

American energy in America for Americans, you will tell Speaker PELOSI: Allow there to be a vote on the American Energy Act.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank my fellow colleagues from the Republican Study Committee for participating in this Special Order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege and the honor to address you on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

This is one of these evenings that is a hot and sultry night here in Washington, D.C. It strikes me as the kind of day that actually was in August when the first hearings happened out here in Washington that were addressing the global warming issue. They had a Dr. Hansen—he happens to be from my hometown—who testified before that first hearing. The temperature was, oh, approaching 100 degrees; the humidity was, oh, approaching 100 degrees, and it wasn't an air-conditioned office about 20 or more years ago, maybe 25 years ago. It wasn't an air-conditioned hearing room, I should say, committee room.

As the first testimony unfolded, Mr. Speaker, about global warming, it was a lot easier to convince Members of Congress that that could be a problem when they were sitting in that 100-degrees-feels-like temperature with the high humidity in the committee room here in Washington.

You know, this kind of weather is the reason there is an August break. Why, as far back as our founders, they went home, and they tried to find some high ground where there was a breeze because they didn't have air conditioning, but August was used about 20, 25 years ago to kick off global warming.

We know that there has been a long debate since then and that the foundation for that science is in question. There are some 31,000 trained scientists who have signed off on a petition that says, "We don't buy the science of global warming." Now, I don't know that you can find very many people on the street, Mr. Speaker, who really understand the science of the idea of global warming—I can surely find plenty who disagree—but I think, when you're going to do something that alters the state of our economy and the state of our culture and the global economy and the global culture in this fashion, then the proof has got to be on the people who want to make the changes and who want to shut down energy and energy access and energy production.

What's going on in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, is what has followed from that hearing those more than two decades ago. It's a belief that, when you use energy, it puts greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Greenhouse gases warm the Earth. It's a belief and not proof that a warmer Earth, in all categories, is bad for humanity. The people who are so concerned about global warming are not the kind of people who draw a line down through the middle of the paper on their legal pads and who write on one side "these are the things that are bad about global warming" and, on the other side of that line, in the center, "these are the things that are good."

No, Mr. Speaker. This is all a one-sided argument. In their minds, everything that has to do with the Earth—and it is very marginally, statistically, warming up. We don't know whether there's an increase in sun spots or whether there's a little bit of increase in greenhouse gases. Whatever the case, in their analysis, if the Earth warms by a degree, it's always bad in every case. Even when the Earth gets colder in certain places, it's still the fault of global warming because, after all, it's the average of the temperature; it's not the extremes that we should be looking at.

Last winter was one of the coldest winters we've had. We see the dynamics in the weather extremes. As to those dynamics, by some of the weather forecasters, they say that it's not because the Earth is warmer but because the Earth is cooling in certain locations that we're seeing more extreme weather.

In any case, this is not conclusive. Yet there are many people over on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, who have concluded that we should shut down energy consumption, that we should slow it down, back it down. Park your car. Park your SUV. Maybe even park your Prius because, right now, if you plug it into an outlet with a plug and you charge it up with electricity that was generated from coal, you're driving a coal-fired automobile down the highway. So they're saying park all of that. Get on your bicycle and ride your bicycle. If you do that, then it will slow down the greenhouse gas emissions. If that happens, it will save the planet for our children and grandchildren. Whatever the price is to our economy, to our way of life, to our culture, and whatever it does to shut down the economy, in their minds, it is all worth it.

□ 2215

That's what we're working with here.

On our side of the aisle, we're saying we need more energy. We're arguing that, in all forms of energy, we need to provide more of it, that high prices slow down our economy.

Everything we do takes energy, whether you're delivering Pampers or

Pablum, or whether you're delivering French wine to the restaurants here in downtown Washington, D.C., it takes energy to do that. When that energy costs more money, everything costs more money. We say, let's put more Btus on the market of all kinds. When there's a huge supply, you'll see the demand doesn't meet the supply and prices go down until the demand meets the supply. That's something we understand over here. It's something that seems to be beyond the comprehension over here.

That's what's up, Mr. Speaker. And I think we need to articulate this over and over again until the American people understand. There is one side of this argument that has pushed for more energy. And we passed a number of bills in the last several Congresses, passed them out of the floor of this House and over to the Senate. If they had not been blocked over there by extreme environmentalists that had an ability to put a hold on a bill, that had an ability to filibuster, many of the pieces of legislation that expand our energy would already be law, and 6 or 8 or more years ago we would have started to open up places like the Outer Continental Shelf, non-national park public lands.

We passed pad drilling in ANWR some years ago. We would have oil coming out of that pipeline up there today from ANWR if we had just signed it into law the day it was passed out of the House of Representatives.

That's some of the backdrop, Mr. Speaker, on the energy issue. And I know that when you go to a place and you're looking for people that know something about energy, the first place you would go in the United States of America would be Texas. And I'm not sure it would be east Texas, but that's where I want to go, to the gentleman from east Texas, Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT, and yield so much time as he may consume.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Iowa. And I admire so much, not just him, but also his State. And having had him be a gracious host previously, I appreciate all that Iowa is doing for the country.

But Mr. Speaker, my friend from Iowa is right; there's a lot of people that know a lot about energy in east Texas where I'm from. And the fact is—and we brought this up in our Natural Resources Committee—you know, there in east Texas where I live they're drilling, they're exploring, they're producing. We're doing everything we can to provide energy for the rest of the country to use. But we're to the point now, we desperately need some help, and we need it from those States that have energy but have been sitting on it and will not help the rest of the Nation with it.

Now, there are too many in this country that have to drive to survive.

There's no mass transportation that is going to get them where they've got to go to keep their job. We were in a debate in Judiciary last week, and one of the Members across the aisle said, well, our Democratic Party, we're concerned about the consumers, unlike the other party. And the fact is, I know those of us on the floor, our friends, we've got some good friends across the aisle—not the ones in leadership, but across the aisle—who understand. You want to help consumers, the men and women that are just trying to keep their job so they can pay down their credit card so they can get enough gas to keep their job next month, they're needing help. And yes, we want to help the consumer, we want to help them keep their job. We want jobs to be available. But I'm talking to people that have restaurants, that have small businesses, convenient stores. They're saying their business is down about 30 percent or so.

And what some of our friends in leadership across the aisle don't understand is, yes, it's nice if you never had to use fossil fuel, but it's what is used to keep the economy going right now. And I'm hoping we can drive in directions—figuratively speaking—that will allow us to get off fossil fuel someday. But what they don't seem to understand is, when you destroy an economy, when you devastate an economy, which is beginning to happen now as these energy prices are hurting people so badly, you don't help the environment. We see that in India. We see it in China. When people are worried about keeping food on their table for their family, when they're worried about providing a place to live and sleep for their family, then they believe that the environmental issues have to take a back seat because we've got to survive first.

Now, the United States—I know with all the beating up that goes on with the United States, but the United States has done more globally to help clean up the world's environment in the last 30 years than any nation on Earth. You destroy our economy, you hurt this economy the way this is beginning to do and you will lose the help from the best help source in the world, and that's the United States of America.

And this isn't the first time I've been proud of America; I've been proud of America my whole life. But I note that on the Natural Resources Committee that I'm on, you look at things that we've been doing in the last several months and compare that to what went on in the last Congress, when the Republican leadership was in charge. Well, I was upset with some of the things that the leadership didn't allow or didn't get done or didn't help us to do, but some of the things that were done were good.

For example, we had a bill, an energy bill in the last Congress, came out of

our committee, we got it passed. And it provided incentives for people to use biomass to produce electricity. Tried and true, we've got a facility down in Nacogdoches just that's coming online. People relied on the representations that there would be incentives to use biomass, like left over tree limbs, things like that, to produce electricity. In our committee, in the last months, we decided to withdraw those incentives and instead provide a bunch of money for a new study to tell us whether it's feasible. I said, we know it's feasible, just use it. It's another source of energy.

We've got wind—and of course our friend, T. Boone Pickens, has been talking a great deal about that—geothermal, hydroelectricity, the solar and biomass, as I've mentioned, those are all out there for use and they need to be pursued. But in the meantime, it's fossil fuel that is driving this country and it's fossil fuel that's driving the planet. And what we end up hearing in so many of these debates, including these late-night discussions, are people that hear things and just assume, well, it's said in committee, it's said on the floor, it must be true. And so we still hear people say, if we were to start drilling in that section 1002 part of ANWR that President Jimmy Carter designated would be used for oil and gas development, you know, nearly 30 years ago, we pursue that, well, it would still be 10 or 15 years before that would be available. What's been heard more recently that people aren't saying across the aisle is—at least not in the leadership, some of our moderate friends know—but that is that actually there is a pipeline, as I understand it, 74 miles from ANWR, this section of it. And despite what you see on the news, there are no pristine mountains, there are no antelope playing or buffalo roaming or anything like, it's just basically a waste land. And what better place to drill. The technology is there to do it.

But we could have that in the United States—some of us have been told it can be done within 2 to 3 years; within 3 years it could be in the United States. Do it now. The mere fact that we would go after that would tell the speculators—that some say are contributing a third to the price—it would be nice to drop the price of gasoline by over a dollar just on speculation when they see we're serious about providing our own energy.

The OCS. We're hearing people say, well, it can be 10 or 15 years down the road. Others say, you know what? We're serious about this. The price of oil is so high, gas is so high, we get out there, and some think it could be produced and on its way back to us within 2 years. I mean, this stuff is right here, available for us to utilize.

We've got this—and most people, those that are listening probably have

never seen, but that shale being talked about in the Green River Formation up in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, it's a thick black—looks like a black rock. It is full of what can be turned into barrels of oil, very clean oil. Now, the 2005 RAND study says that there are probably 800 billion barrels of recoverable oil in this Green River Formation of oil shale. Some of us have heard numbers more recently that actually there may be a trillion barrels of oil in the entire Middle East left. Some think we can get two to five times that much recoverable from the shale in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming. That is American energy from America for Americans, and there's no reason not to be producing that.

But you look at the Outer Continental Shelf. We hear about all these acres that are not being drilled and produced. Ninety-seven percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is not leased and not being used. And as a Texan, I can remember growing up hearing people say, oh, no, if you put drilling rigs out there in the Gulf of Mexico, it will destroy all of the aquatic life that's left out in the Gulf of Mexico. And you know what? When those platforms went in out there, they looked to the fish like artificial reefs. And now, if you want to go fishing, there is no better place to go than around these platforms way out in the Gulf. Man and the aquatic life of the Gulf of Mexico are doing splendidly together.

And when we hear about all this oil that is messing up beaches, most of that comes from tankers and natural ooze out of the Earth itself. When Hurricane Katrina hit the Gulf off Louisiana and Texas, most people aren't aware, but it virtually destroyed some of those platforms. But you know what? They didn't leak. That's still coming from tankers and natural ooze from the Earth itself.

And I appreciate my friend from Iowa yielding because one of the things that's coming out, it seems like yesterday and today, the price of gasoline may have dropped 20 cents or so. And some people are already saying, see, we can take credit, we can back off; we don't have to drill the Outer Continental Shelf; we don't have to drill ANWR; we don't have to produce from coal to liquid, as our friend, Mr. SHIMKUS, talked about; we don't have to produce from the oil shale in the Green River Formation; we don't have to go after this new Haynesville formulation for natural gas—some are saying may be one of the biggest finds in history of natural gas in Louisiana and part of east Texas. Some are saying we don't have to do that anymore, we're okay, not to worry.

But you go back historically, and it's like that frog in the warm water; you know, you start it with warm, and you can get it warmer and warmer. And if he gets a little antsy, you may lower

the temperature so he doesn't get too antsy and jump out, and eventually you can boil him. And it seems like that's what's going on.

We're to the point in American history where we can't keep funding people who fund our enemies, or as someone once said, "we can't keep feeding the dogs that are trained to bite us." And I'm not calling the people that we pay for oil dogs, it's just a figure of speech that what we're doing, we're feeding people who are trained to hurt us. And that's got to stop.

We have got to follow through. We have got to use an energy plan that makes us independent. And Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have thought a year ago that I could say this in good conscience, and so I didn't, but now I can say it. I believe this Nation can be completely energy independent, where we're not having the biggest transfer of funds in the history of the world. We could be energy independent for a number of decades while we develop these alternatives.

And I have some ideas. I'm hoping to file a bill this week that, if we follow through on this, could revolutionize ways to provide energy because of the way we store it. But we'll get into that later, but I'm hoping to file that this week.

These are long-term goals that could make this Nation even greater than it is today as the greatest Nation in the world. But the more we become dependent on those who have funded our enemies, the more vulnerable we are. And those that thought a solution was to raid the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, there's not that much oil in the scheme of things. And when you know history like my friend from Iowa and I do, you know the Battle of the Bulge was lost by the Germans, not because it was toward the end of the war and we had worn them down—yes, it was late in the game—but they, many historians believe, could have driven the Allied Forces right to the Atlantic and North Sea if they hadn't run out of gasoline.

We can't afford to get rid of our strategic reserve that may be necessary, if Iran decides to cut off the Straits of Hormuz, if we get a severe cut in our supply, we've got to be able to step up and allow our military to have what they need, and that petroleum reserve does that.

So, I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa yielding. Let me mention one other thing. In the last month—I believe it may be the last thing that we've done in the Natural Resources Committee that deals with the issue of providing more of our own energy—we passed a bill—and I say "we" loosely because I sure voted and spoke against it; most of us walked out, we couldn't believe we were doing it. But anyway, we put the last best source of uranium in the United States off-limits.

□ 2230

We have already put vast amounts of our coal off-limits. Now we are putting uranium off-limits. We can't keep doing that and expect to be the greatest nation in the world much longer. I think we can go on for decades as the greatest, but it takes common sense now. I know my friend from Iowa has it. I know my friend from Texas out here has it. But we have got to deal with this problem now. We can't say, well, it's dropped 20 cents; so we won't worry about it. We have got to deal with this issue now or it will devastate the economy, which will devastate the environment, and will hurt the free world, and we can't afford to do that. I appreciate my friend for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

And as I listened to your presentation, reclaiming my time, just going down through a list of some of the things that jumped out at me, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, to tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, as the gentleman from Texas said, at a time when Iran has threatened to close the Straits of Hormuz. And through that closed strait comes 42.6 percent of the world's export oil supply. That isn't just the valve through which 42.6 percent of the world's export oil supply goes. That valve, if they turn it down, let alone turn it off, that shuts down the world economy. It nearly shuts off the world economy, and the dynamics of everything we do change dramatically. That's why in past decades we have had the United States Navy in there to keep those straits open during times of crisis because that is the pressure point in the world for the world's economy. If they follow through on this, and there is a relatively unstable leader in Iran, they shut down the straits and we drain out our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, what are our alternatives? Hard-core rationing, and even then we get down to the point where we don't have the fuel for our own military and the scenario of how the Battle of the Bulge was won by Americans instead of won by the Germans falls into play. We won't have the gas. We won't have the gas for our military. We won't have the gas for our economy. We won't have the juice. This is not the time to drain down the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. It's a political ploy on this side of the aisle. That's, I think, clear to all of us.

And, Mr. Speaker, the statement with "use it or lose it," the argument that we have oil companies that have leases that are not being drilled upon, that's another one of those red herring arguments. And if we were serious about this, if we really thought the oil companies weren't developing leases that are on lands, they're just not developing dry holes. That's why those leases that are not drilled aren't drilled on yet. And if we would allow them to

trade out those acres, 1 good acre for 5 bad ones, you would find out what the good land was and what the bad land was, what the good leases are and what the bad leases are. That would be my proposal, but that's not what happened here because we had to do another red herring. We had to stand up another strawman and make another argument because the American people aren't going to tolerate very long a Congress that refuses to act to open up energy.

The belief that tightening down the energy supply, see gas prices go up. If gas prices go up, people burn less. If people burn less, the god of sky is happy. Mother Earth is happy.

Human beings suffer. Grandmothers aren't going to get on their bicycles in January in Iowa and ride them down the gravel road 7 miles to town. That's how far it is for me to go to town, and it isn't all gravel, but the first mile is. It doesn't work for us. We can't drive those little Priuses either because the most recent time I had to shift my SUV into four-wheel drive to get home was still in April when the roads were soft and the frost was going out. So it's not an option for us unless we have a summer car and a winter car, a fair weather car and a foul weather vehicle. No, people in my part of the neighborhood drive the vehicles they do because that's what's necessary to get the job done. And a lot of those vehicles are farm pickups that are doing work every day.

There's a whole different mindset going on. And the reason that the people who represent the blue zones, the inner cities, the ones who hold the gavels in this Congress today, can get by with higher energy prices, one of those reasons is because the people buying gas in places like Texas and Iowa, and it's a long ways between towns in Texas, further than it is in Iowa, the people buying that gas that are going from town to town and doing the things they need to do to maintain their life-style and their businesses are paying 18.4 a gallon Federal tax and a lot of States have 20 or more cents on that to maintain the roads, and 17 percent of the Federal gas tax goes to mass transit. And so the people that are voting, the inner-city people that are voting for the folks that are environmental extremists that refuse to allow the energy development in America, our own energy, those people are subsidized by the folks that are buying gas. And their ticket to get on the metro down here at South Capitol and ride out to Falls Church is about a buck and a quarter. It would be a lot more than that if they had to buy the whole price of the metro. And a ticket on the subway in New York is cheaper than it would be if they had to pay the full fair cost for travel, and a ticket on the "L" in Chicago and the cable car in San Francisco, those transits by my

measure are all subsidized by the people who are buying gas. And the constituents who allow their Members of Congress to drive up these prices are going to push us gas buyers to the point where we say, "I'm not going to subsidize your mass transit anymore on my gas dollar. You pay for your own ticket." That's going to happen too in this Congress, and that will be when they squeal. And then they'll say, well, gas is too high; let's have some more energy.

Here's what has happened during the Pelosi Congress. This was going to be the Congress that was the most open in history, by the way. I think it's the most closed in history. It was going to be the most effective and hardest-working Congress in history. Well, it's sure not open, and, Mr. Speaker, it's sure not effective. And, additionally, we still haven't passed an appropriations bill as late in history as that has ever happened. And this cheaper gas price that was promised if we would just hand the gavel to NANCY PELOSI and apply her San Francisco values to all of America, we would have this wonderful world where everybody got along and gas would be cheaper. That was the promise. We are going to get you cheaper gas, cheaper than it was than NANCY PELOSI, the Speaker, took the gavel.

Here's what gas prices were when President Bush was sworn in, Mr. Speaker: \$1.49. And it slowly crept up. And in about this area, we passed energy legislation, and it went over to the Senate, where the Democrats in the Senate filibustered our energy legislation that would have put many more Btus of energy into our marketplace. They said no. That blocked the smart legislation that came out of the House. And when that happened, prices of energy went up. And they went up to all of \$2.33 a gallon for gasoline on the day that the new Speaker took the gavel here just behind me, \$2.33, and gas prices were going to get cheaper. And here is what the promise results in. Now, it's fallen off a little bit more in the last week or so: \$4.08, I saw \$4.10, \$4.11, more than that on the board in other places. But gas taking a leap like that, and why? Because there's less energy on the market, not more; because the people that are hedging because they need to have diesel fuel and gasoline see the supply that's there and they see that it's going to be harder to develop energy in the United States because of folks in this Congress in their majority won't let it happen.

We say drill everything, drill it now, produce more energy of all kinds, drill ANWR, drill the Outer Continental Shelf, drill the nonnational park public lands. As Mr. GOHMERT said, open up the Green River shale oil and go into that massive amount, 800 billion barrels, maybe a trillion barrels that are there; go in and get that natural gas in

that huge find in Hainesville. Do all of those things. Produce more of every form of energy that we have.

The argument that we can't go to the Outer Continental Shelf and drill because it's environmentally unfriendly, Mr. GOHMERT spoke about how that's the place where you go if you want to go fishing out there is to the oil platform because in the shade of the structure is a place where the fish congregate. So it has been better. There are places where they sink ships out in the ocean because it's fish habitat. Well, the structure of the ship is structure for fish. The structure of an oil platform is structure for fish. And there was at least one oil platform that was torn loose during Hurricane Katrina that blew 60 miles across the ocean, and it went up near shore near Mobile, Alabama. No leak, but a platform that was pushed 60 miles by a terrible storm. But they are set up now with the kind of connections that if they're torn loose, there are not leaks. And we have met this technology.

The North Slope of Alaska is essentially identical topography and identical environment to that of ANWR. They're right next door. It's like Nebraska and Iowa or Iowa and Illinois, and that's how the difference is between North Slope and ANWR. Well, the habitat for wildlife in the North Slope, after we went up and built the pipeline, has done about the same thing, maybe even better, than the platforms out in the gulf coast. In that the count in the caribou herd in the North Slope in 1970 was 7,000 caribou, 7,000 head of caribou walking around out there in that frozen tundra. For a couple months out of the year when the sun shines 24 hours a day, it thaws the permafrost down a foot to 18 inches. Sloppy old tundra in there. And those caribou that were 7,000 caribou in 1970 today are over 28,000 head of caribou.

Why is that? Well, one environmentalist said to me when I made that point, well, of course there are more caribou today. That's because the people that went up and worked on the pipeline shot all the wolves. That was their natural enemy. Now, I would not have come up with that. But this is what I can tell you, Mr. Speaker:

I was signed up to go up on that pipeline, and they had to pay good money to get a man to go up there and work in that climate, not just 80-below temperatures sometimes, though real men can do that, but the rules were this: First of all, there were no women allowed; so you're going to lose some of these men who don't want to go someplace where there are no women. It's tough for me. And the second thing was no gambling. The third thing was no booze. And the fourth thing was no guns. No women, no gambling, no booze, and no guns. That's why they had to pay such big money to get some-

body to go work in 80-below temperatures. That was some of the worst of it. Most of it wasn't that bad.

So the reality is that if there were no guns up there and nobody shot any of the wolves and that isn't why the caribou herd increased, they increased because they had a nice dry spot where they could have their calves, not down in the ice water in the frozen tundra.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. You're talking about the caribou that more than 10 times gained from where they were before.

And with regard to the wolves being shot, one of the things I was surprised about when I heard that polar bears were now listed as threatened here recently was the fact, and we discussed this—it came out in debate in our Natural Resources Committee—it's acknowledged that in the last few decades we were down to 10,000 to 12,000 polar bears in the world. Now it's acknowledged universally there are over 25,000 polar bears, and somehow that caused the polar bears to now be threatened now that there are more than twice as many as there were a few decades ago. So it certainly isn't because of a lack of polar bears that the caribou are doing well. The polar bears are doing quite well themselves despite what you may hear from some of the far left folks on that issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas. Yes, the polar bears are doing well, and they are probably dining on a seal diet. They'll eat caribou. They'll eat anything they can get their paws on. That's what a bear does. And 28,000 head caribou herd up there on the North Slope.

But there is no resident caribou herd in ANWR next door. There's a migratory herd that comes in in the spring from Canada. They come in and have their calves there, and when the calves get to where they can walk, they all walk back to Canada. So it's a kind of a maternity ward for caribou there in ANWR. But no one can come up with any reason why they would stop coming over to have their calves or think that it would hurt their population. It would probably help their population because they like to get up out of that cold, frozen water and the tundra and get up on something kind of high and let the breeze blow the flies away and have their calves up there where they have a better chance of survival.

Another gentleman that has come to the floor to address this issue is one of the three judges from the State of Texas, and they all come here from Texas knowing something about the law and something about energy.

I would be happy to yield to Judge CARTER, the gentleman from Texas.

□ 2245

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend from Iowa, my classmate from Iowa. We

came in this Congress together and have been close friends since we have gotten here. The one thing that I have learned about people from Iowa, like STEVE KING, is that they are blessed, like a whole lot of my folks back home, hopefully I am too, with something called common sense. You know, this is really about common sense, and I think the American people get it.

Tomorrow morning, in Round Rock, Texas, where I am from, that used to be a little bitty town of 2,500 people, and now we are bumping up against 100,000 people, but I estimate we have got at least 15,000 to 20,000 vehicles that are operated out of Round Rock, Texas.

So, tomorrow morning, in just my hometown, 15,000 people are going to get out of bed and go out and start up a vehicle to go to work, and it's summer, they may be wanting to take the kids on vacation, maybe taking them to swimming practice or to baseball practice or down to the park to play, or they are going to grocery shopping, as the price of groceries go up, or they are going out to work, or they are driving down to Austin, 30 miles away, to their job. But they are all mobile and going some place.

There's no mass transit that comes to my town of 100,000 people. There's a Greyhound bus that passes through, going places. But I wouldn't call that mass transit. It won't get you back and forth to work. And all those peoples are going to start their vehicles tomorrow morning, either on gasoline or diesel. We may have a couple of hybrids. But the power that is going to recharge the batteries of that hybrid vehicle is going to come from a source of some sort. Hydroelectric used to be a big source, but it's one of the minute sources now. We got scared to death of nuclear energy and so we stopped making nuclear power plants. So we burn coal and we burn natural gas and hydrocarbons to make electrical energy most everywhere in this country.

Now, sure, I like what I heard from my friend, T. Boone Pickens, from the panhandle of Texas, where the wind blows all the time. Wind mills are a great idea in the panhandle of Texas, and they are going to help a small amount. I am all for it. I, of course, am a big fan of natural gas because my daddy was in the natural gas business. I grew up in the natural gas business, and every summer job I had from the time I was 16-years-old was in the natural gas business. Which brings me down to something that I discovered.

Most of the people here in Congress know that I am married to a little lady who's from the Netherlands. I worked on a pipeline in the Netherlands back in 1965. That is how I met my wife. That pipeline was being laid because the Dutch discovered in the northern province of Holland—and Holland is a little country. It's not very big at all.

I think it's 190 miles long by 90 miles wide.

They discovered natural gas. In fact, one well in north Holland produced the same amount of natural gas as the entire west Texas gas field in the panhandle. Now they were elated. They were overwhelmed. Europe was fascinated. They had found a resource to power their homes, because they were still burning coal, they were still burning coal that was made into liquid. They were still burning coal oil in their homes in northern Europe in 1965. And they were excited about this great resource that they found.

And then they moved offshore; off the shore of Norway, off the shore of Scotland, off the shore of Sweden, and out into the North Sea, out into the Baltic Sea, and they drilled and they found more oil and natural gas. And Europe was excited. Yet, we are ashamed of our natural resource that we know is sitting off the coast of the United States. Oh, woe is me. We can't touch that. That is not good for us.

Now what is wrong with us? Because tomorrow morning in Round Rock, Texas, 15,000 people want to run their vehicles to live their lives as Americans. And, you're right, these folks, the intercity folks, they have got mass transit. Some of it's good, some not so good. But they have got it. Maybe that is what is part of the divide that divides the red States from the blue States in the old comparison that we get right now. Maybe us red State folks don't have as much transit as the blue State folks. I don't know about that.

But I know this. The Republican Party stands for the right idea. Let's develop every power source known to man to make this an American independent power country. American power for Americans.

You have got a chart right there. You have got a great list. I will be glad to yield back for you to go over that list of the power sources that we say are available and how we support each and every one of those power sources. I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas, one of the outstanding judges from Texas, Judge CARTER, and my wing man on the Judiciary Committee for 4 years, and my voice of reason as well.

This is a chart that was far harder to put together than it should have been. This should have been something that a simple little e-mail down to the office would have produced. You would think that when you ask a question, What is the energy production in the United States, what are all of its sources, and put it altogether and put it into the common denominator of Btus. Well, it didn't quite work that way because we don't measure electricity in Btu's. We measure it in kilowatts or megawatts, and sometimes coal doesn't give you that measurement either.

So we got some help from some people and this chart is the energy pie chart, I call it. Each one of these different colors here is a different source of energy. And so I will take us around.

This is the energy we produce in the United States. Overall, this is the number: 72.1 quadrillion Btus. Here's the number down here. That is 15 zeroes or so. But we will get to the meaning of that number here in a moment.

When I go around the horn and I start with gasoline, gasoline that is produced the United States amounts to 8.28 percent of the overall energy production in the United States. Then you go to diesel fuel and heating oil. That is 4.20 percent. Kerosene and jet fuel together is 1.57. Less than I thought it would be. Other petroleum products, heavy oil, those things, 4.8 percent.

Now there's a big piece here, the natural gas. The natural gas that Judge CARTER talked about. Roughly 27½ percent of the overall energy that we produce is natural gas. Coal is 32½ percent of the overall Btu's. Nuclear, 11.66. Maybe bigger than most folks would think. We got to hydroelectric, which Judge CARTER mentioned. Out of all our energy production, hydroelectric is 3.41 percent overall.

Then you get to these tiny little pieces here. We want to do all of these things, as Judge CARTER said. We want to do them all.

Now we are getting down to the list of the things that the folks on this side of the aisle will do. Here they are. They will be okay maybe with geothermal as long as they don't have to watch it happen because they can't stand the thought of seeing a drill rig punch a hole down to turn the heat back. But once it's over, it's kind of okay.

Wind. Well, they don't like wind so good. If TEDDY KENNEDY can see it, they don't want it. But out in Texas it's probably all right. T. Boone Pickens said this is one problem we can't drill our way out of. Well, I believe that may be true, but it's also a problem we can't get out of without drilling. That is what I would add to the gentleman's wisdom. Here's solar, at .11 percent.

Here are the three sources of energy that are not objectionable to environmentalists, geothermal, wind, and solar, and they represent just a little bit more than 1 percent of the overall energy production in America, and that is what they would expand that into the entire energy supply for America.

These tiny little slivers here that are so small, you don't even get a color in there. It's just the line, the black line. Expand those into the whole circle and let the rest of this wither and die on the vine. Because if we drill an oil well, it's going to reach maximum production pretty quickly. From there on, it's statistically a little bit less oil on a daily basis until it finally dries up. We have got to keep exploring.

Same with natural gas. These wells don't last forever. They don't get bigger, better. They get to be a little lesser. With coal, you have got to keep opening coal mines. You can't be closing the uranium, by the way, or our nuclear will slowly get shut down.

There's the little sliver they would have, geothermal, wind and solar. But the rest of us, we would expand all of this, and I include with that ethanol, biodiesel, biomass. All of that source of energy needs to be expanded because I have the chart that shows not just the energy production in the United States, but the energy consumption compared to it, and it is actually the more interesting of the two charts, Mr. Speaker.

This chart shows the outside circle is the energy consumption in the United States. I showed you the number before, 72.1 quadrillion Btus of production, 101.4 quadrillion Btus of consumption. This circle in the middle is our production circle. The outside is our consumption circle. This inner circle is 72 percent of the outer circle.

So, however we want to measure this, we need to grow more natural gas so it comes out to the width of the outer circle. We need to grow more coal production, more nuclear production, more gasoline over here, and on and on with the diesel fuel, jet fuel, et cetera.

This inner circle, which is the energy production in the United States, has got to grow up to match up with the outer circle, which is energy consumption. If we do that, we are energy independent, however you measure it.

Now, I'd change the proportion of these slices of the pie. I would use a lot less natural gas to general electricity because it's a finite source and I'd rather see it go to manufacturing, where natural gas is the mother's milk of manufacturing. I'd rather see it go to fertilizer. We have nearly lost the fertilizer industry in American because natural gas has been pushed to high.

I would change the proportions and the priorities and I'd produce a lot more nuclear because we can and we should and it's environmentally friendly and it's the safest source of energy that there is on the one planet. The French produce 78 percent of their electricity with nuclear. Ours is 8.29—actually, 11.66 percent of our production and 8.29 percent of our overall consumption.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will yield. I will add to the slice of the pie, just as I yield, one of these needs to be energy conservation. That changes the equation too.

The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. There are commercials running on television on both sides of this issue, and one of them says, Why don't the oil companies do something about energy, not just oil? And do something about the environment.

Well, we are told that the big challenge we have today is CO<sub>2</sub>. Carbon dioxide is ruining our planet. We talked about the polar bears earlier. If we captured carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere from some type of burn process, what will we do with it? Who has a use for carbon dioxide; taking it out of the atmosphere? The oil companies have a use.

The oil companies can use carbon dioxide to deep inject into fields like east Texas, where Brother GOHMERT comes from, which just about spinout oil fields, and geologists tell us there may be 50 percent of the oil in that field may not be recoverable without some change in the field.

Under this future gen project, which this government is looking at spending billions of dollars on to study how to take coal, clean the burn of coal, capture the carbon dioxide and put the carbon dioxide deep in the ground, where it will change the composition of—I assume it's like tar sands that are left down there—and bring light crude to the surface.

So, you know, these are not the evil empire. They actually have a solution to a problem that we are talking about, and as we learn how to capture carbon dioxide, which we are working on right now.

I was in a meeting the day before yesterday with a group that has a process of capturing carbon dioxide from a burn process. As we capture it, it has a market price in a free enterprise world to the oil and gas industry to bring petroleum products to the surface safely, without polluting the atmosphere.

We don't talk about these things because these are the things that they do in the regular engineering in their business. But the reality is this is a solution to the very problem that our friend, Mr. Gore, is talking about. And if you believe that carbon dioxide is the end of the world, there are energy companies, oil and gas companies, that are ready, willing, and able to take captured carbon dioxide to work in their business.

This is the kind creativity when you challenge Americans to solve a problem. We say, Go to the moon. Yes, we can go to the moon by using these kind of new ideas to make life better for Americans so that when we get up tomorrow morning, we can comfortably start our automobiles and our pickup trucks and our SUVs and together work.

□ 2300

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I would add to that that the free market solutions that we have, they constantly adjust. If government gets out of the way, the demand will create the supply, and when the supply gets to be oversupply, then the price comes down.

Instead, we have people that have their hands on the gavel that don't be-

lieve in free market economy. They never sat down and read through Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" word-for-word and understood it. They don't live to appreciate it. They think there are a handful of intellectual elitists in the world that can manage the economy.

We have had two Members of this Congress that have called out for nationalization of at least part of our oil industry or all of our oil industry. One of them, the gentleman from New York, called for the nationalization of our oil refineries. In other words, that word doesn't fit too good with Americans, but it happens in places like Venezuela, and it happened in Libya to the Hunt brothers with their oil fields. Nationalization means the United States Government would take over the oil refineries and run them.

One other Member, the gentlewoman from California, argued that we should nationalize the entire oil industry in the United States, run that with the government.

I wonder, where does this come from? Where I come from, we are steeped in free enterprise. We are steeped in free market capitalization. We understand that ambition and the desire and need for profit has done more for the standard of living of all humanity than all the missionaries that ever went anywhere. And God love the missionaries for all they have done, but it has been the desire for profit that has driven our technology, in math and science and in the oil industry and in information technology.

It wasn't done because some intellectual elitist was sitting somewhere and decided let's invent a software package and a microchip and an oil drill rig and a derrick and a platform and a refinery. That was done because there was profit in it, and some good, solid, smart people put capital together and they worked hard and took risks and our lives got better.

There is a book that I read years ago called "Trashing the Planet" by Dixie Lee Ray, former Governor of the State of Washington. She since has passed away. She served one term out there, as I recall.

She starts the book out about how in 1900 the world was a very smelly and dirty and dangerous place, and she writes about how horses were going up and down in the streets, and they didn't wear diapers like they do in Central Park in those days. They left their mess behind them. The garbage got dumped out the window.

There was a time there in transition when a gentleman walked on the inside, away from the curb, so when the garbage got dumped out, it landed on him instead of the lady. Then, after a while, it got to be where the vehicles were splashing water up, so the gentleman walked on the curbside instead of the building side. That is how the culture changed.

We didn't have clean water and we didn't have clean air and we didn't have modern medicine, and she wrote about how we took a step up and new technology came, every new invention improved the standard of living and the quality of life on average of all Americans, and, in fact, most people in the world.

I read that book next to, side-by-side, simultaneous with Al Gore's book "Earth in the Balance." It was quite a thing to see the difference between the good, solid, commonsense of Dixie Lee Ray, that was full of footnotes and references, a very respectable, scholarly work, compared to the work of "Earth in the Balance," that I didn't find a footnote, and I found quotes from a respected politician, a noted public figure, but not even names.

So we are always better off with technology. Energy produces more technology, cheaper, and lets our economy flow. If we decide we are going to shut down, say, the coal mines here in the United States, shut down the oil drilling and for natural gas or for our crude oil, and, by the way, in the last 25 years, our oil rigs have gone from 4,500 of them operating and working in the United States down to 2,000 is all. Only six rigs working in Alaska. Only six up there in that huge oil.

So we need more energy so that we can have a more effective economy. That is the bottom line. We believe in free market capitalization. We believe in supply and demand. We believe that if there is more demand, there will be more supply created, if government gets out of the way.

You folks all believe get in the way and then drag a straw man out and a red herring and say, well, we will take some oil out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, or we will say "use it or lose it." The American people know better.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas. Mr. CARTER. The other bogeyman, strawman out there, is Big Oil. Big Oil finds the oil rigs. As a Member of this House, and I don't think you would be ashamed for me to tell this, and it is not a long story, his name is TRENT FRANKS, he is one of our classmates, and he made his living drilling for oil. You know how he started? TRENT was 18. His partner was his 15-year-old brother. They bought a makeshift drilling rig that was basically rigged on the back of an old truck, and they went down outside of Midland, Texas, and started looking for a place to drill for oil.

TRENT is out of the business now because he is a Member of Congress, but his firm today is drilling offshore off the coast of New Zealand and Australia. So he and his 15-year-old brother obviously found some someplace so they could keep drilling.

The average person who seeks oil is an independent, more or less for the oil

industry, small businessman, and we should stop throwing these bogeymen out there, because these are the people looking for our oil, and they are going to find it and they are going to change things, as are our coal miners and all the other people we have talked about. We will get clean coal, we will get oil that we can live with, we will have American energy.

I thank you for allowing me to join you today. I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge and the judges from Texas. It has been a big help to me and a boost to hear your insight on this energy issue. I intend to continue to turn this up and do all I can to open it up.

I am tired of \$4 gas. The American people are tired of \$4 gas. They know that this if Congress shuts down energy, the price will go higher, not lower, and it is up to us. We have got discharge petitions down here that many, many Members have signed. When we get to 218, they will come to the floor, whether it is blocked by the Speaker or not. That is one of the key pieces of this.

I also wanted to add, first I will go back and recap this energy pie piece. The inside circle is energy production in America. The outside circle is energy consumption in America. The colored components of this, blue is gas production; diesel fuel is red; and you have got the yellow is natural gas; the kind of orange is coal; green is nuclear; and then you get hydroelectric is this little sliver right here in that faded lavender color.

But when you go around the corner and you ask the question, can we bring more biomass into this equation, environmentalists say no, you are burning wood and stuff, so you are polluting the atmosphere with the emissions from burning cellulose. So you can't do that.

Well, we get to diesel fuel and gasoline. We surely can't do that, because that comes from an oil well. That is a crude oil product. You can't do jet fuel, you can't do heavy oils, because that is all petroleum out of a well product. Here is natural gas. You can't do that. That is Outer Continental Shelf. They don't want to create fish habitat out there with those oil platforms.

And the idea for some people in Florida that out there at 199 miles away from shore we might punch a oil or natural gas well down and somebody might not come to Florida and sit on the beach because there was once a drill rig 199 miles away and now there is a platform that might even be underwater, that can't be seen? That has about as much sense as somebody sitting on Iowa's border with Missouri in a lawn chair saying, I don't like the idea there could be somebody with a drill rig up there in Southern Minnesota, right across the line. Same distance, 200 miles north to south.

Why is anybody worried about a drill rig 200 miles offshore of Florida? They can't see it from the beach. Chris Columbus, remember, said that is how he figured out the Earth was round. He saw the mast of the ship first as it got closer. He figured the Earth was curved, because you should have seen all the ship at once if it were flat.

We have to grow the size of this energy pie, Mr. Speaker. All of these things are off the table from environmentalists: No more natural gas, no coal, no more nuclear. Hydroelectric, we surely couldn't stop the water in a river and save a flood, like Cedar Rapids, Iowa, or Iowa City, Iowa, in the process. No, we can't have any more of that. All we can have more of is geothermal, wind and biodiesel. They represent approximately 1 percent of the overall energy, the overall energy production in America, and they are only 0.74 percent of the overall consumption in America.

So clearly something has to change. The American people will not tolerate expensive gas, as long as there is a logical, commonsense solution. We know what that is. We have talked about what that is, Mr. Speaker, and I call upon the Speaker of the House to let these energy bills come forward for votes and let the American people see where everybody stands in this Congress.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, JULY 28, 2008 AT PAGE 16605

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule 1, the following enrolled bills were signed by the Speaker on Thursday, July 24, 2008:

H.R. 1553, to amend the public health service act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to information regarding pediatric cancers and current treatments for such cancers, establish a national childhood cancer registry, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancer

H.R. 3890, to impose sanctions on officials of the State Peace and Development Council in Burma, to amend the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 to exempt humanitarian assistance from United States sanctions on Burma, to prohibit the importation of gemstones from Burma, or that originate in Burma, to promote a coordinated international effort to restore civilian democratic rule to Burma, and for other purposes

H.R. 4841, to approve, ratify, and confirm the settlement agreement entered into to resolve claims by the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians relating to alleged interferences with the water resources of the Tribe, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute and perform the Settlement Agreement and related waivers, and for other purposes

H.R. 5501, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/