

the oil we could potentially get from shale, which is boiling the rock into a liquid and producing the oil, which could be billions of barrels.

I agree with Senator SALAZAR that the technology is not quite there yet, and maybe it is going to be too much of a drain on the water supply in the West. Perhaps it might be a very serious environmental problem. But we don't know. I think we should find out. That is my point. We don't know, but we need to find out because one day we may need to boil that rock, and if we need to, we need to figure out how to do it.

There is plenty of oil here. But when people say "the science," trust me, if there is a scientist in America who wants to come anywhere around Washington to say there is no oil because they have explored it, I will debate them until my last breath, because we have not looked. There has been some seismic—not a lot of seismic—and the technology is so improved now that we can be much more certain of where oil and gas is. Just to say there are 33 billion barrels of oil here and then to jump to the conclusion that there is no oil here, that there has to be no oil here and no oil here, is really defying common sense.

I will end with this, Mr. President. Do we need to do more than produce? Yes, we do. Just increasing production is not the answer, but it is a step that must be taken. We are too great a nation to, every time prices hit \$5, send a little piddling letter over to countries such as Saudi Arabia begging and pleading, as if we are some second-rate power, asking them to increase their oil production when we won't increase it at home. It is not right. We must increase our production, and we can do it safely.

I know there are others who wish to speak, so I will wrap up in just a moment.

We need to also—and this is where my friends on the other side of the aisle have not been very good in their own right. They have not been for mandates pushing conservation, and we must start driving a different kind of automobile, and not just expanding mileage from 20 miles per gallon to 27 miles, but CAFE standards reflecting efficiencies from 25 miles per gallon to 27 or 35.

We need to move to a different kind of automobile because it is the fuel demand, it is the gap between the 20 million barrels we use every day and the 8 million we produce. There is a 12 million-barrel-a-day gap. If we could close 6 million of that by more production domestically and close the other 6 million by conservation, America would have no more problem, the price would come down, and we would be free and happy—a powerful, free people again. And we have to get that way.

We once dominated in this industry. That is how we won World War II. We would not have won without our domination in the energy industry. We have

to dominate again, and we can do it through conservation and production.

I hope our leaders, both the Democratic leader and the Republican leader, understand that there is a group of us who don't want to go home until this is done and that we are going to do everything we can because I don't believe we should be drifting out of this Capitol anytime soon until we have given a clear and unmistakable signal to the American public that we hear them and that we understand the economic strain.

Our economic model was not built for \$5 gasoline, and we cannot sustain it. That is what we were told, and not by the Republican policy people or the Democratic policy people but by two of the brightest minds on this subject. They said the U.S. model cannot sustain this high price for long. It will cause and has caused serious economic disruption. It must be corrected.

So I hope, Mr. President, that we most certainly do this. I am open to things that perhaps I wouldn't have considered in the past, and I hope my colleagues will have that same open mind. If so, we can perhaps get some extraordinary things done.

Either tomorrow or next week, I am going to come back and talk about the myth of oil spills because the signs I see on this floor about oil spilling in the gulf—I want to continue to remind people that less than 1 percent of the oil in the ocean is caused from drilling in the ocean. The majority of it is natural seepage, and I am going to have some information that will show that. The people of Louisiana, Texas, and Mississippi are very proud of this industry that we have helped to birth not just for our country but for the world, and we are determined to help people understand that it can be done in a clean and environmentally sensitive manner.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

LIHEAP

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I understand that there are a lot of differences in this body on the issue of speculation, which presumably is going to come up next week, on the issue of the role of the large oil companies and the enormous profits they are making, and there are differences of opinion about how fast and how aggressively we should go to sustainable energy and energy efficiency. But in one area, it appears to me there is less and less of a difference of opinion, and that is that more and more Members of the Senate understand that we are facing—right now, this summer, and in this coming winter—an energy crisis in terms of people going cold and perhaps freezing or dying from heat exhaustion this summer.

I am very proud to say that we have had tripartisan support for a very substantial increase in the LIHEAP legis-

lation bill I have offered; that is, S. 3186, the Warm in Winter and Cool in Summer Act. That bill now has 47 cosponsors—34 Democrats, 11 Republicans, and 2 independents. At a time when more and more Americans are concerned about the partisanship here in Congress, I am happy to say that this bill has very strong tripartisan support.

I wish to thank the 34 Democrats who are cosponsors, including Senator OBAMA, Majority Leader REID, and Senators DURBIN, MURRAY, LANDRIEU, LEAHY, CLINTON, CANTWELL, JACK REED, KERRY, KENNEDY, SCHUMER, LEVIN, CARDIN, BROWN, KLOBUCHAR, MENENDEZ, CASEY, BINGAMAN, LAUTENBERG, STABENOW, BILL NELSON, BAUCUS, SALAZAR, WYDEN, WHITEHOUSE, ROCKEFELLER, DODD, TESTER, MIKULSKI, BIDEN, KOHL, DORGAN, and McCASKILL. I thank all those Democrats for their support, and the 11 Republican cosponsors we have, including Senators SNOWE, STEVENS, COLEMAN, SMITH, SUNUNU, COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, GREGG, LUGAR, BOND, and DOLE. I also thank the Independent, Senator LIEBERMAN, for joining me as a cosponsor. Both Independents are on that bill.

Let me also thank Majority Leader REID for completing the rule XIV process and putting this bill directly on the calendar. Senator REID understands, as I think most of us do, that this bill has very strong support. For the health and well-being of many millions of people, whether in the Northeast or in the South, it is absolutely imperative that we pass this legislation as soon as possible.

In that regard, I want to express disappointment that just this morning, my Republican friend, Senator CORNYN, objected to a UC for passage of this bill and then objected to putting this bill on the floor and even giving us the opportunity to vote on it today. I hope my Republican friends and the Republican leadership reconsider this action because the truth is, there is a lot of support on the Republican side for increasing LIHEAP. I think it is imperative that we work together and we work as quickly as possible and we take a very strong load of anxiety off the shoulders of people from all over this country by passing this bill and getting a similar bill passed in the House.

This tripartisan bill would nearly double the funding for LIHEAP in fiscal year 2008, taking it from \$2.57 billion to \$5.1 billion. That is a total increase of over \$2.5 billion. This, in fact, is the amount at which LIHEAP is authorized. We should make no mistake about it, the issue we are dealing with is a life-and-death issue. It is life and death today, and it will be life and death next winter.

I would like to report a statistic that is not widely known. When CNN gets its cameras out, they go to the tornadoes and the floods and the forest fires, and that is appropriate. Those are terrible tragedies we are all concerned

about. The truth is that more people in this country have died from the extreme heat and hypothermia since 1998 than all natural disasters combined. That is an interesting point, and you probably didn't know that. I didn't know that. But that is the case. And that includes floods, fires, hurricanes, earthquakes, and tornadoes.

The "problem" is what happens when maybe an old person in Florida can't afford electricity and has her air-conditioning turned off. She will die. Or a person with an illness in the State of Vermont, when the weather gets 20 below zero and he doesn't have the money to heat his home, he will die as well. And people die one at a time, not in great CNN-type disasters, but the reality is that more people die from extreme heat and extreme cold than they do from other types of emergencies. In Vermont and throughout New England, people are extremely worried that they will not have enough money to afford the price of heating oil next winter. A newspaper in my State of Vermont, the *Stowe Reporter*, recently editorialized that the lack of affordable heating oil could turn into New England's version of Hurricane Katrina next winter. We cannot allow that to happen.

The problem is not just in the Northeast. The point I have to reiterate over and over, this is not just a cold weather problem for my State of Vermont and New England. This is a hot weather problem as well. It is not just a cold weather issue, it is a hot weather issue as well.

Over the past decade, more than 400 people died of heat exposure in Arizona. Let me repeat that. Over the past decade, more than 400 people died of heat exposure in Arizona, including 31 in July of 2005 alone, 31 people in 2005 in Arizona. All of these deaths could have been prevented if these people had air-conditioning.

Without increased support from the Federal Government, Arizona will be out of LIHEAP funding before the end of this month. But if this bill passes, Arizona will see an infusion of \$24 million in LIHEAP funding, triple what they currently receive.

Let me quote a letter I received from the mayor of Phoenix, AZ. His name is Phil Gordon. I thank Mayor Gordon for sending me this letter. He is strongly supportive of this legislation. This is what the mayor of Phoenix, AZ, Phil Gordon, writes:

I am writing to express my support for the Warm in Winter and Cool in Summer Act. Currently Arizona can only provide assistance to 6 percent of eligible LIHEAP households. . . . To make matters worse, Phoenix continues to experience extreme heat. In the past month alone, we have had 15 days with temperatures at or above 110 degrees. This extreme heat is especially hard on the very young, the elderly and disabled who are on fixed incomes and can no longer afford to cool their homes. . . . Arizona Public Service reported that there was a 36 percent increase in the number of households having difficulty in paying utility bills and an increase of 11,000 families being disconnected compared to a year ago. Rising energy and hous-

ing costs are placing enormous strains on low-income households across Arizona.

What Mayor Gordon of Phoenix is talking about is taking place all over this country. We are in the middle of a recession. People are losing their work. Wages are going down. The price of fuel in general is going up. That includes electricity. If you are dependent on electricity for air-conditioning, and your electricity gets shut off and you are old and you are sick, you have a serious problem. That is what this legislation is going to address.

In my State of Vermont and throughout New England and the Northeast, people are extremely worried that they will not have enough money to afford the price of heating oil next winter.

A newspaper in my State of Vermont, the *Stowe Reporter*, recently editorialized that the lack of affordable heating oil could turn into New England's version of Hurricane Katrina next winter. We cannot allow that to happen.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, over 1,000 Americans from across the country died from hypothermia in their own homes from 1999 to 2002, the latest figures we have available. In other words, they froze to death because they could not afford to heat their homes. How many of these deaths were preventable? All of them, according to the CDC. We will probably not know for several years how many Americans died last winter because they could not afford to heat their homes—but one death is too many.

And, I want all of my colleagues to understand. This home energy crisis that we are in extends far beyond New England and the Northeast. Today, people in the South and Southwest are struggling to pay for the skyrocketing price of electricity, which has tripled in some parts of the country.

The result is that essential utility services are being cut-off because they cannot afford to pay their bills. What that means is that elderly, frail and sick people trying to stay alive in 110 degree temperatures face a major health crisis if their electricity is shut off.

In other words, whether you are living in the north or the south or the east or the west, our country is facing a national emergency and it is about time that the President of the United States and the Congress treated it as such.

And, while energy prices are soaring, LIHEAP funding is 23 percent less than it was just 2 years ago, completely eviscerating the purchasing power of this extremely important program. In fact, after adjusting for inflation, the Federal Government spent more money on LIHEAP 20 years ago than it is spending today.

To demonstrate how important LIHEAP is right now for southern States dealing with a major heat wave, I want to give you just a few examples of what I am referring to.

Over the past decade, more than 400 people died of heat exposure in Ari-

zona, including 31 in July of 2005 alone. All of these deaths could have been prevented if these people had air conditioning. Without increased support from the Federal Government, Arizona will be out of LIHEAP funding before the end of this month. But, if this bill passes, Arizona will receive an infusion of over \$24 million in LIHEAP funding—triple what they currently receive—to keep their residents cool this summer.

Due to a lack of LIHEAP funding, the State of Texas only provides air conditioning assistance to about 4 percent of those who qualify. Recently, I received a letter from Shawnee Bayer from the Community Action Committee in Victoria, TX. In her letter, Ms. Bayer writes:

The temperatures in our area have been 100 to 110 degrees for 16 consecutive days. I fear it is going to be very tragic at the current pace we are going with so little LIHEAP funding available. . . . There are so many who need our assistance, like the elderly lady in her 80s who recently almost died due to kidney failure; now she doesn't want to use her air conditioner because she is afraid she won't be able to pay the bill. . . . She just called me last Thursday and has pneumonia; she could hardly talk. . . . Last year she was placed in the hospital in the ICU due to a heat stroke as a result of using only a fan, not the air conditioner. I see children every day who have not eaten because the parents, grandparents and in some cases great grandparents are just trying to keep the electricity on. . . . the electric bills in our area have tripled.

That is in Victoria, TX. In addition, I also received an e-mail from DeAndra Baker from the Community Action Agency in Giddings, TX, who said:

We have a gentleman who is 78 years old and on a fixed income of \$770.00 a month. . . . Due to the extremely high temperatures he is unable to afford to keep his home cool. His doctor provided a statement that he must have his air conditioner turned on at a minimum of 80 degrees to avoid congestive heart failure and he is not even able to afford that much. Sadly, he will not continue to run his A/C or fans and will be at serious risk unless LIHEAP funding is increased soon.

That is what is going on in the State of Texas. If this bill is signed into law, Texas will receive over \$47 million to help keep their residents cool this summer. But it is not just Texas.

Without additional support from the Federal Government, the State of Georgia will not be able to offer any LIHEAP assistance whatsoever to its residents this summer. Currently, Georgia has a waiting list of 28,000 people hoping to receive some relief from the hot weather this summer. To demonstrate the desperate need for more LIHEAP funding, let me tell you about an e-mail my office received from the executive director of the Community Action Agency in Gainesville, GA, Janice Riley. According to Ms. Riley, their agency has been out of LIHEAP funding since last December. She was particularly distressed about two families in Georgia who she could not help because of a lack of LIHEAP funding. This is what she had to say:

One family that came in after we ran out of LIHEAP funds was the Jones family. . . .

Mr. Jones, came to our office requesting assistance with his electric bill. He has a wife and five children. . . . They got behind with all their bills when he was injured on the job six months ago. . . . Their daughter is paralyzed from the neck down from a fall she had at six months of age. I wish we could help them. Another participant that did not receive LIHEAP funds and is now facing disconnection or homelessness is Ms. O'Brien, a 33 year old, single parent with 5 children between the ages of 7-16, and a newborn grandchild which she has taken in. . . . Her power was turned off last week because she was unable to pay it. . . . Her need for assistance is based on the high costs of living, not from her lack of work ethic and heroic efforts to maintain her household.

That is what is going on in the State of Georgia. If this bill is signed into law, the State of Georgia would receive over \$70 million to make sure their residents stay cool this summer.

In addition, unless S. 3186 is signed into law soon, the State of Kentucky will not be able to keep any of their residents cool this summer through the LIHEAP program. According to the executive director of the Community Action Agency in Kentucky, Kip Bowmar:

February of 2008 marked the first time in the program's history that all 120 Counties in Kentucky ran out of LIHEAP funds, forcing us to close our doors as fuel prices were soaring and people needed help.

If S. 3186 is signed into law, the State of Kentucky will receive nearly \$35 million to keep their residents cool this summer and warm in the winter.

In Florida, Hilda Frazier, the State director of the LIHEAP program, has estimated that they will serve 26,000 fewer households this year because of the reduction of available LIHEAP funding and the rising cost of energy. According to Ms. Frazier, thousands of families in Florida are being turned away from LIHEAP offices each and every month because they do not have any money. Of the 2 million LIHEAP eligible households in Florida, they will be able to assist fewer than 4 percent of them.

The State of Arkansas is also rapidly running out of LIHEAP funding. The LIHEAP coordinator in Benton, AR, recently had to deny assistance to over 430 families there because they had no money. If this bill is signed into law, Arkansas would receive nearly \$26 million to help keep their residents cool this summer.

Moving on to California, Joan Graham, The deputy director of the Community Action Agency in Sacramento, CA, recently wrote that:

Every day, we are turning away at least 50 families who qualify for LIHEAP because we lack resources. Energy bills have increased 30% over last year, yet our funding has not increased. In 2006, there were 29 heat-related deaths in Sacramento County. One senior who passed away due to extreme heat was afraid to turn on his air conditioner because he knew he would be unable to pay the electric bill. We know there are more like him out there at present.

If this bill is signed into law, California will receive over \$100 million to keep their residents cool this summer and warm next winter.

Why is LIHEAP so important in the south in the summertime?

According to the Centers for Disease Control, the annual mortality rate from extreme heat in the U.S. has exceeded the death tolls of floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes combined since 1998. Meanwhile, fewer resources have been allocated to heat-related problems than to other extreme weather events.

In other words, while more people in this country are dying from heat exposure than any other natural disaster in this country combined; the Federal Government spends less money preventing these deaths from occurring than any other natural disaster we face.

From 1999-2003, over 3,400 deaths in this country were due to excessive heat. All of these deaths were preventable and air conditioning is the best way to prevent these deaths, according to the CDC.

How many more heat-related deaths will occur in this country if we do not increase LIHEAP? We cannot wait to find out.

My heart goes out to the people of Iowa and other areas in the Midwest that have been devastated by the recent flooding. I supported the additional Federal resources that were included in the supplemental to help them through this difficult time.

But, let us not forget about senior citizens who will die of heat exposure if we don't help them out this summer. And, let's not wait until it's too late to provide the assistance needed to keep Americans warm in the north this winter.

In addition to these facts, tens of thousands of Americans have had their utility and natural gas services shut off this year and millions more are in danger of having these services shut off because they are at least 1 month late in paying their bills.

Increasing LIHEAP funding will allow these Americans to turn their electricity and other essential utility services back on right now so that they can cool their homes this summer and heat their homes next winter.

According to the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, a record-breaking 15.6 million American families or nearly 15 percent of all households, are at least 30 days overdue in paying their utility bills.

USA Today recently reported that "Electricity and natural gas shutoffs are up at least 15 percent in several states compared with last year. Totals for some utilities have more than doubled."

The article then goes on to give the following examples:

In Pennsylvania, PPL Electric Utilities disconnected 7,054 customers through April this year, up 168 percent over the same 2007 period.

Duke Energy in North Carolina is averaging about 11,000 shutoffs a month, 14 percent above last year.

Disconnects are up 27 percent for Peoples Gas in Chicago, 14 percent for Southern Cali-

fornia Edison and 56 percent for Detroit Edison. In Michigan, where home foreclosures are soaring and the unemployment rate is the USA's highest, more than one in five Detroit Edison customers were behind in their electric bills in May.

"Some help is available," USA Today goes on to report. "The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) is providing \$2.5 billion in fiscal 2008, but funds are depleted."

Due to insufficient funding, the average LIHEAP grant only pays for 18 percent of the total cost of heating a home with heating oil; 21 percent of residential propane costs; 41 percent of natural gas costs; and 43 percent of electricity costs. What this means is that low income families with children; senior citizens on fixed incomes and persons with disabilities will have to make up the remaining costs out of their own pockets.

And, only 16 percent of eligible LIHEAP recipients currently receive assistance with their home energy bills. What that means is that 84 percent of eligible low-income families with children, senior citizens on fixed incomes and persons with disabilities do not receive any LIHEAP assistance whatsoever due to a lack of funding.

Unless we significantly increase LIHEAP funding, two things will happen: fewer and fewer Americans will receive the assistance to keep their homes warm in the winter and cool in the summer; or the grants they receive will become smaller and smaller even as the price of energy soars. We cannot allow that to happen.

No family in our Nation should be forced to choose between paying their home energy bills and putting food on the table. No senior citizen should have to decide between buying life-saving prescriptions and paying utility bills. For individuals and households that may have to face these difficult choices, LIHEAP makes a real difference in their ability to cope with adverse circumstances.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Warm in Winter and Cool in Summer Act.

There are differences, obviously, in the Senate, differences within the House, on a number of very important energy issues. I understand that. I appreciated the differences. I have my point of view. Other people have different points of view.

There is far less difference of opinion—I think widespread support—among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents that we need to move. We need to move quickly to significantly expand LIHEAP funding. By expanding it, by doubling it, we are doing nothing more than keeping pace with inflation because the price of home heating fuel in my State has doubled so all we are doing is keeping even.

I hope we will come together as a body—progressives conservatives, Republicans, Democrats, Independents—and pass this legislation quickly. There is a companion piece in the House. I

hope we can get that done and bring the two pieces together. We are going to be able to provide some relief to millions of Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, it looks as though I am the clean-up hitter tonight, before we close the session. It has been this Senator's privilege to be sitting in the chair while a number of these, our colleagues, have been speaking from their perspective. One of the unique features of this democracy is that there are 50 States, each with two Senators who sometimes have points of view that are different from each other. But out of the collective will, by the give-and-take process—as the Good Book says, “Come let us reason together”—we try to forge a consensus in which to govern the Nation and to set policy through law and then abide by the rule of law.

What a great privilege it is for this Senator to be a part of that and try to articulate the interests as I see the national interests through the lens as I perceive it, through the interests of my State, as well as the country as a whole.

The fact is, we are in a deplorable condition where we are now importing 66.2 percent of our daily consumption of oil from places such as the Persian Gulf, Nigeria, and Venezuela. These are very unstable parts of the world. The President can certainly appreciate the fact that if we did not have to do that, we would be not only economically a lot better off but just imagine what our defense posture would be if we did not have to protect the sea lines. The U.S. Navy has to protect the sea lines, not only for our interests but a lot of the others of the world's interests in all those areas coming around—out of the Persian Gulf, on the west coast of Africa, and so forth.

It is also true that those sea lines and that flow of oil is increasingly under jeopardy because of terrorist groups such as al-Qaida that can figure it out and strike in undefended oil-producing facilities, as they have tried to do in Saudi Arabia and who knows where else. All of those jitters that ripple throughout the economy come because people think this tight oil supply is going to be cut off—as well it may be.

Back in the early 1970s it was cut off because of a cartel called OPEC, and they decided to cut back on production. You remember in the early 1970s

that drove oil from something like \$2 a barrel up to \$10 a barrel.

This has progressively gotten worse to the point that the United States is now dependent for almost two-thirds of our daily consumption of oil coming from foreign shores. The United States only has 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. Yet the United States consumes 25 percent of the world's oil production.

It does not take a mathematical genius to realize if we want to do something about our vulnerability, if we only have 3 percent of the world's oil reserves but we consume 25 percent of the world's oil production, what is the ultimate solution? We have to wean ourselves from oil. We have to go to alternative fuels. We have to vigorously, through research and development, develop new engines. We have to use renewables, such as solar and wind and geothermal. Indeed, we have to get serious about conservation.

This Nation simply has not done this with great vigor. It is clearly the hope of this Senator that the next President of the United States is going to have this at the top of his agenda. Then, this Congress, combined with the next President, is going to be able to make some major policy shifts about our energy consumption and from where we get our energy. But, in the meantime, the scare, the fright, the pain of \$4.11-per-gallon gasoline; the scare, the fright of oil, what normally would be at \$55 a barrel, according to an ExxonMobil executive testifying, under normal supply and demand—it is not anywhere close to that. It is way up in the 130s, and it actually got up over \$140 a barrel.

Because of that pain right now we have to act. There are those who have trooped in here and over and over their mantra is, as they hold up a big sign—and it is primarily the ones on that side of the aisle who say: “Drill here. Drill now,” as if that is the solution. This Senator has no problem with drilling if it is done responsibly and it is done in an area that there is not a prohibitively painful tradeoff.

What do I mean? I want to give you an example. It was this Senator who, 3 years ago, had to start a filibuster to stop a punitive measure against the defense interests of the United States. I had to stop it with a filibuster. That was an attempt to drill oil in the eastern Gulf of Mexico off of Florida. That happens to be the largest testing and training area for the U.S. military in the world. Why do you think we train all of our F-22 pilots at a base in Florida? Why do you think we train the pilots for the still-being-developed F-35 Joint Strike Fighter in Florida? It is because they have all of that unrestricted space over the Gulf of Mexico.

When the U.S. Navy shut down their training facility on the island of Vieques next to the island of Puerto Rico, why did they bring all of that U.S. Naval Atlantic Fleet training to the Gulf of Mexico? It is because it is restricted air space where they can

have joint air, sea, and, at Eglin Air Force Base, land exercises in the training of our military.

We are testing new weapons systems that go hundreds of miles. Where? In the testing and training area of the Gulf of Mexico. And this Senator has shared with this Senate a letter from the Secretary of Defense that says: Do not drill for oil and gas in the military mission area of the eastern gulf testing and training area.

So 2 years ago, we put together a compromise. The oil forces wanted to have 2.5 million acres headed on a line straight for the west coast of Florida. This Senator worked it out with Senator LANDRIEU and several others. We arranged not 2.5 million acres to drill in, but 8.3 million acres, four times as much. But we kept it away from the military mission area, the military testing and training area, which also kept it away from the coast of Florida.

So when these folks come up with this mantra: Drill here, drill now, it is not taking into consideration that we have been through this drill before, and we have crafted a compromise. You know, we put that into law, as Senator LANDRIEU has shared, on different parts of the offshore. She showed you where we put that into law. It is prohibited under law, not by Presidential proclamation, it is prohibited by law until the year 2022.

We did that for the reasons I have already said. We thought we balanced the interests, and that was 2 years ago. And do you know what. Not one acre of that 8.3 million acres has been drilled. So this mantra of “drill here, drill now,” as if we do not have the area to drill, this Senator worked his fingers to the bone to get a compromise to satisfy all of the interests, including the drilling interests, and not one acre of that has been drilled.

As a matter of fact, not any of the 32 million acres under lease in the Gulf of Mexico has been drilled. This Senator is not opposed to drilling. This Senator wants to drill in the 32 million acres that are already available in the Gulf of Mexico and not harm the preparation and training of the United States military to defend our country.

Now, that is a simple message I want to share, and I had to wait until this hour in order to get the time to come out here and maybe, through the lens of that camera, some of this message is getting shared.

There is one more thing I want to share with the Senate that simply is not true. The folks who come out here with this simple message, drill here, drill now, constantly say: In all the hurricanes that they had there was not any oil spill. That is not true. I want to show you a satellite photo 4 days after Hurricane Katrina had already hit land up here on the Mississippi and the Louisiana coast. I want you to see the oil spills as recorded in a photograph from space. That is what it looked like 4 days after Katrina.

Now, I hope this debunks all of those folks coming up here and saying there