say and get some expert opinions. I can see some merit in what the gentleman is proposing, and I will certainly do my best to work something out.

Mr. HOLT. Well, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this and related issues. I know the gentleman was instrumental last year in facilitating the establishment of specific guidelines for the treatment of detainees, and I hope that once again he can help refine and strengthen our policies in this area in conference. I thank the gentleman.

□ 1530

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the distinguished ranking member

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member and the entire subcommittee for excellent work on the Defense Appropriations Act of 2007. This act does an extraordinary job of continuing the transformation of our forces, while funding our military at war.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that every military threat now and in the foreseeable future is derived from or impacted by one thing, and that is our dependence on foreign oil.

We fund a Defense budget of \$500 billion this year, including supplemental spending. Of that amount, \$10.6 billion is spent on the Pentagon's direct energy costs alone, and of that \$10.6 billion, \$4.7 billion bought one thing, fuel for our Air Force planes. That is about the same amount as the President has budgeted for the National Cancer Institute this year alone.

The Department of Defense uses 97 percent of all Federal fuel consumption, and half of that is used for fuel for the Air Force. A single F-16 can burn 28 gallons of gas a minute, in fact.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, \$10 million for the Air Force's alternative

fuels research program to help reduce our reliance on foreign oil to fly our own Air Force planes is not included in the budget.

I was going to submit an amendment that I would let the Air Force allocate \$4 million for B-52 synthetic fuels testing, \$3 million for other synthetic fuel testing, and about \$3 million for studies on synthetic fuel and suitability for use in jet engines. However, I will not proceed with my amendment in the hope that the honorable gentleman and ranking member will pursue this effort during conference with the Senate.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I think you are absolutely right. Matter of fact, 10 years ago, we put language in that would allow them to produce jet fuel from coal. The Air Force did not particularly like it, did not particularly agree with it, but now this particular year they said to me this could reduce the cost of their fuel substantially. So I agree with you, and we will do everything we can to work this thing out.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I know he, above all people, realizes that our energy dependence is a national security issue that we must triumph over. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASTLE:
At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10001. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended to provide award fees to any defense contractor for performance that does not meet the requirements of the contract concerned.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, let me just start by thanking the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and their staffs for their exemplary work on what is not easy legislation. What I am about to discuss is something that has been brought more to light this spring than it had been brought heretofore, but I think it is documented enough that we should try to add it to this bill. It is a simple but, in my judgment, much-needed amendment to the legislation before us today.

Currently the Department of Defense spends over \$200 billion annually to acquire products and services from defense contractors, including everything from spare parts to major weapons systems. In an effort to encourage contractors to perform at the highest level possible, the Department often gives its contractors the opportunity to collectively earn billions of dollars through monetary incentives known as award fees.