

who has psoriasis all over his body and arthritis that is caused by this. Three weeks ago, he fell and needs surgery on his shoulder to repair it. He has no job, no money and no insurance. We started looking for a program to help him. There are none that we can find. There is nothing to help him get his shoulder fixed, but after it heals wrong and he is disabled because of it, then there are programs to help him. They will not help get it fixed so he could find a good job. Instead, they would rather support him for the rest of his life instead of trying to help him now."

Gail from Janesville writes, "My husband recently lost his job. He applied for over 100 positions only to be told that he lacked a college degree or he is overqualified or they can only pay \$8 an hour. I was diagnosed with breast cancer in June of 1998 and again in 2003. I have gone through breast cancer twice and have undergone a mastectomy and reconstructive surgery. COBRA has run out, and without a stable income, we cannot afford to pay the premiums of our own health care policy. My husband is 59 years old, and I am 58, and we have no medical coverage. I have looked at every insurance company and get turned down because of my medical history. All our lives we have paid into these insurance companies only to be turned away when we need coverage the most."

Lastly, Madam Speaker, I want to relay a story that was shared with me by Laurie, a fourth grade teacher in Madison, Wisconsin. Laurie recently had a student fall during recess and break his foot. Laurie writes me.

"As he was waiting in extreme pain and cold for the school nurse to get to him, he cried to an assistant, waiting with him, 'I can't go to the doctor. We don't have insurance.'" That a 9- or 10-year-old child should even think something like this is an atrocity.

Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing that obtaining comprehensive, affordable health care presents a very real challenge for millions and millions of Americans. We can not turn a deaf ear on our constituents' pleas for help. I invite my colleagues to join me in working on this most pressing domestic priority—to provide quality, affordable health care for all Americans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I yield back my remaining time.

AMERICAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the recognition and the opportunity to say a few words on the topic that has been talked about here on the floor repeatedly as well as by our constituents on almost a daily basis.

For those of you who may not have heard it originally earlier this morning, I want to harken back once again to that old movie, "The Natural." As you will remember, the fictional team—the New York Knights—in an effort to try and stop their losing streak, brought in a psychologist to speak to them, to the team.

As he was sitting there, talking to them, he simply said, "The mind is a strange thing, men."

We must begin by asking what is "losing." "Losing" is a disease as contagious as syphilis. "Losing" is a disease as contagious as the Bubonic plague, attacking one but infecting all. Now, imagine, if you will, you're on a ship at sea on a vast ocean, gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking.

At that stage, Roy Hobbs, not being able to take it anymore, realizing the possibility that actually winning a game has nothing to do with talking to a psychologist or to a psychiatrist at the team meeting but that it has everything to do with performance on the field, just bolted out of the room and ran up there because he couldn't take it anymore.

What Roy Hobbs realized is, if you are going to be successful, it has got to take action. You have to do something. There are too many people on this floor who have been talking and talking about energy. There are too many people who have tried to find scapegoats to blame for the energy situation we are in. They blame Big Oil. They tell you we're in an energy bubble of some kind. Yesterday, someone even suggested that Enron was the reason. The only thing we have done under the auspices of the majority party so far here is allow attorneys to go and sue OPEC countries so they'll give us more oil. Now, that is like talking to them and simply saying, "Lack of energy is a disease."

Imagine you're on a ship, on a vast ocean of oil, gently rocking, gently rocking, but are not doing anything to get the job done. Indeed, if we continue on that pattern, we can be living in reality the words of the book, which are simply "how we get along by freezing in the dark."

See, what Roy Hobbs understood in the movie was that, if you want to win, you don't get there by talking about it. You have to get out and do something. He went out on the field; he was given a chance to play, and he pounded the crap out of the ball. In so doing, he was able to be successful, and the New York Knights started to win, to win more than they ever had again.

One of the things this party is talking about is, if given the chance to play one more time on the field, we will go out there, and we will do things. We will promote action. We will not be satisfied with simply the psychology of saying, "We will freeze in the dark and accept it and be happy about it." We will produce energy to eliminate the need for the consumption. Because you

see? It is, indeed, an attitude. Our attitude should be that we are not accepting the status quo and that we are not going to be satisfied until we have a new goal in this country, which is to be energy-secure and energy-independent. That has to be our goal and that we are going to do things now to do it.

I hate to say this, but I am one of those who strongly supports American energy production. There was a time, if you actually admitted that in public, it was kind of like you're in favor of drowning kittens, but with gasoline's now costing \$4 a gallon and being likely to rise, people's attitudes have now been changing. Some people used to say, if you were for American energy production, you were merely a shill for Big Oil. Unfortunately, there are still people who are saying that, but that's not the reality.

Who I am fighting for are the people who are being impacted by our energy crisis. I am fighting for the thousands of natural gas users in my home State of Utah who are going to be asked to pay next winter to heat their homes at an increased cost of around 36 percent. It will be the largest increase in their ability to heat their homes in the history of this country.

I am fighting for 1,100 citizens who lost their jobs last week and for the countless others who are going to pay increased ticket prices with the airlines because United Airlines announced it was cutting 1,100 jobs and was removing 100 airplanes from its fleet because it could not contain the spiraling oil fuel prices.

I am fighting for an Ethiopian-born, Washington, D.C. cab driver who for the first time since his kids started school was unable to greet them when they came home from school because, every day, he now has to work 2 hours longer just to make the same daily income he was making before this energy, gas price spiked.

I am fighting for people like Christine of Utah, who is actually selling her plasma now to make ends meet with this high-energy demand.

I am fighting for dozens of citizens in my State who are reportedly selling their jewelry, electronics—even one gold tooth—in order to cover the high cost of gasoline.

I am fighting for a young father in Virginia who was not able to attend his father-and-son outing last month because the cost of the gasoline to go there was too excessive.

I am fighting for the students in Nevada's Clark County School District who are facing a 62 percent budget overrun solely because of the amount of gas it takes to run the school buses in that county's district.

I am fighting for citizens in my home State who choose to risk imprisonment in order to fill up their tanks. One Utah minivan and truck driver, a minivan and truck that belong to the Alpine Medical Equipment Company, had his gas tank drilled, and the sole motive was to steal the gas in his tank.

Because of that, there were 30 needy people who did not receive their scheduled deliveries of oxygen tanks, wheelchairs and beds at their homes on that particular day.

Now, to my Democratic colleagues, I want you to notice there was no mention in that litany of people of Exxon or of Shell or of Conoco or of BP or of Chevron or of all of the other Big Oil scapegoats that we often hear about. But let me make no mistake. I do support these entities because I am for a fair and level-headed recognition that our main focus, that our main mission in this country, must be to deliver and to develop cheap, affordable energy for American citizens. They are not public enemy number one nor should we try and push off on scapegoats the inability to do that. We have the ability. We have the resources. That's why we're fighting today, and I will not cower in support of average Americans who need this kind of support.

Now, in so doing, the Western Caucus, of which I am a member, will be introducing a bill that is trying to do what needs to be done, which is to make sure that we have a comprehensive approach to energy development. Conservation is a key element in meeting our energy needs, but that alone will not solve the problem. Production of all means of energy because there is no one, single, silver bullet is a key element. That alone will not meet the needs. Innovation is also needed, innovation in some kind of effort that, when we have the new sources of energy that we can develop, we need to be able to deliver those sources of energy.

So the three elements that have to be in any particular bill and will be in a comprehensive American energy act are the concepts of pushing conservation, of pushing production and of pushing innovation, not necessarily in any particular order. All three of them have to be there if we are ever going to meet the needs of the American people. It has to be there.

There are some who would like to try and single out some particular area. There is a city in France that is kind of going back to the future. In fact, what the city in France did is they got rid of their entire municipal fleet, and instead of their municipal fleet of automobiles, they bought horse-drawn carriages. They are called eco-friendly, horse-drawn carriages. Each one of those fleets costs \$17,000. They feature disk brakes, signal lamps, removable seats. That's how they're trying to solve their energy problem.

Now, the only thing I will caution once again, when we try to go backwards into history to try to solve our problems rather than using modern technology, is that, in 1900 in New York City, just before the automobile was introduced and everything was once again with those eco-friendly, horse-drawn carriages, New York City produced 90,000 tons of horse manure every year, not to mention the millions of gallons of horse urine every year.

I'm sorry. That had to be disposed of, most of it in the water.

What they found in New York City is that it was impossible to get rid of all of the horse droppings, and therefore, there was on the streets a fine mist, a mist that was always in the air, and there was an endemic tuberculosis problem to the point where environmentalists in New York City, when automobiles were finally introduced, were happy because, for the first time, they could limit the amount of horse-drawn carriages and could actually improve the health of citizens in New York.

□ 1745

Sometimes, trying to go back in history or try to find a cheap, easy way is not the solution. The solution is technology. Technology can present solutions to all of our problems. Sometimes it's a long time in coming, sometimes it comes as rapidly as new cell phone plans.

Consider in 1900 what Jules Vern must have thought as he predicted in the future in his writings. Did he ever realize we would go from radios to iPods, from antibiotics to organ transplants? Do you think he actually envisioned the concept of bottled water? All those things are results of technology.

New technology will allow us to better use our existing energy resources, and that technology, which has to be part of this equation, the innovation part, has to be both in the public and the private sector. We need a major overhaul of the way Washington manages our input. We cannot solve all our problems by bringing in a bunch of experts to sit in a room in Washington. We must reach out with an aggressive national research effort.

One of the reasons we want to produce more energy in the United States is because the royalties we use can, and in this bill, will be funneled back into research so that technology can find even better ways of doing things. We also have to realize that as we are looking for that, it has to be market-driven. We cannot have an over-reliance on old technologies and uneconomical resources simply because they happen to be politically successful here in Washington.

The best way to destroy this effort of using technology is to allow government to pick winners and losers. It has to be done through the concept of the private sector. Federal mandates and massive government programs will not solve the problem. Certainly we will have government-funded labs. But they cannot be the only solution. I do not believe it is the only, nor is it the most practical way of solving our problem. If we want to think of how we can spur on innovation, what we have to do is tap the greatest resource this country has, which is the American people.

Just think of what American people have been able to do in history. In 1784, we invented bifocals, something I still

don't use; 1794, the cotton gin, and it changed the world; 1805, Americans invented refrigerators, and the next year, coffeepots; 1837, it was power tools; 1849, the safety pin; 1867, the typewriter, which revolutionized the way information is handled; 1867, it was barbed wire, which enabled us to secure the West. Even more important, and also in 1867, we invented for the first time toilet paper.

In 1888, it was revolving doors. Three years later, it was escalators, which evolved into the Ferris wheel the next year. In 1903, crayons; 1905, windshield wipers; 1930, Scotch tape; 1945, microwaves; 1955, nuclear submarines; 1957, polio vaccine; 1970, optical fiber; 1972, the artificial heart. It continues on and on.

Clearly, a country creative enough to come up with bifocals, the first oil well, the first blue jeans, the first telephone, the first crayon, not to mention airplanes, lasers, computers, everything else, is capable of developing the next source of energy and the technology to develop and deliver that energy.

If we look at history, it's likely that we would have even begun it before we imagined it today. How are we able to do that? By doing what our bill proposes to do and presenting prizes for technological breakthroughs in innovation.

I remind you that the British government offered a prize in 1714 for a device capable of measuring longitude, and John Harrison, a clock maker, got 20,000 pounds for devising the first accurate and durable chronometer that transformed the way we traveled across the oceans. In 1810, the first vacuum-sealed food was produced, after 15 years of experimentation, because Napoleon offered 12,000 Francs as a prize. We still use that technology today.

Will the Speaker be kind enough to tell us how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 45 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In 1909, the first flight across the English Channel was spurred on by a prize from a newspaper. Charles Lindbergh made his flight, nonstop flight from New York to Paris because there was a prize offered. And a \$30 billion aviation industry sprang out of that. The British Spitfire, which saved England in the Battle of Britain, was developed as a result of the Snyder Trophy, a prize for technological development.

The United States Government also offers prizes today with its NASA Centennial Challenge Program, and it reaches out to nontraditional sources of innovation in academia, in industry, as well as the public.

Americans have always looked to ourselves for solutions. If we just have the confidence in American ingenuity, American creativity to deal and to overcome our problems and to insist that we do it now, we do not wait, I am confident that we can do that.

As I said, in all sincerity, if we are to solve the problem at the gas pump

today, there are three elements that have to be there. We have to be able to produce more, to conserve more, and especially to innovate.

I am happy to be joined by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and ask him if he would join us and talk about one of these areas which is extremely important to him, and he knows so much about it, that is the production end that has to go along with the increased technology for the innovation, as well as conservation. But without production, we cannot make it fit.

I am sure if we can have one of our good pages bring the easel and the first of the charts here, it can illustrate exactly what we are talking about as we move forward in this particular piece of legislation in an effort to try and make sure that we have a complete and rational policy towards energy production and solving the problems of people; letting them have their lives back with cheap and affordable American energy.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Utah, my good friend, for his wise words on innovation. I think we are going to be forced into innovation. That is good. But I will have to say the current prices of driving a vehicle and heating a home this year in my rural district are going to be prohibitive for some people being able to handle it.

Their budgets are not prepared for the prices. Because as we have felt the oil prices, natural gas only increased marginally last year, but today the price for natural gas out of the ground is \$12 and 40-some cents. Last year at this time, it was between \$6 and \$7. We are approaching a doubling of natural gas prices.

At this time of the year, we don't use a lot of natural gas because we are not cooling much and we are not heating hardly anything. So we have surplus. We are using it for industrial purposes, which is big, and to generate electricity and to run our plants, but we are not using it at the home as much. So this is the time of year we normally put it in the ground.

Last year, we were putting \$6 and \$7 gas in the ground. This year, it's currently, in the last few months, \$11, now \$12 gas, and seems to be going up a few pennies every day. So we don't know where that is headed. But the fear is we have a storm in the Gulf, which always interrupts supply, we could have \$15, \$16 gas, and that would make home heating almost impossible next winter.

Just to share with you, as he was talking about innovation and change, I come from Titusville, Pennsylvania. I live in the little town of Pleasantville, Pennsylvania, 5 miles from there. But I was born 1 mile from Drakes Well, the first oil well in the world. It was drilled in 1859. And I vividly remember as a young boy, down the Oil Creek Valley, a stream called Oil Creek because it always had oil on it because the way oil perked its way out of the ground naturally. So there was oil on that stream.

And when we had the rush of oil, those hills were naked. There was no vegetation. The trees were gone. But today, it's almost like a virgin, beautiful oak-cherry forest. And the streams there, Oil Creek naturally produces both trout and bass, which is not very common. And the brooky trout streams flow into it all the way down. It's a beautiful, pristine area. And nobody did anything. They just left nature purify it. So oil is not the horrible thing. It's a hydrocarbon. It went back to dirt. The trees grew and the streams are pure and wildlife is very abundant.

Now I guess what we want to talk about is production. How did we get to \$125 to \$135 oil and how did we get to this tremendous price on natural gas? Many years ago, we had a legislative moratorium to lock up the Outer Continental Shelf. Now back then natural gas was \$2, oil was \$10, and many argued that we shouldn't use ours, we ought to use theirs. Whether that was a wise argument or not, I won't say, but they have won and it has been locked up ever since.

In the early nineties, President Bush I put a Presidential moratorium on top of the legislative moratorium. Now what is a moratorium. The Continental Shelf is from 3 miles offshore. The States control the first 3 miles. Then the Federal Government, we the taxpayers, own the next 200 miles. That is considered our Continental Shelf. And most every country in the world, in fact, every country in the world produces there. Canada produces right above Maine. Canada produces right above the State of Washington, Great Britain produces on their continental shelf; Norway, Sweden, Ireland, New Zealand, Australia. It's just common practice. In fact, everybody gives Brazil great credit for being energy independent, and they give credit for ethanol. Well, ethanol is 15 percent of their energy use. The rest of it, they opened up their Outer Continental Shelf, had a big find out there, and they are now self-sufficient. They don't have to buy from anybody. Wouldn't it be great if America would be self-sufficient?

I think we have a lot more oil than was anticipated in this country. I know we have a lot of natural gas. We are currently importing 17 percent of our natural gas. We wouldn't even have to do that. We get 15 percent from Canada and we get 2 percent from LNG, which is from foreign countries similar to where we buy oil.

So we have locked ours up. Now what does that do? Well, we have locked it up and so we have taken our supply off the market. Now what is this Congress doing to react to that? Two or three weeks ago, we passed a bill, very thoughtful bill. We said, We are going to figure out a way to bring OPEC into court. We are going to bring OPEC to court. We are going to force them to produce for energy so we have more petroleum. Currently, we import 66 percent of our petroleum, about half from

that area of the world and about half from Canada and Mexico. So we are going to force them because they are not producing enough. I think Saudi Arabia produces 12 million, I think another one, 7 million; another one, 6 million; another one, 5 million. But someone has determined that is not enough so we are going to have to bring them into court.

Now how you take someone to court for not producing enough oil when we've locked up our Outer Continental Shelf, we've locked up most of Alaska, we've locked up most of the Midwest, now how a country can think that we can sue our neighbors for not selling us enough oil when we have refused to produce our own doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

My taxpayers back home laugh at that when they hear the debate, but it's not funny. But we actually passed a bill to do that, as if it would make a difference. And I don't know what court we would bring it into.

Let's look at our energy use today. We are about 40 percent petroleum, 23 percent natural gas, 23 percent coal, 8 percent nuclear, 2.7 hydro, 2.4 biomass. And this is the one people have not paid a lot of attention to. This is woody biomass. This one has grown measurably in the last few years. Eight hundred thousand Americans use a wood pellet stove today to heat their homes, and that is sawdust compressed. All our dry kilns in the country where we dry our wood uses wood sawdust to heat those rather than buy propane or fuel oil. A lot of factories in the rural areas are using wood waste also.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Would the speaker yield for a question?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Surely. Be glad to.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It is my understanding that in the natural forests of the United States, owned by the United States, we grow about 40 billion board feet of new growth a year.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. We have about 20 billion board feet of new death a year.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That's right.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It's my understanding the Forest Service is only removing about 2 billion, not 20 billion, but 2 billion board feet a year. Is that not a potential plus for it, and is it also not true that this Congress prohibited any new development in that area?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That's one of the problems. Wood waste has great potential. I also have a company in my district that has built a wonderful wood waste boiler. It burns cleaner than natural gas and will burn even green wood, and it burns it cleanly. But the Democrats passed a bill that prohibits wood waste from public land from being utilized. We are not allowed to produce, which makes no public sense.

I don't know who got the theory that letting every tree grow makes sense. When you thin a forest, it grows much faster, which takes CO₂ out of the air. The biggest place to get rid of carbon in the air is plant life for us. And tree growth. Because you lock the carbon up. The log we cut down is carbon. We take it and put a roof on our house or floor in our house or windows in our house or furniture in our house. That is carbon.

□ 1800

You lock the carbon up. So we have taken it out of the air. Well, by not pruning the forest, your forest becomes like a jungle. It grows very slow, and it dies naturally, which turns to CO₂. As it dies naturally, it turns to CO₂ and emits into the air, just the same as we do when we breathe and when we burn something. So nature itself puts CO₂ back in the air.

But biomass is kind of a sleeper. I think it can do a lot. And if we could unlock the National Forests, if we could start marketing an appropriate amount from the National Forests. You know, 40 percent of America is owned by the government. I don't think people realize that. Almost 50 percent of America is owned by some level of government, when you include counties and State governments.

My State owns about 5 million acres in Pennsylvania. Most States don't have that much forest land. But the whole northern part of Pennsylvania is heavily owned, some by the Federal Government, much by the State, and a lot of that is not marketed adequately either. But when you market a forest adequately, when you prune it adequately, it is sort of like a garden. You prune the old out and you leave the young grow, and it is very healthy for the environment. It is much better for wildlife, and it is certainly better for clean air.

Geothermal, a good form of energy, but it is expensive installation. Wind, solar.

Now, here is the problem we face. How did we get here? I am going to tell you who I blame. I blame Congress. But who influenced Congress? Congress has pressure. Well, there is an organization. I made this statement the other day that Hugo Chavez and the Shah of Iran don't need lobbyists to keep us as a customer. The Democrats and the environmentalists continue to lock up domestic reserves, and that forces us to send billions of dollars over there to buy their oil.

Now, the Sierra Club is number one. They are against oil shale development, they are against coal liquefaction, they are against offshore energy production that I talked about a minute ago.

You have got Greenpeace. They want to phase out all fossil fuels. That means from here up, 86 percent of what we are using today has to go away. That is Greenpeace.

Environmental Defense says power plant smokestacks are public health

energy number one. Folks, that is 51 percent of our electricity.

League of Conservation Voters. Coal to liquids. Most of us believe that coal to liquids or coal to gas is our future because we are the Saudi Arabia of coal. And when we learn how to do it, if carbon is the issue, I think we can learn how to sequester the carbon, right along with the ability to make liquids from coal. Then we wouldn't be buying oil from other countries. We would be using the liquids made from our coal.

Defenders of Wilderness. It says every coastal State is put in harm's way when oil rigs go up in our coastal waters. Well, you know, folks, every country in America produces energy out there and has the rigs out there.

Next Wednesday, we are going to offer this Congress the first real chance we have for production. We are going to be offering offshore production. We are going to have legislation, an amendment to the Interior Committee, that will remove this. In the Interior Committee every year there is legislation that locks up, that says we cannot spend a dollar to lease the Outer Continental Shelf. That is 200 miles offshore.

We are going to remove that from 50 miles out. Now, 50 miles is giving a big cushion. A lot of countries do 20. Some do 25. Most don't do 50. We are going to give 50. Eleven miles is sight, so after 11 miles, it is four times the sight line, more than that, so there will be nothing anybody can see. And every person in the energy business, MMS, that is the minerals and mine management people who manage this program, said that the most environmentally sensitive way to produce energy is offshore. It improves the fishing. It doesn't hurt it. You are not disturbing wildlife. You are not disturbing anything. So offshore energy is our most environmentally friendly way to harvest energy and use it.

So we are going to give this Congress a chance next Wednesday, not the whole Congress, but just the Interior Subcommittee, to remove that moratorium. Then we will have to maintain it in full committee if we win and then maintain it on the floor, and then we will have to deal with the Senate, which is always our tremendous challenge.

So as we go down these, we have these groups, Natural Resource Defense, coal mining. They are opposed to coal mining. They want coal. That is 50 percent of our electric grid.

Center for Biological Diversity. Oil and gas drilling on public lands has devastating effects.

Folks, it is a new era. You talked about technology. We have new technology. We know how to do it right. You drill a 6 inch hole in the ground. With gas, you just let gas out. With oil, you pump out oil. It does not have to be an environmental disaster.

Then Friends of the Earth, the other one, the eighth one, liquid coal is dirty and a costly fuel.

Folks, these eight groups, Sierra Club, Greenpeace, Environmental Defense, League of Conservation Voters, Defenders of Wilderness, Natural Resource Defense Council, Center for Biological Diversity, and Friends of the Earth, those are the people you need to thank for the energy of America being locked up. It is their influence on Congress that has prevented us from a providing energy for America. They are wrong, folks. They need to lose that argument. We need to show them that we can produce energy.

Now, as far as the world is concerned, you know, when it was \$2 for gas and \$10 for oil, maybe they were right. We should use their's. I remember that argument. Folks, at \$125 to \$130 a barrel, at \$12.50 for natural gas, I think it is time to use ours.

What is the other benefit of using ours? When we produce American energy, the landowner makes money, whether it is the government or a private person. The promoter of the well makes money. The pipeline guy makes money. The driller makes money. The hydrofracking people make money. The processing station, whether it is gas or the refineries for oil, make money. Millions of dollars of wealth are created. Billions of dollars of wealth created. Hundreds of thousands of people have wonderful jobs and can maintain a family and home. So producing our own energy will put a lot of Americans to work, especially in rural America where I live.

Now, they claim, and when you hear all the talk, it is the bottom three that are ready to take over, with geothermal, wind and solar. If we double wind and solar in the next 5 years, we are less than three-quarters of one percent of our energy. We are all for wind. We are all for solar. We are all for geothermal. I led the Hydrogen Caucus 10 years ago. But, folks, we are not there yet.

Now, what can keep us going? Here is what the Energy Department has in their chart. From this middle line towards me is history. That is where we have been. From that middle line out is where the Energy Department thinks we are going to be.

To listen to many people, you would think we are ready. We have been holding back wind and we have been holding back solar and we have been holding back geothermal. We have been holding back hydrogen. We have been holding back electric cars. Folks, nobody is holding anything back. It has to compete. We have spent billions on every one of the new energies. But their projection is that not much is going to change.

I don't quite agree with their chart, because I look for coal to decrease. This administration has not been friendly to coal. This Congress has not been friendly to coal. There have been 50 coal plants turned down in the last 6 months in this country. They will all become natural gas plants. And when you have a power plant and you switch to natural gas, this is going to widen.

Really, that is one of the reasons that we have expensive natural gas in America. Twelve years ago, we didn't use natural gas to make electricity. Only 8 percent of our electricity was made with natural gas. Today, 23 percent of our electricity is made with natural gas, and it has put tremendous pressure on natural gas.

Clean, green natural gas is the fuel that we use to make ethanol, it is the fuel we will use to make hydrogen. It is the fuel we will use as the bridge. A third of our auto fleet could be on clean, green natural gas if it was less expensive.

So I look at natural gas as the savior for us to get us to the new generations of fuels. But in the meantime, we are going to need a lot of oil. We are going to need coal. We are going to need nuclear. The energy bill in 05 gave incentives. It took 10 years to get a permit for a nuclear plant. We now force that to be done in 4. So they say 4 years to build one. So I say with delays and problems, we can build a nuclear plant in 10 years. There are 50 on the drawing board and there are three or four ready to go, and that is because of the 05 Energy Act. But we need all of those 50 on line by 2030 to remain 20 percent of the grid, because electric use is going up so fast.

Folks, the energy problem in America is because of the environmental groups we have decided to stop producing fossil fuels, forcing us to be 66 percent dependent on foreign and forcing us to cause part of the world shortage of petroleum and gas because we don't produce. So I find it very frustrating that here we are today with the highest prices.

One more thing on natural gas. Natural gas is the one fuel that is not a world price. Neither is coal. When oil is \$120 a barrel, it is that all around the world. But we have had the highest natural gas prices in America for 8 years.

What does that do to us? That affects the petrochemical companies, the polymers and the plastic companies and the fertilizer companies that use huge amounts. They use it as an ingredient. Polymers and plastic, 45 percent of the cost of making it is natural gas. Fifty-five percent of the cost of petrochemical is natural gas. From 50 to 70 percent of fertilizer cost is natural gas.

Half of our fertilizer plants have left in the last 3 years. We have lost 300,000 polymer plastic jobs in the last 3 years. A great percentage of the petrochemical industry has moved offshore.

Just to show you, our largest chemical company is Dow Chemical. They spoke out the other day about natural gas prices. In 02, they spent \$8 billion to purchase natural gas. This year, they will spend \$32 billion for natural gas. That is a 400 percent increase.

Now, here are the numbers that are scary. In 02, 60 percent of their revenue and jobs were in America. Today, 34 percent of their revenue and jobs are in America. Where are they? They are in

foreign countries, where natural gas is a fraction of what it is here.

Many of the plants I have mentioned, polymers, plastic, steel, aluminum, those plants are moving everywhere because of energy prices. They are building every kind of a plant you can think of down in South America in a place called Trinidad, about a day-and-a-half by ship to here. My prediction is if we don't deal with natural gas prices, bricks and glass, heavy bulky commodities will be produced in Trinidad and be on our shores within a day-and-a-half.

Folks, that is not the America I believe in. If America is going to compete, we have to get gas prices under control. We have to get oil prices under control. We have to have energy that is affordable for Americans to heat their homes. We have to have energy prices that are affordable so companies will want to be here and produce the jobs here. I believe for the first time in the history of America we have to fight to compete with our competitors like China and India. They are huge. They are growing fast. They are building their own energy future.

China will be producing oil 50 miles off the coast of Cuba and 50 miles off the Florida coast, while we prohibit it. Does that make sense? I don't think so. They are going to be working. China, Canada and Spain will all have contracts to produce energy in waters that should be ours, off our coast, because we don't produce there and because it is an equal distance from Cuba.

It is time for this Congress, it is time for this administration, to lead. Recently the President has spoken out three times on offshore. He has never supported offshore production. But he said we should be offshore and onshore producing more energy.

I wrote him a letter 2 weeks ago and put a release out today that says the following: "Mr. President, I commend you for speaking about offshore production of energy. But it seems like if you would lead by removing the presidential moratorium, that is yours, and urging Congress to remove their moratorium so we can start the process." It will take years to get out there. We have to get in a 5-year plan, we have to do the leases, we have to do the environmental impact statements, and then they have to go out and build the platforms and the pipelines and drill. It takes a long time.

Every day we wait we endanger the economic future of America. I think we are almost past the point. We need energy production in America today. Not next year. Today. We need to unlock what this Congress and three presidents have locked up. We need to produce our energy. We need to conserve. We need to use the innovation that my friend talked about a little bit ago.

We need it to do everything we can to produce every form of energy that is available. We need wind, we need solar, and we need to use less. We need to use

it more wisely. But, folks, the day is today. We cannot solve this problem with just conservation. We have to produce energy.

I believe if we opened up the Outer Continental Shelf, we would take what we call the fear factor out of the market and we would get Wall Street out of the marketplace and we could drop energy prices 20 to 25 percent. The only other thing you and I can do is to use less and find alternatives. Folks, it is a crisis in America.

I want to thank my friend from Utah and my friend from California who have joined us for the opportunity to share some time with them today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has done a great job in explaining the reality of the situation that we have and the reality of what our future can be if we are willing to take to the field right now and do it. So we are fine.

What we hope to do when we do a comprehensive bill is actually provide 12 steps that will fit what Mr. PETERSON was talking about and the three goals: Increasing our conservation, increasing our production and increasing our innovation.

□ 1815

Those 12 steps are very simple.

First is increasing American natural gas. As Mr. PETERSON just told you, we could heat 100 homes for the next 30 years with the natural gas we have available but not yet developed in this country alone.

Step two, increase American oil resources that we have in this country. We have increased the amount of oil we import seven times since the 1970s, and we decreased our exploration and production of American oil in the 1970s because of American policies, government policies. And the only thing we need to do to increase that so we can recover American oil supply is change American government policies.

Step three, look at coal, American coal. We have 200 to 300 years' worth of coal undeveloped, unsecured in this country.

Step four, develop American oil shale. 70 percent of all the oil shale in the world is in three western States in the United States, where there is more undeveloped oil than underneath the entire country of Saudi Arabia.

Step five, increase affordable and clean nuclear fuel. Since the 1970s, we have had no new nuclear power plant built, while our friends in France in that same time period have built 58 plants. That has to be part of a future solution.

Step six, we have to invest more in renewable sources of energy: Sunlight, wind, rain, tide, geothermal heat. All of those have to be increased. Right now, only about 7 percent of the total energy consumption comes from renewables. We are not going to solve the problem by this source alone; but if we could increase that, double it to 15 percent, 16 percent, 17 percent, we would

go a long way toward doing that. And part of the way of doing that is government policy again. When we try to improve our solar and wind power plants, if we would simply extend the investment tax credits by another 5 years we could start moving forward dramatically today in that particular area.

Step seven, greater efficiency and conservation, and especially giving incentives for the government to do that, for individuals, business, as well as government. And the reason I actually put business in there, they are already doing it. The U.S. steel industry today uses 45 percent less energy to produce 1 ton of steel. The U.S. forest and paper industry today uses 21 percent less energy to produce 1 ton of paper. We have the technology to do that. What the American government needs to do is to provide rewards for individuals and the government to do the same thing that the business community has taken on as a means of being profitable.

Step eight, we increase our gasoline refinement capacity. We all know we produce in the United States about 17 million barrels of oil a day, but our consumption need is 21 million barrels of oil today. And we all know we haven't built a new refinery since 1976; and only 23 years ago we had 324 operating refineries, today we have 148 operating refineries. And for those who are operating, they are still only marginal because the market does not bear them. What we have to have is increasing supply of American oil going to American refineries; we need, and this bill calls for, an additional 10 new refineries immediately built on property owned by the Department of Energy to do that part.

Step nine, to adopt common sense regulatory relief. Department of Interior suggests that we have about 80 billion barrels of recoverable oil and natural gas that are locked away because of regulatory controls that Congress has put on those areas. Our need for standards don't have to be sold out, but they need desperately to be reformed simply so we can make decisions faster, because we need relief now, not sometime in the future. That time was long ago. We need it now.

Step ten, we have to improve our transmission and energy infrastructure. We have 5 million miles of electrical distribution lines; we have 1 million miles of natural gas pipelines, and they are incredibly outdated and they do not supply America's needs. We have to improve those. If we are going to improve them with ethanol and we are starting to unload ethanol, we have to have blending terminals. We don't have it. Department of Interior has right now been tasked with trying to develop energy corridors for the future, and there are people trying to stop them from at least identifying where we will have energy corridors for the future. That cannot be. We must identify them, and they must be useable.

Step 11, we have to restore our domestic energy workforce. I hate to say

this, but there are 90 percent fewer petroleum engineers and geoscientists who are graduating now than 20 years ago. Unfortunately, our workforce for the future and how we develop technology to innovate is simply not there. We have to provide some incentives, some rewards, some scholarships to develop that workforce. It has to be part of our program.

Finally, step 12, we have to tap American innovation to develop our new energy technologies. And I mentioned how we did that, the same way we have in history: We prepare and provide rewards for people in America who can solve our problems.

Now, as I said, one of the things my party is willing to do is move forward directly on this. Just like Roy Hobbs in *The Natural* realized sitting there listening to a lecture on the psychology of defeat does not produce a solution. Getting out on the field produces a solution. And what the Republican party wants to do is to get out on the field and make it happen, do the work now. And this comprehensive bill is one of those that have to take place.

We are ready to move forward with an attitude that it can be solved, it must be solved, and we have the capacity to do it. And our goal will be to become energy independent and energy secure now, not in the future, but now, in our lifetime.

I keep coming up here every day looking up at the top of this building with a quote by Daniel Webster up there which simply reads and tries to exhort to us: Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We have the capacity and the ability to do something worthy to be remembered, and the Republican party wants to get on the playing field to do that. That is our goal, that is our destiny. The American people deserve it. And we can't wait; we have to do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6124. An act to provide for the continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. First, I would like to identify myself with the re-

marks that I have just heard from my two colleagues, and congratulate them on presenting to the people the hard facts that have not been faced in this country for over 30 years. And those hard facts are some of the basic reasons that we are in trouble today.

Mr. Speaker, I will preface my remarks tonight, and what I have to say tonight I would like to say totally is in parallel with the spirit of what was just said. But I preface my remarks to underscore, just as my colleagues would underscore their commitment.

While I adamantly reject the man-made global warming theory, I am committed to a clean and healthy environment, to purifying the air, to purifying our water and our soil, all of this for the sake of the people of this planet, especially the children of this planet, and especially my three children, Christian, Tristan, and Anika, and all the children of the world who we hope will receive a world that we hand them that will be a better world, a healthier world. And I have no doubt that unless we thwart the onslaught of the nonsense being foisted upon humankind in the name of man-made global warming, our next generation will be deprived of freedom, prosperity, and a healthy environment.

The radical environmental crusade behind the man-made global warming theory may well be well motivated. Motives and good intentions, however, do not count. What counts are facts. And when it comes to the facts about so-called man-made global warming, the public has been denied an honest debate.

Only 18 months ago, the refrain, "Case Closed, Global Warming is Real," was repeated as if a mantra of some religious sect. It was pounded into the public's consciousness over the airwaves, in print, and even at congressional hearings. This was obviously a brazen attempt to end open discussion and to silence differing views by dismissing the need to take seriously contrary arguments by anyone, no matter how impressive his or her credentials might be, if that person happened to doubt global warming.

Just a short time ago, the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, the OISM, released the names of some 31,000 scientists who signed a petition rejecting the claims of human-caused global warming. Of the 31,072 Americans who signed, 9,021 had Ph.D.s; many of the 31,000 signers currently work in climatology, meteorology, atmospheric, environmental, and geophysical studies, astronomical studies, as well as the biological fields that directly relate to the climate change controversy. And note, of the 31,000 signatories, these signers are American scientists.

There are many prominent scientists throughout the world who are stepping up to expose the well-financed propaganda campaign behind the man-made global warming theory. But the views of these American scientists and those