Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, you are pointing out when this comes down to it, when we had the chance to gather together and link arms and be one as Republicans and Democrats, our friends on the other side of the aisle didn't join us. There have been plenty of opportunities for that to happen, for us, as Mr. RYAN says, to do what our constituents want and put politics aside.

As I said at the outset, the pumps don't care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. The pumps don't care if you voted for CHRIS MURPHY or not. They are going to charge you the same thing one way or another.

I think Mr. ALTMIRE is right. Maybe they have the best intentions at heart. But it is a pretty simplistic solution to a pretty complex problem: Drill more, drill more. Again, you are just feeding the beast. You are continuing to perpetuate a monopoly on energy that offers no real competition.

What you need is not competition between Exxon and Mobil. You need competition between oil and electric, between biodiesel and gasoline. That is what you need competition among. That is how you are going to solve this thing in the end.

But so long as the solution to high oil prices is just more oil and nothing else, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN, you are not getting anywhere.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important, the American people are onto this. They have been dealing with this problem now for like 35 years.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Pretty much our whole lives.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Before we were even born. But they have been dealing with this issue of oil and gas and the Middle East and dictators and how do we do this and prop up this one and try to figure it out.

In this whole scheme, I was watching a thing on Darfur last night. The only reason we couldn't get things done in Darfur is because China has oil in Sudan and we couldn't go in there because they were blocking things at the UN. Oil has become a major, major geopolitical and domestic problem in the United States of America. It has come to a head, and it is NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID and the Democrats who are trying to move us off the dime and say long-term alternative energy is the investment. If we drilled in ANWR today, in 20 years you would save 1.8 pennies per gallon of gas. We can't drill our way out of this thing.

So if we don't start getting innovative and having a NASA-shoot-the-moon project for alternative energy, we are going to be in the same spot a decade from now, two decades from now. Our constituents did not elect us to come down here and play politics with this.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ALTMIRE, I thank the Speaker again for allowing the 30-Something Working Group to come down to the floor again and share with our colleagues the ''New Direction'' mentality that we continue to preach, talk about, and vote for here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 2230

DEVELOP ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for half the time before midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate greatly the privilege to address you tonight on floor of the United States Congress, and as I listen to my colleagues talk about the energy situation that we have here in America, it's quite interesting to me that my colleagues would say well, we can't drill in ANWR because in 10 years we are going to still have some other energy issue.

Are they looking for the silver bullet, I wonder? Do they insist that we can't do anything with regard to energy? We can sit here and deal with $4 gas? Unless we can fix $4 gas and make it $1 gas, we shouldn't do anything? I wonder what is the problem with the realistic approach to this that seems to be a barrier for my colleagues from the other side of the aisle?

We know this, that there is a little over 10 billion barrels of oil in U.S. reserves, and we know that the United States Department of Energy produced a number about three days ago that showed there is about 10.4 billion barrels of oil in ANWR. If we open up ANWR, we will essentially and virtually double the oil reserve supplies for the United States of America if we tap into ANWR.

Now, what kind of thinking person would say I would rather pay $4 for gas, or $5 for gas, or $6 or more dollars for gas before I would tap into 10.4 billion barrels of oil in a neighborhood up there that I would remind you, and I would remind the body, that in 1970, we were scheduled to go up to Alaska and drill for oil in the North Slope. I remember that very clearly, 1970.

The idea was, we will build a pipeline from the North Slope, Mile Post Zero up there at Dead Horse access on the Arctic Ocean, and that pipeline will run from there all the way down there through the Port of Valdez in Alaska where they will then tanker that oil down to refineries along the coast of California and other points. That was 1970.

The same philosophical environmentalists that are blocking drilling in ANWR today, the ones that took the floor just a few moments ago that said—where we shared—we dare not drill in ANWR because it's not going to solve all our problems are the ones that brought the lawsuit that brought the drilling that blocked the North Slope of Alaska in 1970.

In those days, there was a long and intense court battle that finally got the environmental extremists out of the way. In 1972, they said, all right, there isn't any logical or rational or legal reason why you can't drill the North Slope of Alaska.

So we went up and we started to punch holes in the North Slope of Alaska in 1972. In 1972 we started building a pipeline from the Arctic Ocean all the way down to the Port of Valdez. I don't actually know how far that is, but I know that there was a right-of-way for alongside the pipeline that went from Fairbanks 600 miles north. It's more miles than that from Dead Horse access on the Arctic Ocean on down to the Port of Valdez.

Even though the environmentalists in court blocked drilling in ANWR for that period of time for 2 years, even though we look back on that—well first, at the time, I thought how can the environmentalists be so effective as to shut down access to the American energy supply for two full years without a logical, rational or legal argument?

Well they did so, and now I look back on that, and I think how in the world did we resolve issue in two short years by going to court between 1970 and will 1972 to clear the environmental extremists out of the way and go in and drill in ANWR where all these extremists ideas were that if we punch our drill in the North Slope, if we punch holes in the North Slope, there will be oil flooding all over the permafrost, the tundra will be destroyed. They will be driving bulldozers through the tundra, and you can never put that environment back again.

It's a careful balance that Mother Nature has, and the caribou will all drown in crude oil. There won't be any wolves left, and it will just be a terrible economic or terrible environmental catastrophe. That was what they predicted in 1970.

In 1972 we started building the pipeline and building the right-of-way and drilling the wells on the North Slope of Alaska, identical in the environmental component that's there, to ANWR today. In 3 years we built the pipeline, we built the right-of-way road along the pipeline. We punched the wells in. We got the wells up and got them running. We hooked them in and began to transfer that crude oil down through that long pipeline down to Valdez and into other parts of the United States where it was refined. That got accomplished in 3 years.

And now, Mr. Speaker, the very people that sit over on this side of the aisle tonight that have blocked the drilling on the North Slope back 30-some years ago, and are blocking the drilling in ANWR today say, well, gee in 10 years, we still will have a problem with enough oil for the United States of America, and you will not solve this problem, the whole problem. You will not solve it in perpetuity so, therefore, you ought not do anything in Alaska to fix it.

What kind of a Nation would be foolish enough to set aside half of its crude oil reserves when gas is 4 bucks because of some myopic idea that you should not punch a hole down through the permafrost when you have proven 38 years ago—I should actually say 36 years ago—that we could drill wells through the permafrost, we could drill them on the North Slope of Alaska.

We could transfer that oil out of there into the terminal, start it in at Mile Post Zero in the Alaska pipeline, that 51-inch diameter line that runs from there on down to Valdez and pump all that crude oil, and we have done since 1972, 36 years.

If there was an environmental problem, I guarantee you that people on this side of the aisle lament anything that will lower the price of energy, would have told us that somebody spilled a gallon of crude oil someplace up there near the Arctic Circle. But have we heard them say anything about a single gallon? No, we have not.

I know it does happen. Occasionally, there will be a leak in the pipeline, a little rust hole, leak or something. They will go in and swab up the oil off the ice, weld the hole shut, patch the pipeline in and everything goes on.

But if there was a serious environmental problem, these would be the first people that would let us know. I am telling you, they don't have an argument. If you have one, stand up. I will recognize you. But, of course you won't, because you don't have an argument.

But you say to the American people, it's people like LOUIE GOHMERT that wants to see $4 gas—no—LOUIE wants to punch a hole down there and suck this oil up out of the ground and lower the price of energy.

I would be real proud to recognize Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT for as much time as he would consume.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Iowa for yielding.

Of course, Iowa is going through some tough times right now and our hearts and prayers go out to the folks there.

Energy is a huge problem around the country. My friend from Iowa was talking about the production of oil in Alaska, and it's amazing, but so many people were saying back in the days when there was talk of building a pipeline up to Prudhoe Bay, that if that pipeline is built, it will destroy completely the last 2,700 head of caribou that exist in the area, that they just would not be able to exist in that area any longer.

Well, the pipeline got built, and, as it turns out, those 2,700 head of caribou found that when the oil, warm, comes out of the ground and goes through the pipeline, the pipeline is warm.

We have subsequently found that now, when the caribou want to go on a date with each other, they will invite each other to come to the pipeline. Apparently the pipeline actually makes them a little bit amorous. Now, all these years later, we are up to 30,000 head of caribou.

Now, I grew up in Texas, and we used to hear, a few decades ago, that, my goodness, if they start building these deep-water rigs off the coast of Texas, it will destroy fishing in the Gulf of Mexico from now on. That's what we heard.

Now, if you want to go fishing, deep-water fishing in the gulf, your best bet is to go out to one of those drilling rigs, the platforms, because they have acted as an artificial reef. We have got all this additional fish and aqua particular life around those platforms. It's just further evidence that man and animal, fish, the environment, can work together to each other's good.

Now, I know the rules are you are not allowed to recognize people in the gallery, and I won't do that, but I can tell you that the students in Henderson Middle School know that people and oil and gas drilling rigs can actually survive together.

People in Nacogdoches, people like the Reynolds family, they know. You can survive in areas where there are drilling rigs. Not only that, you can proliferate and do well. So in my district there in east Texas, as someone said here yesterday from east Texas, we kept the military afloat in gasoline in World War II from east Texas, the east Texas oil and gas field.

Many don't realize the Germans potentially could have driven us to the sea if they had not run out of gasoline during the Battle of the Bulge, but they did run out. That is something that we have got to constantly keep a weather eye on, and I am proud to represent a district that understands the seriousness of having the energy we need and that $4 a gallon gasoline headed to $5 a gallon gasoline is a travesty for people.

I have got hardworking union people in east Texas. I have got hardworking folks in all kinds of jobs who are struggling to get by. This Congress, for the last 18 months, has done nothing to help produce more of our own energy.

I am so grateful to have a friend like my friend, Mr. KING, from Iowa, who understands that. I am proud to represent people like the students from Henderson Middle School who understand these concepts and understand we can work together for the greater good of mankind of the United States of America, of aquatic life, plant life, and all be better for it.

I appreciate my friend from Iowa yielding, and I appreciate the effort you are making to educate America on exactly what we can do to help ourselves if the majority party in this Congress will allow us to help ourselves.

With that, I yield back to my friend, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I appreciate his perspective.

I will point out that there are three branches of government, there is the executive, the legislative and the judicial branch of government.

I really only know of one person in the history of this country that has felt a compulsion to legislate, found himself on the bench as a judge, and decided that the constitutionally appropriate thing to do was to walk away from that judgeship and run for the United States Congress and come here to legislate. That's Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT from east Texas.

I am proud to call him a friend and serve on the Judiciary Committee with him. I appreciate something that he brings to the table, a unique personality that's never been matched in the United States Congress and also the judgment of a judge that makes him a good listener and an analyst of the law and one who thinks deeply into the long-term ramifications of the decisions that we make. I look often to the prudence of the gentleman from Texas, and I appreciate him coming to the floor and offering his remarks for the energy situation here in the United States.

I said some year or 2 or 3 years ago that what is the solution for $2 gas? That's $3 gas. What's the solution for $3 gas? That's $4 gas.

Well, we are truly here at $4 gas, and that sounded like an outrageous kind of a number to put out back at that time. The reason I said that was as gas gets higher, we are willing to do more things to provide energy for the people in this country.

But when I sit here, and I think of the votes we have put up here on this floor, and I think of the decisions that have been made—and about 3 years ago, there was a bill on floor of the House of Representatives that said let's drill ANWR. I can remember there was a letter that was produced by Republicans that had 10 or 12 signatures on it that said we will join with all the Democrats, and we are going to block all drilling in ANWR.

We are not going to let that happen because of some idea about when the North Slope was opened up for drilling, there was some kind of an implicit promise that we wouldn't tap into the rest of the oil up there in that part of the world. That doesn't make any sense to me, I cannot rationalize that.

But I remember that letter that had 10 or 12 signatures on it, and the 10 or 12 Republicans that said ''no'' was enough to join with all the Democrats that said ''no.'' Had we done that, we would have more than a million barrels of oil a day coming down here into the United States to be poured into this marketplace, which would make a significant difference in the cost of energy in the United States of America.

□ 2245

But the 10 or 12 Republicans that were on the wrong side joined with all of the Democrats on the wrong side, and we didn't drill ANWR. And the rationale was pretty weak. I have had people say you want to tap into 2,000 acres in ANWR, what does that mean.

Well, there are 19.6 million acres in ANWR. And 2,000 acres out of that

would be the equivalent of a little postage stamp stuck in the corner of a football field. That is 2,000 acres in 19.6 million acres of ANWR.

And so if that is the part that is going to be a footprint to develop half of the oil reserves in the United States of America, and they are asking me this question, how much is an acre, Mr. KING? So I say well, it is 208 feet by 208 feet, that is 43,580 square feet. That is, let me see, oh, about a football field. So it is about 2,000 football fields on 19.6 million acres. That is the equivalent of a postage stamp in the corner of a football field. That is all it is.

On top of that, we get access to these oil fields by ice roads on top of the frozen tundra, and then sinking wells on a work-over pad by which we do directional drilling. We pull a lot of that oil out into one single collection, and collect it in the collection tubes that go into the terminal at milepost zero, Dead Horse Access. That is what it is all about.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, if you flew over that at 5,000 feet, a football field, you are looking for a postage stamp that is the same color as the grass, could you see that from 5,000 feet? Could you see that postage stamp from a thousand feet or 500 feet? Could you see it if you walked around on the football field looking for that postage stamp? I will submit not.

I will submit further that I can take the most extreme environmentalist on this side of the aisle, and I could put him in a Black Hawk helicopter and fly him around the North Slope today where we have developed oil fields, and I could ask them, tell me when we are over the oil field. Tell me what you see that violates your sense of intrusion upon this pristine environment that nobody goes to see. I challenge that not one of you environmentalists could point down out of the window of that Black Hawk and say, There is an oil well, there is a oil rig, there is a oil field. Oh, it violates my sense of what Mother Nature is all about. Not one, Mr. Speaker, because when you look over the oil fields of the North Slope, there is not a single derrick down there. Not one structure sticking up in the air 230 or 240 feet that is set to drill for oil.

There is not, as I could find, not a single pump jack pumping that oil out of the ground looking like an oil field, which doesn't offend my sensibilities, by the way, but maybe offends some of you over there. And let me know why that is the case, and I will yield to you. But no, you don't see any of that. And the reason why is because the wells are underground. The wells are drilled. They don't have pump jacks sitting above the ground, they have submersible pumps way down in the casing at the level of the oil.

The collector tubes don't even show where they are, and I don't know if they lay on the ground or if they are slightly subterranean, but they collect the oil that goes into the tanks at the terminal at Dead Horse Access, milepost zero, on the Alaska pipeline. And there it gathers it together and it sends it down that 51-inch pipeline down to the Port Valdez.

Now I cannot understand why a people that is dependent upon energy, a people whose economy is run by energy, a people who sit on billions of barrels of oil, would somehow draw some kind of a moral position that even though no one goes up to the North Slope, and if they went up there they wouldn't know what they are looking at, and if they saw it they wouldn't be offended by it, and it would be environmentally friendly, all of those things, but somehow we have some kind of a Mother Nature religious aversion into tapping into American energy. Why is that, Mr. Speaker?

When the 110th Congress convened, I did not know, I really thought there was a sense of conscious and goodwill and a way that we could move forward with the American economy and the American people. I could not at that time have believed that the core of the Democrat Caucus in this Congress sincerely believed that energy costs should go up no matter what it takes, shut down the drilling in ANWR, shut down the drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, don't let any drilling happen in the non-national park public lands in America, don't do any of that because by blocking all of that, we are blocking the delivery of energy to the economy of this dynamic, robust free country that we have. Why? What rationale, can there be.

Well, first of all they hate capitalism. They don't want to see prosperity, and they want to see energy cost more. I am convinced that this regal Pelosi Congress wants to see energy cost more.

What is it that the regal Pelosi Congress likes better than $2 gas, $3 gas. What do they like better than $3 gas, $4 gas. You've got it. You should be happier now, and I know you will happier yet when it is $5 gas. This is the drill-nothing Congress. This is the develop no energy Congress. This is a drive the energy prices up Congress. This is the Congress that is punishing the American economy. They know that an economy requires energy, and the more expensive it is the less economic activity that we will have and the more it will slow down. When it slows down, we will burn less energy. When we burn less energy, there will be less greenhouse gases that go into the atmosphere.

And then, and this requires an article of faith, the leap is if we assume less energy, there will be less greenhouse gases and then there will be less global warming.

Now there are two reasons why that is a bad idea. First of all, 95 percent of the greenhouse gases are created by nature. The other part is the 5 percent of the greenhouse gases that are created by man cannot be 100 percent controlled by man. Reasons for that are the Chinese and the Indian economies are growing. They are going to burn more coal and release more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and they are going to create more greenhouse gases, and they don't care. They don't care because their people are hungry and they need economic development. They are not dying because the planet is 1 degree too hot, they are dying because the planet is short of calories and protein for them that keeps them alive, and it is short of health care. So they know what their priorities are.

Here we are running this myopic agenda that we are going to make energy more expensive and we are going to see $5 gasoline and $6 gas, and people will park their cars and grandmothers in Iowa are going to ride their bicycles 10 miles to town through a blizzard. I mean, they are not going to do that. We know they are not. But the people in San Francisco and New York and Boston don't know that. But I'm here to tell you all, that's the case. They are not going to park their cars and ride their bicycles to town in January in Iowa. It is not going to save the planet. It will keep grandmother home. She will not be living this life to the fullest that she could. Millions of Americans will not be living this life to the fullest that they could.

And when you bring your myopic, Goddess of Gaia faith-based approach, and I mean this from a nature environmentalist extremist perspective to this economy, you drive up the cost of energy and you slow down the activity of our economy and impoverish the people of America and you think you are going to save the planet and it is all worth it.

Here is what it is. It is not worth it in the first place. And the second place is you are not going to save the planet. And you are not going to do that because the science doesn't support you in that. And if it did support you in the idea that if we shut down America's emissions of greenhouse gases, we don't affect the Indian and the Chinese and the other growing economies' emissions of greenhouse gases, and so we are here in the United States shouting out into a thunderstorm trying to solve a problem.

It won't work, it can't work, it is not rational. There is no scientific base that upholds it. And on top of that, there is not the sociology that says human nature will support the kind of approach that you bring to this. Drive up the cost of energy and slow the emissions of greenhouse gases, and if you do that, the planet will what, is it going to cool? No, it isn't going to cool. It might not increase in its temperature quite so much, but we can't prove it and we don't have a model that says so. In fact, our models say we can only affect 5 percent of the greenhouse gases if all humanity joins together, and we are a small percentage of the emissions of the entire planet. And even if we controlled them all, the Indians and Chinese are going to increase their emissions of CO_2 and greenhouse gases.

So why go through this exercise to unilaterally disarm the economy of the United States so we can't compete around the globe economically with free trade, militarily, culturally, and politically. What is it about America that you don't like over on this side of the aisle? Why is it the blame-America-first crowd is carrying the agenda in this United States Congress?

Why is it that the constituents of Iowa and Nebraska and Kansas and all of the way out to the left coast and all of the way to the right coast, why are they paying $4 for gas with this driven-up price of energy, and why have you blocked the drilling in our non-national park public lands, and why have you blocked the drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf where we know there are 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas out there, coupled with the oil that naturally goes with it that we can't tap into to drive down the cost of fertilizer, to drive down the cost of energy, to lower the cost of BTUs, to add to the overall supply of energy in the United States of America? Why can't we do that?

It is because you have a religious belief and it is kind of like the laws of your nature and the laws of your God say that we should cut down on greenhouse gases because of this belief that, and say religious belief, and I have strong religious beliefs. But sometimes that religious belief is defined as something that you say you believe in that you have no scientific basis for.

If you believe in this global warming God, and you cannot stand up and defend a scientific basis for a belief in a global warming God, then it is a religious belief. It is a religious belief that is unfounded. It is one that is unfounded on science and one that can't be proven.

We have watched this planet. Yes, it is a little warmer than it was 20 years ago. But if you look at the data, it might be cooler than it was 2 years ago. We had a long winter, we had a late spring. Most of my constituents thought global warming would be a good thing.

And by the way, the beginnings of this global warming debate began here in Washington in August years ago when not many of the office buildings and the ones they had the hearings in were not air conditioned and we had a Ph.D. come out here from Iowa who testified that global warming was an impending disaster, and the Members of Congress were sitting in a hearing room with temperatures approaching 100 degrees and humidity approaching 100 degrees, and as the sweat dripped off them, it was not hard to convince them global warming was a problem. We have one of those scientists who advocated it was an impending ice age in 1970.

He cited his scientific ability to predict to us that we should figure out a way to gird our loins and get ready for the next ice age. That was 1970. So some of us girded our loins, and some of us just went to work, and we went on and realized that God runs this planet, not man. In his time he will let us know and we will do what we need to adapt. And in 1970 the impending ice age didn't come. The idea that it was going to be here went.

And so here we are in 2008. And guess what, Mr. Speaker, that scientist that was a part of the Time magazine prediction that we had an impending ice age is today a scientist that says you can't avoid it, we have an impending global warming period of time, and it is going to happen and here is what you need to do, shut down your economy and greenhouse gas emissions, don't produce energy, and somehow or another we will help avoid, dodge this bullet which is the idea that the Earth could be a couple of degrees warmer. Some of the ice could melt and the sea level could go up a couple of a tenths of a foot or so.

Mr. Speaker, when I asked the USGS people what is sea level, well, they have an elevation that they pegged by satellite, but they couldn't really peg sea level because it goes up and down. It is awful hard to catch. The tides go in and out. Wind stacks water. And if you go to New Orleans, and I asked them what is going up and what is going down here, and what is settling and what is swelling up, they don't know. They don't know what the elevations are in New Orleans, Mr. Speaker, and yet we have scientists telling us that sea level is going to rise by a certain amount and that is going to start to swamp the coast land areas, but we don't know what sea level is.

So we do have an energy situation in America, and the energy situation is this: $4 gas; $4 gas. And the people in my district are buying gas. And they are paying the price, and they are paying 18.4 cents a gallon Federal, and they are paying more than that for State gas tax. They look and they expect that all of that money is going to go to road construction and road maintenance to make sure that they have a good transportation route. That's why they pay that gas tax.

So you are at 42-point-something cents a gallon in my State, but I can tell you for sure 18.4 cents of that is Federal gas tax dollars, my constituents believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are converting all of those dollars in that gas tax into road construction and road maintenance, making sure that they have a good transportation route.

□ 2300

Users fees, drive on the road, pay the tax. All right. We're good with that. We're user people, and we like user fees, and we know it takes money to run the government. There's nothing more appropriate than a user fee, a per gallon gas tax.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that most of the money that my constituents, and, in fact, all constituents in America, the Americans that buy the gas and pay the gas tax, most of the money that they spend does not go towards road construction or road maintenance. No, Mr. Speaker, it gets diverted off on these other things, like, for example, 3 percent of that 18.4 cents goes to trails, to build bike trails. So apparently we don't have bicycles riding down the highway.

Now I kind of like it that the bikes are out there riding doing their thing. But I'm not so sure that's that a good idea to tax the people that drive cars so the folks that ride bikes have a place to ride them.

Second thing is, it takes 28 percent of that 18.4 cents of gas tax, 28 percent to meet the environmental and the archaeological requirements in order to build new roads and maintain the ones we have: 28 percent.

And, Mr. Speaker, it takes another 17 percent to subsidize the mass transit in the United States. And so, right there, Mr. Speaker, is the answer to the question that I've asked many times, and that is, how is it that the constituents of Speaker PELOSI, of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, CHARLIE RANGEL, of the chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. BARNEY FRANK, how is it that their constituents let them off the hook? Aren't they angry that they're driving up the cost of gas? Don't they get mad when they have to pay $4 for gas?

How is it that somebody in San Francisco or New York or Boston or Washington, DC, for that matter, can have the patience to spend $4 for gas and not hold their Congressman or their Congresswoman accountable if they're the ones that are pushing up the price?

Well, now, here's a piece of the answer, Mr. Speaker, and that's this. Of the 18.4 cents of Federal gas tax dollars, 17 percent of that goes into mass transit funding. Seventeen percent. That means that if you pull into the gas station in Iowa, and you squeeze the nozzle and you pump a gallon of gas into your car, and that's all you can afford, you only have 4 bucks. You're going to pay 18.4 cents in tax for Federal, 20 some percent State. Of the 18.4 cents in gas tax that you pay, 17 percent of that money goes to fund the mass transit.

So, if you're riding the cable car in San Francisco, you get a cheap ticket because it's funded by the folks in my district and across America that are buying gas.

And if you jump on the El in Chicago you get a cheap ticket because it's funded by the folks in my district and across America that are buying gas.

If you jump on the subway in CHARLIE RANGEL's district in New York and you ride it, you get a cheap ticket because that's subsidized by the people all across America that are buying gas.

And if you go into BARNEY FRANK's district and you jump on, I don't know what they call it, the subway, the Big Dig, the major multibillion-dollar boondoggle and you buy a ticket to ride along on that thing, you get a cheap ticket because it's subsidized by

the folks all across America that are paying 4 bucks for gas.

And, Mr. Speaker, if you go out here outside this Capitol building and you walk a little block over and a block down and you get into the Metro on South Capitol, and you ride over to Falls Church, Virginia, that's going to cost you about a buck and a quarter, and that buck and a quarter is a cheap ticket that's subsidized by all the folks across America that are paying 4 bucks for gas.

The constituents of those Members of Congress that are driving up the cost of energy, the regal Speaker PELOSI, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. FRANK, all of them, their constituents are riding to work, going into town, riding around on mass transit that is 17 percent of the Federal gas tax dollar, that's subsidized by the people that are buying gas.

Why aren't they angry? They don't care, Mr. Speaker. They don't care because they got a buck and a quarter from South Capitol to Falls Church. They've got a cheap ticket, a cheap ticket that's subsidized by the people that are paying for expensive gas. And that's why they're not feeling the pressure.

But I can tell you, even though my constituents are utterly polite and respectful about all this, I can feel the pressure because I'm one of them. It cost me $41.42 to fill up my tank the other day at $3.85 a gallon.

So here, Mr. Speaker, is the solution. This, Mr. Speaker, is the energy pie chart. Now, this might seem like it's very simple, and actually it is, although, to approach this concept seems to be a little complicated.

Energy production in the United States of America, for 2007, well, I'll take the position, Mr. Speaker, that it's about all the energy. It's all interrelated, whether it's nuclear or hydroelectric, geothermal, biomass, motor gasoline, diesel, other petroleum, natural gas, coal, whatever it might be, if all of the energy in the United States is interrelated, and if you raise the cost of one form of energy, it's going to affect the cost of the other kinds of energy. And consequently, and correspondingly, if you drive the price down of one kind of energy, you'll lower the price of all kinds of energy because it's all interrelated.

So I've taken the trouble to build this chart. And I can't tell you how difficult it actually was. It should have been a simple no-brainer. It's not. But here's the energy pie chart. We produced 72.1 quadrillion Btus of energy in the United States last year. That's 72 followed by, I think, 15 zeros. Three, six, 9, 12, 15. 72 quadrillion Btus. It's more important, I think, to think of it in terms of the proportionality of it.

This is all the energy that we produced in America. Now, the percentages are on here. 27 percent was natural gas, 32½ percent was coal, nuclear was almost 12 percent, hydroelectric 3.4, other versions, geothermal, wind, solar, fuel ethanol is a little smaller, a lot smaller than you would think. It's three-quarters of a percent of the overall production in America. Biodiesel, one one-hundredth of a percent. Biomass, 4 percent. That could be the people burning wood and the methane, et cetera, that comes out of there. Gas was only 8.29 percent of our overall production.

The list goes on. You can see it here, Mr. Speaker. Now, that's energy production.

What I've done is, Mr. Speaker, taken this pie chart of the energy pie, I'll call it, and I cut this out so that I could put it on top of the energy production, or the energy consumption in America, so you can see how this works in just a moment.

All right. This, Mr. Speaker, is the energy consumption chart in America. And the outside circle, and I'll kind of line them up here a little bit; the outside circle is the energy that we consumed. Actually, I think I might be able to do it this way.

This is all, Mr. Speaker, the energy that we consumed in America last year. Energy consumption, United States, 2007, 101.4 quadrillion Btus. Number down here, 101, comma and the equivalent of 15 zeros out.

Now, we're dealing with 72 quadrillion there, 101 there. So let's just think, Mr. Speaker, in terms of we produced 72 percent of the energy that we consumed in 2007. And this is a picture of the consumption, this round spot here is a picture of the production. This circle is smaller than this circle. That's kind of like Energy 101, probably the first time that that idea has arrived on the floor the Congress, Mr. Speaker.

And so you look at the percentages of the overall consumption, and you see natural gas is 23 percent, and we produce 27½ percent of all the natural gas that we consume, but it's 23 percent of the overall Btu picture here.

Coal, 22 percent, nuclear, 8.29 percent, hydroelectric, 2.4, smaller pieces of energy here, including ethanol, biodiesel, wind, .31 percent. Not very much. We're working on this.

By the way, I do represent the number 1 renewable energy producing congressional district in America, and so we're not without knowledge on this subject matter.

Gas, 17.44 percent of the overall Btu consumption in America. And here in the red we have the diesel fuel and heating oil at 8.84 percent, kerosene jet fuel here, 3.3 percent and other kinds of petroleum, asphalt and that kind of thing, almost 10 percent.

So, what do we need to do, Mr. Speaker?

Well, here's a way to approach this thing from my view. The small circle is energy production. The big circle is energy consumption. And so you don't have to be a Harvard M.B.A. or, let me say, a rocket surgeon, to be able to calculate this, Mr. Speaker. The inside circle, which is energy production, needs to grow to the size of the outside circle, which is energy consumption.

Yes, we could maybe add another piece to this energy production pie called energy conservation that will help us grow the size of this inner circle to get it to be the size of the outer circle. But however we do this, we're producing about a little more than 72 percent of the energy that we're consuming. And so we can stand here on the floor of Congress, until all Hades freezes over and talk about this piece of energy and that piece of energy, and somebody's wrong because they want to drill ANWR and somebody else is wrong because they don't want to drill the Outer Continental Shelf; somebody else is wrong because they think ethanol is a good idea, or biodiesel's a good idea, or they could even make the ridiculous argument that somebody's wrong because they think that we ought to dramatically expand our nuclear.

And, Mr. Speaker, we should dramatically expand our nuclear production of electricity. That is the single most effective thing we can do, cut down on the emissions of greenhouse gases, and replace the consumption of other energies and allow those other energies to be used for other purposes. We can produce a lot of energy with nuclear.

But in the end, it's this. I'll go right around the circle. Natural gas, drill the Outer Continental Shelf, drill the non national park public lands, open up the natural gas production in America, the place where we have enough natural gas to heat every home in America for the next 150 years. Get the slice of the pie in production as big as the slice of the pie in consumption on natural gas.

We go over here to coal. Why in the world can't we produce and burn more coal to add to the overall size of the energy pie? Yes, we can. And we should do that, and we should do that until it's no longer cost effective as competing against these other signs, other components of energy.

Nuclear. I talked about the nuclear. Here's the overall percentage of our energy production in nuclear, which happens to be 11.66 percent. But it needs to be a bigger piece of our energy consumption, and we can broaden that out.

You can see how these pieces of the pie come out to the edge of the circle and they get wider. We do that with ethanol, we do it with biodiesel, we do it with wind, we do it with biomass.

We can produce more gasoline, Mr. Speaker, and we can produce more diesel fuel and more jet fuel and we can produce more natural gas. There is no component in this energy pie that we cannot produce more of. And if we grow the size of the energy production pie to meet or exceed the size of the energy consumption pie, we have then solved the problem of energy dependence on Middle Eastern oil, on foreign energy.

Mr. Speaker, we can do this. We should do this. We must do this. And any idea that says that we should strike off of our list of options any component, and you will hear almost every source of energy vetoed and opposed by Members of the other side of the aisle. Some will stand up and say, no more nuclear. We will not do any more nuclear plants.

Some will say, can't drill in ANWR because 36, 38 years ago, somebody said, well, we're not going to ever drill ANWR. That's our deal.

And somebody else will say we can't drill the Outer Continental Shelf because people sit on the beach in Florida will figure out that there must be a drill rig out there 199 miles away.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, I talked to three children in Lineville today. They're down on the border with Missouri and Iowa.

□ 2315

And if they stand with their back to Missouri and they look north, it's 200 miles to the Minnesota border. And for them to say, I can't have a drill rig up there on the Minnesota line because it offends my idea of sightseeing with my back to Missouri 200 miles from there is as ridiculous as the people on the beach in Florida saying you can't have a drill rig 200 miles offshore.

No, Mr. Speaker. There is a reason, and more like an excuse. And my father taught me a little bit about that. He said there's a difference between reasons and excuses. There are all kinds of excuses for not developing energy. I can't find a single reason, Mr. Speaker.

Unless you like $4 gas, unless you like $5 gas, and unless you like expensive energy, expensive energy shuts down our economy. You shut down our economy, it uses less energy; if it uses less energy, it emits less greenhouse gas; if you emits less greenhouse gas, somehow or another in this fantasyland world where you're out there in Pa-la-la-losi land, you're going to save the planet if you shut down the economy is the only rationale that's there. It's weak and it's unfounded, Mr. Speaker; and we've got to open this energy for the American people.

And with that, I thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

A NEW ENERGY POLICY FOR THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) until midnight.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, tonight the freshmen, the Democrats of the Freshman Caucus are going to take the rest of this hour to talk about our economy. And it's an excellent way to move forward, Mr. Speaker, because the prior speaker had some interesting things for us to chew on, and we will help the American people to see that under Republican control, the economy has not fared well, that they're not good at running the economy, and the proof is out there for everybody.

We'll be able to show how, when Democrats are in charge, that we do have job growth, we do have strong economy, we do have an economy where we are reducing poverty. We have an economy where all Americans are doing better than they were doing before.

I think it is obvious to everyone if you reflect only a few years ago in the late 1990s—I think it was a different President in office than the one we have now—that the economy was much better than it is today and that it is these policies that we've seen over the last 8 years where it was a Republican House, a Republican President, that have really led us to the difficult situation that American consumers and workers are seeing today.

So we have a different vision. We have a vision that includes everybody. We have a vision that says that workers should have the right to organize. We have a vision that says we should have a fair trade policy. We have a vision that says that we need investment in our public infrastructure. We have a vision that says that we need universal health care coverage for all people. We have a vision for an economy, Mr. Speaker, that says that everybody counts and everybody matters.

And, you know, I really couldn't be happier tonight because I'm joined by my good friend from Colorado, ED PERLMUTTER, not only a very excellent legislator but a really nice guy.

ED, how you doing?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Good evening. It's good to be here with my friend from Minnesota, and we just were listening to the gentleman from Iowa, and he was talking about what's the Democrat's plan.

Well, what is the Democrat's plan for energy? Well, it's just obvious what the Republican's plan has been with two oil men in the White House. You can see exactly what has happened to the price of oil under the Bush administration. From $25 a barrel to $134.35.

So when he is making comments or generally people are saying what is going on here, we can see with two oil men in the White House what the energy plan has been for this country, and that's higher and higher and higher gas prices.

Now, what we've got to do is we've got to take ourselves off of oil to a greater extent than we are right now. We have to relieve ourselves of this addiction. And in the short run, we're going to feel some pain, but in the long run, the liberation from being addicted to one commodity the way we are, which is oil, which is really having a ripple effect throughout the economy, will be fantastic.

And so what we are doing as Democrats is to provide other ways to save energy. A gallon saved is a gallon earned. A kilowatt saved is a kilowatt earned. And so what we want to do first is make sure that we're efficient in how we use our energy so that there is a lower demand and we aren't so hooked on petroleum and petroleum by-products.

Second, we've got to find other commodities that compete with petroleum, whether it is cellulosic ethanol or better ways to make electricity through renewable energy sources. As Democrats, those are the kinds of things we're doing. It's time for us to get to the future and not continue to be hooked on oil like we have been for the last 30, 40, 50 years.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I certainly will yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, let me just ask you this question sir. You have studied this issue. I consider you one of the most learned persons on this issue in the Congress, and I just want to know, isn't this proposal of just drilling in the Continental Shelf, drilling in ANWR, isn't this kind of like trying to cure a disease by simply treating the symptoms of the disease? For example, if I were to have cancer, you could try to find a cure for my cancer, or you could simply try to alleviate the symptoms of the suffering that I am enduring but not really get to the root of the matter.

Is this kind of like—does that analogy work when it comes to just drilling for more oil and continuing to spoil our natural wilderness areas and to risk oil spills? Isn't that sort of an analogous situation?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Well, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. ELLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. It clearly is.

This is the time for us to get healthy, and we can get healthy in many, many different ways. And it is going to be across the spectrum, whether it is making our buildings more efficient, our homes more efficient when it comes to energy consumption, our cars more efficient, come up with different fuels, different ways to power this country, we can do those things; and it's just so obvious because it's good for national security, it's good for climate, and it is good for jobs.

But let us go back to this thing about they want to drill in ANWR, they want to drill offshore, they want to drill a million places.

Well, we know that right now, and I'll put up a chart, that right now oil companies are not drilling 30.6 million acres that they have offshore and 30.5 million acres that they have on shore.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, then, why are they crying about wanting to drill in ANWR and wanting to drill off the Continental Shelf when they have all of these places they can drill now? I mean, I know that there's got to be a million Americans watching this broadcast who want to know that question.