

the federal government. This incident calls into question your written response that the firefighting forces are adequate to address the fire suppression needs in the western United States. It appears that the 16 large air tankers were not adequate since the use of the DC-10 had to be funded by the state of California.

The responsibility for airworthiness and safety of aircraft over the United States is the responsibility of the Federal Aviation Administration, not the Forest Service. The FAA has the category of Public Use Aircraft for aircraft used to fight fires, if aircraft wish to be used to save lives and property. For example, the National Guard C-130's are public use aircraft and do not have to pass the additional requirements of the Forest Service. We allowed the IL-76 flights into Little Rock Air Force Base after Katrina when they brought supplies to our citizens. Not to consider new or foreign aircraft under the excuse of interagency safety and airworthiness standards is a red herring which has cost the country both in funds, in property and in lives destroyed and at risk. Your unwillingness to take the necessary steps to ensure the availability of large aircraft in situations in which the current assets are not sufficient is unconscionable.

To summarize, your response was again filled with the bland generalities on this

issue and it continues to leave me with no confidence. The failure during the Esperanza fire validates my lack of confidence in your organization and decisions. Since we are at the end of the 2006 fire season, I want to be ensured that we are better prepared for the 2007 fire season than we were for this season. To this end I am talking to Senator Feinstein and others to ensure that this issue is not ignored until more firefighters lose their lives and property and homes are destroyed. I am also involved in a private evaluation of this issue. Unless I receive satisfactory explanations, there will be a painfully harsh critique of your decision making on this issue. I expect to hear from you in detail before the first of the year.

Sincerely,

DANA ROHRBACHER,  
Member of Congress.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, Under sections 211, 301(b), and 320(a), of S. Con. Res. 21,

the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revision to the budget allocations and aggregates for certain House committees for fiscal years 2007, 2008, and the period of 2008 through 2012. This revision represents an adjustment to certain House committee budget allocations and aggregates for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and in response to the bill H.R. 3963 made in order by the Committee on Rules (Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007). Corresponding tables are attached.

Under section 211 of S. Con. Res. 21, this adjustment to the budget allocations and aggregates applies while the measure is under consideration. The adjustments will take effect upon enactment of the measure. For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, a revised allocation made under section 211 of S. Con. Res. 21 is to be considered as an allocation included in the resolution.

Any questions may be directed to Ellen Balis or Gail Millar.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2007	Fiscal year 2008 <sup>1</sup>	Fiscal years 2008–2012
<b>Current Aggregates:<sup>2</sup></b>			
Budget Authority	2,250,680	2,350,996	n.a.
Outlays	2,263,759	2,353,954	n.a.
Revenues	1,900,340	2,015,841	11,137,671
<b>Change in Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 3963):</b>			
Budget Authority	0	9,332	n.a.
Outlays	0	2,386	n.a.
Revenues	0	6,210	35,510
<b>Revised Aggregates:</b>			
Budget Authority	2,250,680	2,360,328	n.a.
Outlays	2,263,759	2,356,340	n.a.
Revenues	1,900,340	2,022,051	11,173,181

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

<sup>1</sup> Pending action by the House Appropriations Committee on spending covered by section 207(d)(1)(E) (overseas deployments and related activities), resolution assumptions are not included in the current aggregates.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes emergency amounts exempt from enforcement in the budget resolution.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

(Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2007		2008		2008–2012 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Current allocation:</b>						
Energy and Commerce	-1	-1	366	362	-59	-63
<b>Change in Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 3963):</b>						
Energy and Commerce	0	0	9,332	2,386	49,711	35,384
<b>Revised allocation:</b>						
Energy and Commerce	-1	-1	9,698	2,748	49,652	35,321

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RAMSTAD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following

enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, October 24, 2007:

H.R. 995, to amend Public Law 106-348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 25, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. BEARD,  
Chief Administrative Officer.

ENERGY CRISIS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House on an issue that I think should be a very high priority in this Congress.

On October 25, 2007, our world oil prices hit \$92 a barrel and closed at \$90. This is our chart from 1986. These are annual average prices. I can't analyze this year's price; we don't show the little spikes that happen throughout the year. But folks, we're clear up here, off the chart.

Two weeks ago, I stood at this microphone with shock and dismay that we had over \$80 oil, had set record prices 2 weeks ago. Now, this would be understandable if we had had a storm in the gulf as we normally do every summer, but we have been protected for the last 2 years. We have not had a storm in the gulf that disrupted supply. We get 40 percent of our energy from the gulf. So whenever we have problems in the gulf we have oil spikes because oil and gas are deprived from the system for weeks, months at a time until all repairs are made, and so we lose a lot of our energy.

But this year and last year, we've had no disruptive storms in the gulf. We've not had a terrorist act that has blown up a refinery, a pipeline, or somehow impeded supply. We have not had a dictatorship. I don't think a lot of people realize that the vast majority of oil produced today, in fact 90 percent of the oil in the world, is produced by government-run dictatorships who own the oil, produce the oil, market the oil, skim off the profits for their social programs, and actually run their own oil companies.

It's kind of surprising to the world, but Exxon is now the 14th largest oil company in the world, our largest. But they are only 14th in the world. The other 13 are countries, dictatorships, some of them very unstable ones. Now, we haven't had one of them tip over, but here we are at \$90 oil.

Six years ago, we got as low as \$16, just 6 years ago. Now, it doesn't show it on here because these are average prices, but it got as low as \$16. And we had \$2 natural gas.

The question I have is, When will the House of Representatives of this Congress think that energy should be a priority issue for Americans?

What's really concerning is, as we look at \$90 oil, we have somewhere slightly under \$3 gasoline at the pump today. Now, that's not going to last because there is a lot of gasoline, there is a little extra gasoline in the market place, and this is the slowest time of year for gasoline usage, so the price is below the normal trend.

I talked to a refinery in Warren, Pennsylvania, today in my district and I said, where would, normally, gasoline prices be with \$90 oil? If it stays there, now it has to stay there a while until the system becomes \$90 oil because it's

not \$90 oil yet in the system. He said it will be about \$3.29 or \$3.30 gasoline. What does that do to the American homeowner, the American family trying to raise their children and go to work, go to school and travel, \$3.29 to \$3.30 gasoline?

We're going to have record-setting home heating oil prices this year for both natural gas, and particularly home heating oil. We already have record-setting prices for fuel oil for trucks, record-setting prices.

Now, the Senate passed a bill some months ago and the House passed a bill some months ago. And we heard a lot of chatter here a few moments ago about conferring on the appropriations bill; and that's appropriate, but this week, last week, the week before, I have not heard any mention of conferring on an energy bill for America. I don't know why they're not getting together. I guess it's just not a priority.

You now, why do we have record-setting oil prices? Because for three administrations in a row and 26 years of congressional rule we have locked up America's best oil and gas reserves. Then we can go up here to Alaska, and there are even larger spots up there locked up.

Now, I remember the arguments decades ago when gas was \$2 a thousand and oil was \$10 a barrel. People said, yes, we should use their cheaper energy and we should save ours. Should we be saving ours when it's \$90 a barrel?

I don't know if you watched "60 Minutes" 2 weeks ago and watched Dubai build cities, build islands, build immense properties with our cash. That part of the world is enriched. They're buying our debt, they're buying our facilities, they're buying our buildings, they're buying our infrastructure because they have so much cash because \$90 oil will enrich them far greater than they were enriched at \$50 and \$60 oil.

When is America going to realize, when is this Congress going to realize that high energy prices, the only way to fight them is to increase supply of all of our energy sources. They are market driven on Wall Street. Every day they're trading them on Wall Street. And when there's a shortage in the world, the prices go up. When there's a storm in the gulf, prices go up. When something happens in a country that produces two or three million barrels a day, prices go up because there is going to be a shortage.

Now, these are not caused by weather. These are caused by congressional action, not inaction, action. We have locked this up. This outer area is known as the Outer Continental Shelf. Should we produce there? It appears Congress thinks we shouldn't. Does Canada produce there? Yes. Does Norway produce there? Yes. Does Sweden produce there? Yes. Does Australia and New Zealand? Yes. Does Denmark? Yes. Do South American countries produce there? Yes. Is there another country in

the world that doesn't produce on the Outer Continental Shelf? No.

America is the only Nation who has decided to lock up its energy resources. And maybe they were right when it was \$2 for gas and \$10 for oil, and we'll use theirs while it's cheap; but it's not cheap anymore.

I met recently with someone from the Department of State on energy, and they shared with me their concern that \$75 oil would put this country, and maybe the world, into a recession. It didn't. But energy is such a part of our overall economy, overall lives, that when it reaches a certain point, it will put us into a recession. Every recession we've had goes to energy spikes, in the seventies, in the eighties and in the nineties. Energy prices have an immense impact on the economic future of our country, yet we sat here today, a body that's not even talking, Congress is not even talking about the energy crisis.

In fact, I guess they don't think it's a crisis. I thought it was a crisis for a number of years and I've been speaking out for a number of years, and I'm going to keep speaking out until this body decides that energy is something we need to deal with.

Now, why is energy so high? Well, what people don't realize, I was talking to a gentleman today from a world oil company, Statoil in Norway, stopped into my office just to talk. And he said the world is astounded by the amount of energy being used by China and India, the two largest populations in the world, as their economies are almost exploding with their population. Those two countries are moving forward with tremendous growth in their economies. Their energy use is growing between 15 and 20 percent per year. And their thirst for oil and gas and all other energy sources are causing the world's shortage.

We've never had competitors before. America has always been the big dog in the world marketplace. We've always been the big dog in the energy market. China will soon pass us in energy usage, and India is climbing fast.

And then you have all of developing South America. The developing world starts to use energy when they go from life on a desert, or nomad on a desert, to where they're living a life like we live. They use energy. They use electricity. They use heat. They use fuel in a vehicle. That's happening all over the world. So the demand for energy continues.

□ 1800

It is interesting. China has just made a deal with Cuba. They are going to be drilling 45 miles off the Florida coast and we can't drill within 200 miles. Does that make sense? Cuba and China will be producing oil 45 miles. Cuba is cutting deals with Canada, with Norway, and a number of other countries, I think maybe Russia, I am not sure on that one, but I know with China, where they are going to be producing oil actually within our 200-mile limit. They are

going to be producing oil where we can be producing oil, but we have chosen not to. We have chosen.

What does America want Congress to do? I think Americans want us to deal with the energy issue. They want available, affordable energy so they can heat their homes, they can drive to work and school, and they can live a decent life.

What does this Congress have on the table to deal with energy? Let's take a look.

These are some of the things that are in the energy bills that will be looked at in the House and the Senate. Does it produce more energy? No. We call it the "no energy bill." It locks up 9 trillion cubic feet of American natural gas. The Roan Plateau. Why? I don't know. It is prepared. It is ready to be produced. It is ready to take to market. But, no, this Congress is going to say, "That is off limits, too." This bill cuts off production from the Roan Plateau, a huge, clean natural gas field in Colorado that was set aside as a naval oil shale reserve in 1912 because of its rich energy resource. This means that 9 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, more than all the natural gas from the bill passed last year in the Gulf, off limits. It has already gone through the NEPA process. That is the Environmental Impact Statement, and they passed them. It is ready for lease sale. This provision was not in the original Natural Resources Committee bill but was added without hearings, without any input, any debate and very little discussion in Congress.

The next one, this one requires the redundant environmental studies to place a second well on existing oil and gas drilling pads. It really locks up 13 percent of the Federal onshore production of American natural gas. It guts the category exclusion provision from the Energy Policy Act of 2005, a provision I authored and I understand it. What it did was, NEPA is an act we have that you have to go through an environmental assessment to do anything. It takes almost a year to do this environmental assessment. I had people tell me in the West who had leased land, 5, 6 and 7 years ago and hadn't drilled a well yet because they were doing their fifth, six and seventh NEPA. They had to do a NEPA on the original plan. Then they had to do a NEPA where they were going to build the roads. Then they had to do a NEPA on every well site. Every time they turned a corner they had to do another NEPA, and they hadn't gotten a well drilled. It was being utilized to thwart energy production because they believed we shouldn't produce energy. So we took away the redundant NEPAs, and now they want to put them back.

Now, this one is really interesting. It locks up 2 trillion barrels of American oil from the western oil shale. What is western oil shale? This is an oil shale reserve in the West that some say has enough oil to supply us for several hundred years. We have to refine the proc-

ess of removing it from the shale rock that it is in. It is somewhat similar to what the Canadians have done with tar sands. They have been talking about tar sands in Canada since I was a kid as being a great oil reserve. They have worked at it to where now they are getting about 1½ million barrels a day. Their goal is soon to have, in some period of time, to have 4 million barrels a day. We are going to be the benefactor because we buy most of it, because we import a lot of oil. Thankfully, Canada produces a lot more than we do. They have worked at the tar sands with process to release that oil from those tar sands. It takes a lot of energy to do it. It takes a lot of natural gas to do it. They are fortunate. They have a lot of natural gas there, too, and they produce theirs. We don't produce ours. But we are going to lock up the shale oil. We are going to stop the production of it. We are going to stop the experiments of trying to get that shale oil so Americans can have some of their own oil and not have to pay foreign countries \$90 a barrel for it.

Do you know what is scary about \$90 oil? That is without a storm in the Gulf. It is without a dictatorship tipping over. It is without terrorist attacks. If any one of those happened tomorrow, if we have a storm in the Gulf, I had two energy experts tell me this morning, I said, "What will oil be?" They said, "\$120 a barrel if a major storm hits the Gulf that disrupts our refineries and disrupts our oil supply."

Folks, we are already in trouble. We better pray that we don't have a storm. We better pray that dictatorships stay stable. I don't know about you, but I am not comfortable with that. I am not comfortable with this process we are in. It also locks up 10 billion barrels of oil from the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. Why? Many of those oil reserves up there are tundra. They are frozen ground. There is little life. But we are saying we are not going to produce it. They want to produce it. The Alaskans beg to produce it. But Congress says "no." Legal offshore contracts are being thwarted. We have legislation moving because of contracts that had royalty incentives in them that they think are too low. Now, whether they are or not, Congress doesn't have the right to change legal contracts. The Clinton administration signed them. They are law. They are a contract. But that is part of our legislation.

This one is really crazy. There are a lot of Members of Congress that hate the oil companies. I won't say that I am in love with them. But a \$15 billion tax increase on the American oil and gas industry. When we tax the production of energy on our shores, that means we are less competitive and we are more likely to buy energy offshore.

And we will get to that chart in a minute. We are tremendously dependent on foreign energy. For us to tax, what they are doing was when we had the corporate tax cut for employers to

grow in this country, we had a 4 percent cut. They are taking that away. The manufacturer right down the street will pay 4 percent less tax than the guy who produces energy right up the street. I don't think that makes sense, because when you increase the taxation on energy, the users pay it. The gasoline price goes up. The fuel oil price goes up. The natural gas price goes up. We are taxing ourselves. And it seems to me \$90 oil is enough. Why do we want to tax it?

While they are trying to get at big oil, I have American Refinery, a little 10,000-barrel refinery in Bradford. It used to be Kendall Refining. They now pay the higher priced taxes. That was a company that we put together a few years ago. The State government helped them. When Kendall left us and we had a refinery and the Kendall brand got sold off to another company, and American Refinery, a smaller company came in and bought it, I used to say it was put together with chewing gum and rubber bands. But it worked. We now have 400, 500 employees there. They are a growing company. They have developed another brand. They are entrepreneurs. They are doing good. And we are going to make them pay higher taxes.

United Refinery in Warren, not big oil. But they provided the gasoline for most of New York State and Pennsylvania. They are going to pay 4 percent more now in income taxes. And who pays it? We do by raising the cost of energy.

Now this one down here I find frightening. There is nothing in the Democrats' bill about coal to liquid or coal to gas. It would seem like when we had 70 and \$80 oil, that was enough incentive that we ought to start figuring out how we make liquid energy out of coal. Not burn it; turn it into gas. There are processes to do that. In World War II, Germany fought us because we barricaded them. We didn't allow them to have oil shipments. They had to make their own energy. The Germans are pretty smart people. They figured out how to make it out of coal, the Fischer-Tropsch method and several other methods. Penn State has just developed a process to make jet fuel out of coal. Instead of us incentivizing and promoting energy from coal and liquids and gas so we learn how to do it so we get it streamlined, so we make it compete with oil, so we would be less dependent on 90 or \$100 oil. No, we are not going to do that because coal has CO<sub>2</sub>. We can't do anything that puts carbon in the air.

I said to some I was arguing with recently, well, let's start eight plants, and we will give them a dual role. We will say, "We want you to streamline the Fischer-Tropsch process and you streamline this process, and let's get it going. Your secondary mission will be to sequester the carbon and figure out how to deal with it. Let's practice. Let's get to work at it." No, we can't do that. Coal is out.

I see coal electric plants all over this country being turned down for permits. That is going to have a huge impact on electric prices because nuclear and coal are the cheapest electric prices we have. Coal to liquid should be something, and coal to gas should be things that we are incentivizing.

Now, the interesting one down here at the bottom, raises false expectations by mandating unrealistic 15 percent RPS. Now, what is RPS? It is renewable portfolio. It says that companies making electricity in America have to use 15 percent, they have to produce 15 percent of it from renewables. I am for that. But when you mandate it by law, and it is not achievable, what happens? They are going to pay penalties. Who is going to pay the penalties? The electric users. Or they are going to cheat. Currently we make 3 percent of our electricity from renewables, 3 percent. And we are going to mandate 15 percent.

Now, Pennsylvania has a mandate. But they were smart. They have waste coal. They use the cleanest process they know. But that is being included in their standards, renewable standards, using the waste coal where we clean up the environment when we get rid of that runoff from the coal piles. So Pennsylvania was smart. They are using it. Now, some States will be able to do it more so than others. But some States, if you have a lot of wind farms, the only States that come to mind with real sizable wind farms that produce any amount of wind energy is north Texas and North Dakota. They will be able to do some wind. Solar is still on the margins everywhere. We are hoping and praying solar becomes a bigger factor. But we are going to say that we have to produce 15 percent of electricity from renewables. I wish that was simple. But it is not.

Let's look for a moment at where our energy use is. Currently, 40 percent of our energy is petroleum. And 66 percent of that comes from foreign countries. A lot of them unstable dictatorships. Natural gas is now 23 percent and fast growing. Coal is 23 percent, and I say will soon be shrinking because Federal policies, Federal regulators and EPA are making it very difficult to permit a new coal plant. There are many Members of Congress who don't want new coal plants, even though they are using the newest, cleanest methods.

Nuclear is at 8 percent and shrinking because the amount of electricity is growing, but nuclear has been studied. Now, there are 35 plants starting the process of permitting. The 2005 act speeded up the process.

□ 1815

It used to take 10 years to get a permit. They have told them they have to do that in 4 years, then it takes another 4 to 5 years to build the plant. For a new nuclear plant to begin producing electricity, you're probably going to be looking at a minimum of 10 years. There's one, I think, that has a

complete application in; the rest are in the process. Now there are 35 that are in the process, and we need them all permitted by 2030 and built and producing electricity to keep nuclear at 8 percent of our grid, just to keep status quo. That means we are going to have to have more of something else. And if we don't meet that goal, we are going to have to have more of something else to replace nuclear.

Hydroelectric is 2.7 percent of our overall energy power. Nuclear is actually 20 percent of the grid, but 8 percent of overall. Hydroelectric is 2.7 percent. Again, a figure that is dropping because as energy use rises and it remains static, and there are many Members of Congress who want most of our dams in place torn down. When they tear a dam out, we lose hydroelectric power because they don't believe we should have ever built dams.

Now, the only energy field portfolio that is showing pretty steady growth is biomass. That surprises a lot of people. That is wood waste. This year more and more Americans will heat their homes with pellet stoves. Pellet stoves are saw dust, wood waste pressed into a pellet, put in a nice heating unit in your home. They can be put in fireplaces. More and more Americans, many use wood stoves, but they are now using pellet stoves. People who can't cut wood or don't have access to wood, and that is biomass, wood waste.

There are many companies in the wooded areas where there's a timber industry that heats their factories with wood waste because they have it. They take the old trash wood and they grind it up and they burn it. We have dry kilns in the timber industry. We used to run them all with natural gas. Now they can't afford to. They are putting in wood waste boilers.

In fact, I had a friend a couple of years ago when I saw gas prices rising, I said to him, How do you dry your wood? I knew they had two plants. They said, Well, we use natural gas. I said, Had you ever thought of putting wood waste? He said, No, why would we do that? I said, Well, natural gas is going to get pretty expensive.

Well, they had a little meeting about it and decided not to do it. A couple of months later they called me and said, How did you know gas prices were going up? I said, Well, I just knew it. They said, We got our new contract and our prices quadrupled and we can't afford to dry wood with gas anymore. But it took them a year to buy the equipment to put in a biomass burner.

There are many coal power plants who are topping off their load with wood waste so they get under the EPA standards, because wood burns a lot cleaner than many fuels. So the new hope for biomass is cellulosic ethanol. Now, that is still in the test tube. This administration is pushing six new plants. Even though it's still in the test tube, there are those who think they are close to the process.

Now, geothermal is one that we have high hopes for. That is where you use

groundwater temperature. You either pump water out of an aquifer and put it back after you take heat out of it, or take coal out of it; or you put in a big loop system and fill it with water and use the ground to cool and warm the water after you have used it.

Now, wind and solar are the ones we have tremendous hope for. Windmills are being talked about everywhere. Solar. What a lot of Americans don't realize is they are not ready to take over. We have a growth curve in the use of energy.

These renewables at the bottom people think can supply our future needs, and we don't need to drill and we don't need to use gas and we don't need to use coal. And most of them don't want nuclear either. This is what we have to use. I wish it was growing at the rate that it would fill the bill. I wish it was ready to take over. It's not. We are incentivizing, we are supporting, we are subsidizing; but it has to become where it will pay for itself somewhere down the road. Though it's growing, when you multiply wind by two, it takes years to double it; solar by two, it's still a very small part.

Let's just talk about where we get our oil, once again. We are actually higher than 60. We are up here at 66, because this is a 2-year-old chart. We are up here at 66. We are increasing dependence on foreign oil 2 percent a year. Now, if we pass the Democrat plan, I predict our only option, if we pass this plan and take gas off the table and oil off the table, we will increase 3 percent a year in the future.

Foreign dependence, unstable dictatorships: 90 percent of the world's oil is owned, produced and marketed by a government-owned oil company, a dictator. Our best friend ought to be Canada. We buy more oil from Canada than anybody, and we buy most of the 17 percent of our natural gas. We import I think about 15 percent of it comes from Canada. So we should be saying: Thank you, Canada.

But when it comes to oil dependence, and I hear people on the House floor talk all the time oil independence, we have got to be independent, there is no way in the next decade America could even conceive of being oil independent. Anybody who says that doesn't know the numbers, doesn't know the facts. At the same time, they say you can't drill out here and drill off the coast and you can't drill in the Midwest and Alaska, but we want to be energy independent, wind, solar and geothermal. I wish they were right, but they are not.

These are just the facts, folk. These aren't opinions; these are just the facts. Here's the supply of natural gas. Natural gas is becoming the choice fuel because we use it to make ethanol, we use it to make fertilizer to grow the corn to make ethanol, we use it to make hydrogen, we use it to make most of our products. I will show you that chart in a minute.

Natural gas is the one that is going to have tremendous pressure upon it.

It's the one that heats 58 percent of our homes. It's the fuel we ought to be the most concerned about. Why? It's not as bad price-wise today as oil. But when oil is \$90 a barrel, the whole world pays that, and so all our competitors that we compete with in the global marketplace pay that. But we have one of the highest prices for natural gas of any place in the world.

On this chart, there is \$1.85, \$4.90, \$1.65, and \$7.20 is about our price. Russia, \$1.50. But Trinidad is the one I am worried about. They are building every kind of manufacturing plant known to man in Trinidad. That is a very short shipping distance from the United States. If we think China is tough competition, wait until Trinidad starts making our bricks and our glass and our bulk commodities, because their natural gas prices are a fraction.

You know, I want the American working people to have a job. When we look at the next chart, we will see why natural gas is the one we should be most concerned about. Most people don't realize that natural gas is the feedstock for all these products. I don't mean that it is just the energy we use to make them. It is part of the ingredient.

I mentioned fertilizer a little bit ago. The fertilizer we grow corn with, one part of it is 70 percent natural gas. There is another one, I can't remember the name, some sort of ammonia, it is 90 percent natural gas. Natural gas is what we make it out of. So farmers are paying huge prices for energy, and in the last 2 years, 50 percent of our fertilizer business has gone offshore, and I find that very troubling. Whether it is household products, skin softeners are a derivative of natural gas, shampoos, pipe, clothing, plastic products, plastic bottles. All these products. Tires have natural gas to make them and natural gas as an ingredient.

It is the mother's milk of manufacturing in the world, and we are paying the highest prices for it of anybody in the world, and that puts American manufacturers and processors at a disadvantage. When oil is \$90, the whole world pays, unless they have their own. If they are buying oil, they pay it. But natural gas, there is not a world marketplace because you can't just ship it around.

We buy about 2 percent of our natural gas, liquefied natural gas, called LNG, that comes in large tankers. Unfortunately, it comes from the same parts of the world where we buy our oil: foreign, unstable dictatorships.

Folks, energy for America, affordable energy for America should be the number one issue in this Congress. It should be the number one issue on the White House's agenda. It should be the number one issue in the Senate's agenda. Affordable energy for America.

Why should it be in crisis mode? Any of the things we have talked about, whether we are opening up the Continental Shelf, whether we are opening up land in the Midwest, wherever we

are going to produce energy, whether we are going to do coal to liquids, whether we are going to do nuclear, all of those initiatives take 8 to 10 years before we have the energy to run America.

The longer we wait, the more trouble we are going to be in, because what is going to happen, it is my opinion, that Congress thinks little about America as a country that has to learn how to compete in the new global economy. The debate on being in the global economy is over. We are a global economy. We trade with everybody. We have to compete. There are developing countries everywhere, and we have to sharpen our tools, we have to sharpen our competitiveness, we have to help our manufacturers stay alive in this country.

The first thing we ought to do is give them decent energy prices, less litigation, better tax laws. You tax jobs because that is what you tax when you tax business. A lot of people say, we are just taxing business. Well, businesses are jobs. I was talking to a gentleman, a Member of the House the other day, I was talking about a cost to business we were debating about, and he said, they have got lots of money; they can pay for that.

I said, sir, they have choices. Do they grow this plant here, or do they grow this plant over here where costs are less?

They are going to grow that plant and their production where costs are less. It is a competitive world. They have to compete with competitors. And Congress needs to make priority number one helping American job makers, help American businesses compete. And that means affordable energy, legal reforms, tax cuts for business, regulatory reform to be fair to business, help our companies make sure they have the skilled workers they need with technology education, which we are terrible at in this country. We are a failure. We are one of the worst, teaching the working people the new skills they need.

It used to be 50 percent of Americans had to show up at a plant and within 6 weeks they knew their job and had a good job for the rest of their life. Not true today. Today you need to have skills, a set of skills that are certified with some sort of a 1-year or 2-year certificate that says, yes, he or she has this ability and she can provide this company with the skills they need to compete in the global marketplace.

America is being challenged, my friends. We are being challenged by fast-growing nations who have plans on action. On the energy side, China is opening a coal plant every 5 days. They are opening a new nuclear plant every month. They are building the biggest hydro-dams in the world. They are locking up oil and gas supplies all around the world. And we sit here and do not have a plan of action.

The 2005 energy bill had a lot of good pieces in it, and I want to congratulate

all of those that created it and got it passed. It took like 4 years to pass it because this Congress didn't want to deal with energy. But, folks, it is not enough. It was just the starter. It was just the primer.

We are now challenged with a world shortage of energy. America must figure out how to have their own. Now, I agree, we have to conserve more. We have to use it more wisely. We have to teach Americans how to be careful and not waste energy. And we need to help small businesses be energy efficient, like big businesses.

Big businesses are cutting their energy bills. I have been told by many of them, they say we cut our energy bills 20 percent the last 4 years. But you know what? Energy costs us more, because energy prices are going up faster now.

□ 1830

And they were discouraged because they had worked so hard. Big business has the ability to figure out the cheapest way to do it, but many Americans don't understand and we need as a government to provide the technology and the education so that people know how to use energy wisely and purchase energy-efficient appliances and energy-efficient cars. We need to conserve.

But folks, we also need to have affordable energy to run this country. Folks, America is at the crossroads. Today it is \$90 oil. Two weeks ago I was here, it was \$80 oil. I didn't expect this. I predicted that energy prices would rise steadily this fall. I didn't think they would spike. We haven't had a storm in the Gulf which we were afraid of, we haven't had a country topple, which can cause 2 or 3 million barrels a day to come out of the system. We haven't had a terrorist attack which interrupted oil supply.

But in spite of that, we have fast-rising oil prices. If we couple that with any of the three I just mentioned, we have \$100-\$120 oil. I can guarantee you this country cannot afford \$100 a barrel for oil and stay competitive and have a thriving economic base. We will go into the tank. We will be in a recession, and this Congress needs to take this issue seriously.

You know what bothers me in the Presidential debate, and I listened to two Presidential debates. The press asks the questions, and so I blame the press. The press doesn't take this issue seriously. The press doesn't understand this issue very well. If they did, they would be asking every Presidential candidate in every forum: What is your energy policy for affordable, available energy for America?

I haven't committed to a Presidential candidate yet because I don't see a candidate that has a good, well thought-out energy policy for America. That will be the issue the next President has to deal with because the Congress in the last decade, we have not adequately dealt with energy's availability and affordability for America.

Without a crisis, without a storm in the Gulf, we have \$90 a barrel oil, and it hit \$92 today. I am going to conclude my comments this evening with America needs a bona fide energy plan. We need to open up the Outer Continental Shelf where we are energy rich.

My legislation opens it up for natural gas, and I hope we can get it considered. I will conclude with that chart. Our bill says that the first 25 miles remain locked up, and you can only see for 11 to 12 miles, so nobody will even see it. It will not hurt the shoreline. It won't be unsightly. The second 25 miles are options of the State. If they want to open it, they can. The second 50 miles are open automatically for natural gas, but the States still have the right to close it if they choose to. By passing a law with the Governor's signature, they can keep it closed for the first 100 miles. The second 100 miles it is open. That is a pretty soft bill. That is not what I would like to do, but that is what I hope to coax this Congress into doing so we do something for natural gas.

We will give \$150 billion in royalties to the States, \$100 billion for the treasury, \$32 billion for renewable energy. That's real money to help renewables; not promises, real money; \$32 billion for carbon capture sequestration research, and that can come from the payments of royalties; \$20 billion to clean up the Chesapeake Bay, exactly what they have been needing; \$20 billion to clean up the Great Lakes restoration, exactly what they have been needing; \$12 billion for the Everglades; \$12 billion for the Colorado River basin; \$12 billion for the San Francisco Bay restoration; and \$10 billion to help the poorest of Americans winterize their homes and pay their heating bills in the wintertime.

Folks, the NEED Act is the act Congress needs to pass. We have 160-some cosponsors. It is bipartisan. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is my co-partner on this bill. It is the bill that America needs to have in its energy package, but neither the House nor Senate are talking about it.

On top of natural gas and offshore, we need to have a plan for nuclear, the expansion of nuclear in America. We need to have a plan where we are moving forward with coal to liquids and coal to gas. We need to have a plan where we push wind and solar and all renewables. And yes, we should look at many dams we have that are not harnessed, harnessing them for hydro. There are many dams in America that could be harnessed for hydro.

And yes, we need to do ethanol and biodiesel and cellulosic ethanol. Landfill gas should never be flared. It should all be plugged into the energy pipeline. We need to get serious about not wasting energy in America, conserving energy in America, and producing energy for Americans that is affordable and available so this winter they can afford to heat their homes, they can afford to run their businesses, and the jobs will not be pushed offshore.

High energy prices have pushed more jobs offshore than any other fact that this Congress talks about. And energy has the potential of pushing almost every manufacturing and processing job that is left in America offshore if we don't deal with the energy issue. Energy is a crisis for the future economic viability of America.

I challenge this Congress, both bodies and the White House, to get serious about it. Affordable, available energy for America, we could do no more. That's the least we can do to make sure Americans have the quality of life that they should have, they have a right to, and they deserve.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. DAVIS of California (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of San Diego wildfires.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 3:45 p.m.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a death in the family.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2 p.m.

Mr. DREIER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of inspecting wildfire damage in California with the President.

Mr. MCHENRY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 1 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 3 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HIRONO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, November 1.

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, November 1.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, for 5 minutes, October 30.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 995. An act to amend Public Law 106-348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 29, 2007, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3879. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7989] received October 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3880. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Commercial Equipment: Distribution Transformers Energy Conservation Standards; Final Rule [Docket No. EE-RM/STD-00-550] (RIN: 1904-AB08) received October 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3881. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations [Docket No. 2000n-1596] received October 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3882. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Polydextrose [Docket No. 2006F-0059] received September 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3883. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee; Risk Communication Advisory Committee; Establishment — received October 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3884. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Designation of Oripavine as a Basic Controlled Substance