

are still in your house and not the poorhouse. If we identify the essential elements that need to be in any solution that is universal, I think there are several. First, openly disclose the prices.

Second, every citizen should be allowed to pay the lowest price.

Third, I think we need that insurance risk pool to be nationwide. If you are a citizen, you are in with no cherry-picking.

Fourth, we need to have a deductible that is 3 percent of a household's Federal taxable income.

If Mr. ALTMIRE were to make \$100,000 a year, he and his family could afford \$3,000 on health care. But then give it to him as a tax deduction at the end of the year, up to that 3 percent limit.

Fifth, most importantly, I believe the measure of any nation is in how we treat those who are in need. So I would say it this way, that local, State and national governments must provide for those in need.

I think it is up to us here as Democrats and Republicans to come together and decide who is in need and what is it we should provide for them? If we can agree on the essential elements that should be in any national solution, the next step will be much more easy to take.

Mr. PALLONE. I wanted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think we have about 7 minutes left, but I did want to mention one other thing. I know the gentleman from Florida brought up community health centers and that type of thing. That has got to be an important part of this as well.

It is unfortunate, because a few years ago in his budget message or State of the Union, the President actually said he wanted to prioritize community health centers and create a lot more, but he never provided the funding to do that, which is often the case. We get the rhetoric, but we don't get the funding.

To the extent that you can, take a lot of the people who are uninsured and who will go to an emergency room, and become part of that uncompensated care that is a big burden on the hospital, and you can, instead, set up community health centers, whether in a fixed place or in a mobile van or whatever, and have people go there as they would go to a doctor, as you said, and get the preventive care they would get from a doctor, as opposed to an emergency room later. That is a big factor in this, as well, that we have to look at. I wanted to commend the gentleman for what she said in that regard.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania again.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to comment on what the gentleman from Wisconsin was discussing with regard to community rating, which means there are approximately 160 million people in this country that are privately insured, get their insurance through their employer, pay for it themselves, but they participate in the private market.

What the gentleman is recommending, which I think would be a good step, is to put those people, or at least a large portion of those people, in the same community-rated risk pool for the purposes of setting their insurance rates. You are still getting your insurance from the same people. You still have the same freedom of choice in the market and to choose your own health plan with this initial step, but the difference is, instead of you being viewed as an individual for the purposes of setting your rates, or small business, only your 10 employees being viewed together, you have 160 million people that are in the same pool.

So if you or a member of your family, or one of your employees in the case of a small business, has the misfortune to get sick or injured, you don't get that phone call from the insurance company saying, we are going to raise your rates, because you have your rates set by the health status of the pool at large, 160 million people, not just you as an individual or your employees.

I would commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for recommending that. I do think that would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR. Well, under the new Democratic Congress, I think we now can show some leadership when it comes to health care solutions. We have such expertise out in our country in the various universities and the medical schools and with the researchers, and it is time for a little leadership on wellness care and preventive medicine.

I was listening very intently to President Bush last week, hoping that he would be true to his conservative principles and say we need to conserve energy and you need to be conservative in how you take care of yourself.

I think now is the time for Democrats to provide this kind of leadership on diabetes, obesity prevention that is running rampant among our children.

How do you prevent heart disease? Show how important it is to exercise, eat well and sleep. These are simple things that if we commit as a country to wellness and preventive care, we are sure to save millions of dollars later when it comes to funding Medicare and those types of programs.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. You can look at every government program, whether it is Medicare, Medicaid, NIH, whatever it is, and you can try to look at those or reinvent them so that there is more of an emphasis on prevention and wellness. This is a theme that we can look at and try to make some changes, and I think it really would make a difference.

I appreciate your comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. It is a tremendous concept, and it will work. It is an old saying, an ounce of prevention is worth a

pound of cure. It works in health care. It works across the country, works on your automobile and will work on your body as well.

Here is another sentinel idea. Right now the insurance companies write their own policies that benefit them. I think it is time for Congress to consider writing a Federal standard, a basic health insurance policy. It becomes a Federal standard. We have Federal standards in automobile manufacturing. We have Federal standards in construction, in health care, in every industry that you can name. But we don't have a basic health care policy that each and every insurance company should have to sell.

You see, if every insurance company was selling the same piece of paper, then we could compare them based on the quality of their services and their price.

I think it is time to take that step. It is time for us in Congress to decide what should be covered. If it is in your body, head to toe, I think it should be covered. I think it is time to start writing a basic, standard health insurance policy, not mandating prices, but allow the insurance industry to set their own prices and compete for us.

Right now, back home in Wisconsin, my patients are on their hands and knees crawling to the insurance companies hoping to get in. Farmers will have their wife or themselves working on the farm during the daytime, working a nighttime job, just to get the health care benefits.

Mr. PALLONE. I know that we only have a couple of minutes left, if that, and I just wanted to thank all of you for joining with me tonight. Other than me, it was all new Members, and I think that gives us new, fresh insights into what we need to do that is really so crucial. Thank you.

If I could just say, Madam Speaker, in summing up, that, number one, we do commend the President for prioritizing health care in his State of the Union address, but essentially what he has suggested as a way of dealing with the problems is not a good start. In fact, it is very much the privatization and ideological answers that I don't think are going to work.

Democrats do have alternatives. We certainly intend, now that we are part of this majority, to move forward on those alternatives. But I know that with the input from the new Members we are going to make a difference.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. Res. 20, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 116) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other

purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1945

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, this is the 22nd time, I believe, that I have come here to the well of the House to talk about a subject which I think will be the overarching concern of our world for the next decades and several decades beyond that. That subject is energy and specifically the energy that we get from oil.

As an illustration of the problems we face, I have here a map of the world as it would be drawn if each country was sized relative to the amount of oil reserves that it had. So this is the world according to oil. And you see here Saudi Arabia, and it would swallow up the United States. How many times would it swallow us up, a dozen, 15 times?

Notice the incredible wealth of oil in the Middle East. Venezuela looms, what, two, three times the size of the United States as far as reserves of oil are concerned. The little United Arab Emirates, you can hardly find them on a map. They are kind of a little pinpoint on a usual map, and there they are six, eight times larger than the United States with their reserves of oil. The famed reserves of Russia up there. Notice that the United Arab Emirates have more oil than Russia has. And Saudi Arabia, of course, and Iraq. And little Kuwait, a little province that Saddam Hussein thought ought to belong to Iraq when he invaded it more than a decade ago, has many times as much oil as the United States and more oil than Russia has.

Remember this map when we put the next map of the world up here because this is an interesting map. And this is a map with the continents, the countries drawn relative to their actual size. And you will notice here the little symbols that represent several things, and one of them is oil that China has bought around the world. And this is Unocal, which they almost bought in our country. Everywhere you see this little symbol, the Chinese have bought rights to oil. They are scouring the world for oil.

And the next chart shows a statement by Condoleezza Rice, who recognized this. And this is a pretty interesting statement made by our Secretary of State: "We do have to do something about the energy problem."

Thank you. I am pleased that you recognize that.

"I can tell you that nothing has really taken me aback more as Secretary of State than the way that the politics of energy is. I will use the word

wharping diplomacy around the world. We have simply got to do something about the wharping now of diplomatic effort by the all-out rush for energy supply." And, of course, China has been preeminent in this.

Several days ago I came upon an article. I have no idea why it took so long to come to light. It really is not an article. It really is the script of a speech that was given by Rear Admiral Hyman Rickover, the father of the nuclear submarine. And he gave this speech, it will be 50 years this coming May 14, 1957. He gave this speech to a banquet of the Annual Scientific Assembly of the Minnesota State Medical Association in St. Paul, Minnesota. And we will recognize, celebrate the 50th anniversary of that here in a relatively few months. That speech, by the way, was just 14 months and 6 days after a really famous speech that was given by M. King Hubbert in San Antonio, Texas, to a group of oil people in which he made a prediction that we will be talking about this evening, and that is that the United States would reach its maximum oil production just 14 years after that in 1970.

And right on target, that is exactly what happened. And no matter what we have done since then, we have pumped less oil than before until now we are pumping about half the oil that we pumped in 1970. He predicted that the world would be peaking about now, and that is the subject that brings us here tonight. I have a few excerpts here from this speech that he gave:

"High energy consumption has always been a prerequisite of political power. The tendency is for political power to be concentrated in an ever smaller number of countries. Ultimately the nation which controls the largest energy resource will become dominant. If we give thought to the problem of energy resources, if we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have and prepare well for necessary future changes, we shall ensure this dominant position for our own country."

He said this 50 years ago: "If we act wisely and in time," he says 50 years ago, "to conserve what we have and prepare well for the necessary future changes, we shall ensure this dominant position for our own country." We have done nothing in the last 50 years except try to find more and more gas and oil and coal and use more and more of what we have found.

Another quote from this very interesting speech: "In the 8,000 years from the beginning of history to the year 2000 A.D., world population will have grown from 10 million to 4 billion . . ."

Now, he missed it a little because we are at nearly 7 billion now.

" . . . with 90 percent of that growth taking place during the last 5 percent . . ."

Way more than 90 percent taking place during the last 5 percent of that period.

" . . . in 400 years. It took the first 3,000 years of recorded history to ac-

complish the first doubling of population, 100 years for the last doubling, but the next doubling will require only 50 years." And it occurred well before that because we are now at nearly 7 billion people.

The next chart shows what he says in chart 4. If you were to plot population on this chart, it would pretty much follow the curve here for the increased use of gas and oil. This is only about 400 years of the 8,000 years that he spoke of, of recorded history. So you can move this way, way back a great long distance here to see the whole history of the world. In the long history of the world, 8,000 years of recorded history, the Age of Oil will last but about 300 years. We are about 150 years into the Age of Oil from when we started to where we are now. And if M. King Hubbert was correct, and he was correct about the United States, but if he is correct about the world, for the next 150 years there will be less and less oil pumped at higher and higher prices until finally, roughly 150 years from now, there will be little or no more gas, oil, and coal which is economically recoverable.

This is an astounding picture, and future generations looking back at this Age of Oil may very well ask themselves how could they have done that, this incredible wealth?

In a few minutes I am going to read a fascinating history, a very brief history of the world and energy that Hyman Rickover gave to those lucky physicians that night nearly 50 years. They will ask themselves how could they have done that when they found this incredible wealth under the ground? Couldn't they have understood that it couldn't last forever? Wouldn't they have asked themselves what can we do with this to provide the most good for the most people for the longest time? But instead of that, we simply have used that energy as rapidly as we could with little or no thought for the future.

Another quote from this very interesting talk: "I suggest that this is a good time to think soberly about our responsibilities to our descendants, those who will ring out the Fossil Fuel Age." And he recognized 50 years ago that there would be a Fossil Fuel Age. "We might give a break to these youngsters by cutting fuel and metal consumption so as to provide a safer margin for the necessary adjustments which eventually must be made in a world without fossil fuels."

Less than a month ago I came back from China. Nine of us went there, nine Members of Congress. We went there primarily to talk about energy. We met with a number of relatively high officials in the Chinese Government. I was surprised in our discussions first with the energy people and then with others that they began their discussion of energy by talking about post-oil. Hyman Rickover 50 years ago anticipated that there would be a world without fossil fuels when we had gone through the Age of Oil.