

other, five deep on either side of the road, people standing there with one hand over their hearts, the other hand holding an American flag, and tears being shed at every corner. It was a remarkable tribute from a remarkable city to a remarkable young man.

Sergeant Nicholas Patterson of Rochester was killed on September 10 in an accident while his team was returning from a raid in western Baghdad. Like many people in the Army, Nick was a spectacular athlete. A 2001 graduate of Rochester High School, he led his basketball team in scoring his senior year, and in Indiana that is quite an accomplishment. He played second base for the baseball team, proudly wearing number 10 in both sports. His former teacher, Rob Malchow, said, "Nick had such an outgoing personality. He had so much energy, you couldn't help but get to know him." When he joined the Army, shortly after graduation from high school, he set his sights on becoming a paratrooper. He was thrilled to become a member of the storied 82nd Airborne Division, and treasured the camaraderie of his men and his brothers. His widow, Jayme, said Nick was "very, very proud to be part of the unit he was in." Nick described it as a high-speed team. Fellow soldier Sergeant Blake Bagbay noted, "Nick could always be counted on to pick you up and make you smile. His concern for his fellow soldiers and his friends will be missed by all."

Nick and Jayme shared their loved with their 4-year-old son, Reilly, and he valued the daily contact with his family by phone, e-mail, and even Web cam from Iraq. He made sure to e-mail Jayme every day, and the last thing he said in every e-mail he sent to her were the three words, "I love you."

He was close to his dad, Jim, whom he affectionately called Pops. Father and son shared a love of the Chicago Cubs, a difficult passion under any circumstances, the Indianapolis Colts, IU basketball, and fishing in Nyona Lake.

Everyone in Nick's family continues to mourn his loss; his mom and stepdad Jane and Scott Holmes, his stepmom Virginia Patterson, sister Tai Johnson, and stepbrother Kyle McLochlin, as well as the entire close-knit community of Rochester.

Mr. Speaker, our most recent loss in Indiana's Second Congressional District occurred less than 2 weeks ago when Army Captain Tim McGovern of Idaville, Indiana was killed October 31 while serving in Mosul, Iraq. Tim was leading his troops in a mission clearing the roads of IEDs when his group came under fire and his truck was hit by a roadside bomb.

After moving to Idaville as a teen, Tim graduated from Twin Lakes High in 1997, where he excelled in honors classes and was a star in both football and track. Even at that point, it was clear what Tim was going to do with his life, as his former football coach commented: This young man was made for the Army. "It didn't surprise me at

all when he joined the Armed Forces and also when he became an officer. That was just the kind of guy he was, born to lead."

It probably didn't surprise anyone, for a career in the Army was in Tim's blood. Just a year before he graduated from high school, his dad, Bill, retired from the Army having achieved the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Tim started on that path immediately following high school when he joined ROTC while attending Purdue University. Less than 2 years after his graduation from Purdue in 2001, Tim set off to serve the first of his two tours of duty in Iraq. He was on his very first tour when the war in Iraq started, and when he came home he did not hesitate to do another, according to his Uncle Mike.

Although Tim was in the process of buying a home in El Paso, Texas, his heart remained with his family in Idaville and with the Chicago Bears. During his second duty in Iraq, Tim was given a 2-week pass to return home to the United States. He made sure to return home for the Super Bowl, and Tim's parents will never forget the very last moments they spent at home with their beloved son. "Tim was a Bears fan from the word go," his mom Jonell said. "In Indiana, he was one of the very few rooting for the Bears. He and his grandfather together. That is going to stay in our minds forever."

But if his heart was with his family, his passion and purpose was with the Army. As captain of a 90-member company, Tim showed exemplary dedication to his duties and to the safety and well-being of his men. His mom noted, "Tim said the thing he was most proud of was that he had never sent anybody home injured, and that nobody had been killed from his group. To him, that meant he was doing his job and taking care of his men." Safety did not mean staying away from where the action was in his area.

He assumed command of Company E from Captain Tim Hudson, who observed, "We both chose to go to El Paso and Fort Bliss, and we both came here for the same reason; and that was to come out here and command soldiers, keep an eye out for them and protect them and bring them home safely."

Having commanded Company E for 20 months, Captain Hudson could only praise Tim's work upon assuming command in June. "I put my heart and soul into this company," Hudson said, "and after Tim took over, Echo Company only got better."

What was Tim's secret to being such an excellent commander? He may well have shared it with First Lieutenant Michael Holbrook. "He told me there was no greater honor than leading American soldiers. I am going to remember that until the day I hang up my uniform."

The button Shawn Hensel's mother, Beth, wore after his death said, "Our hero, 1987 to 2007." Our hero. This is

most certainly what Shawn was and is now. This is what all of these men are to all of us in this country.

We are used to speaking of young men as having lives full of promise and possibility, but all of these young men put their promise and possibility on the line in service to their country. For that, we honor them as heroes.

But we are also left with their absence. Nicholas Patterson's dad, Jim, expressed the paradox well. "I am so proud. He is my hero. But it hurts so much." This is the truth for those families, for all of those that love these young men and so many more in our country. By their sacrifice, these men and the women who share duty with them are all heroes. But that does not erase the pain of all of us who mourn their loss.

When President Dwight D. Eisenhower called upon all the citizens of the United States to observe the first Veterans Day in 1954, he gave the following instruction, "On that day let us solemnly remember the sacrifices of all those who fought so valiantly, on the seas, in the air, and on foreign shores, to preserve our heritage of freedom, and let us reconsecrate ourselves to the task of promoting an enduring peace so that their efforts shall not have been in vain."

Mr. Speaker, today I have done my duty to remember those who have fought so valiantly this past year, and those from northern Indiana who made the ultimate sacrifice for our great Nation. Having honored America's veterans, having honored those who gave their lives, may we all remember our duty as national leaders to promote a peace both enduring and just.

At this time, I would like to conclude by saying how grateful we are to have had them with us during their brief lives, and we will never forget them. God bless America.

AMERICA'S ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again on this House floor to talk about an issue that I think is the most important issue that this Congress should be dealing with and that this administration should be dealing with.

Six short years ago, we had \$2 natural gas and \$16 oil. Most of our lifetime we have had gas that was less than \$2 per thousand and oil that was around \$8, \$9, or \$10 a barrel. That is how America grew, cheap, affordable energy. Now, we have lots of other sources of energy, coal, hydro, wind, solar, renewables of all kinds, but the majority of our transportation fuel has always been oil. Four weeks ago, I rose to speak on this House floor. Oil was \$82, and most of us were panicked. Can our economy handle \$82 oil?

Just a few months ago, I met with an Assistant Secretary of State whose role is to deal with energy. He shared

with me that he and many of his colleagues felt that \$70 to \$75 oil would really put us in recession because the economy could not absorb those costs. It didn't. Then, we were at \$82. Two weeks ago, we were at \$90.92. Last week we were at \$94.53. And, at one point it was 98-something. Today it is \$91.92. Can America's economy continue to afford \$90 to \$100 oil? I think there are many who are very concerned.

I know that the poorest among us, the average American who spends every dollar they earn every week, and sometimes with the use of a credit card maybe a couple dollars they didn't earn that week hoping to catch up later. And with the winter heating season coming on, you would think this body and someone would be debating energy. Four weeks ago, there was no energy debate on this floor; three weeks ago, there was no energy debate on this floor; last week, there was no energy debate on this floor. And there is a little rumble that there could be an energy debate on this floor, but most people don't think so.

Record high heating oil prices; winter is coming. Record high diesel prices for our truckers who move our goods across this country; winter is coming. Gas prices are on the rise. We have a mortgage crisis, everybody is talking about it. Is the mortgage crisis equal on the impact on America that high energy prices will have? No. Is it important? Yes. No discussion about energy for America.

We passed a House bill some time ago. They passed a Senate bill some time ago. No conference committee has met. We have heard rumblings that a few staffs have met, but no sense of urgency.

I cannot understand for one minute why energy isn't the number one issue facing this Congress, available, affordable energy to maintain our economic base, people to heat their homes, people to drive to work, and to have a few dollars left for food.

□ 2215

Now, we've done a few things. The Speaker sometime a few months back made a declaration that we would stop heating a portion of the complex here with coal and we would use natural gas. And that was because of the concern of the carbon, the CO₂, the carbon footprint.

Now, we didn't do anything to put double pane glass in any of the windows in the Capitol or all the surrounding office buildings. They're all single pane. I'm not saying it was right or wrong to switch to natural gas. It costs the taxpayers another \$3 to \$4 million. But it didn't do anything to conserve energy. We could have put double pane glass on all the buildings in the complex and saved millions of dollars in energy for America.

Oh, we also mandated with recent legislation that all bulbs in the Capitol complex will be the new fluorescent bulb that screws in. I have some of

those at home. My wife doesn't like them. I don't like them in a place where I read a lot. They're not quite as clear, bright, and some of them buzz, vibrate a little.

But the unfortunate part is we mandated them here; those are all made in China. No American jobs. And I have the largest incandescent light bulb plant left in my district in St. Mary's, Pennsylvania.

What are others doing about energy? Well, the one that's leading the world in the fight for energy is China. They're building a coal electric plant every 5 days. They're building a nuclear plant every month. They're building the largest hydro-dams in the world as we speak. They're buying up rights to oil and gas and other forms of energy all over the world. In fact, they've just developed a pact with Cuba. Less than 50 miles off the Florida coast, with Norway and Canada and a number of other partners, they're going to be producing oil and gas right off our coast, while we prohibit offshore drilling.

China and India, the two new giants that are our competition, are increasing their energy use between 15 and 20 percent annually, and they're out securing it. In fact, that's the real reason for the price run-up.

I have a chart here that shows, that I've been using for the last 6 to 8 months and no longer does it work. It doesn't go high enough; 90's up in here. So I'm going to take it down because really it's no longer applicable.

Now, here's what's happened in just a year. In 11 months we've gone from \$58.31 to a high of \$96.65 on the day this was used in a press conference last week. It actually hit 90-some later that day. But no energy around here about doing something about energy. I find it unbelievable.

What does America want Congress to do? They want available, affordable energy to heat their homes, to run their vehicles, and to power the places they work. Companies who make steel use a lot of energy. Companies who make aluminum use a lot of energy. Petrochemicals, polymers and plastics, 45 to 55 percent of the cost of all of them is energy. Fertilizer that we grow our corn and our wheat and our crops with, 70 percent of the cost is natural gas, energy.

And while we have these skyrocketing prices that have Americans afraid because this \$90 oil is not \$3.09 gasoline, which is the price at the pump where I buy, it will soon be \$3.39, \$3.49, \$3.59. In some parts of the country it already is.

This spring we had \$3.09 gasoline with \$63 oil. How did that happen?

Well, oil companies don't set the price. We like to blame them, but they don't set the price. Wall Street sets the price. And there was a shortage of gasoline because Americans don't realize it, but we don't produce enough gasoline in America for Americans.

Twenty percent of our gasoline now comes from Europe. Europe has an ex-

cess of gasoline because they switched to diesel in their cars. Many of their cars and trucks are diesel so they have an excess capacity of gasoline, so they ship it over here in ships.

This spring they used more than usual, for some reason, and they didn't have enough to supply us, so we had a gasoline shortage in Europe and America, and the prices were extremely high. And so with \$63 oil we had \$3.09 gasoline. So you don't have to be a very good mathematician to know that \$92, \$95, \$96 oil doesn't equate to \$3.09 again. It'll be much higher. It's just a matter of a few days and weeks until that little extra gasoline that's in the marketplace from the summer gets utilized.

Well, what is Congress doing?

Let's take a look at not what should we be doing, but what are we doing. And we're not even meeting on this for some reason. Maybe that's good. Many of us stood on this House floor a few months back and debated this energy bill and tried to get amendments into this bill, but it was pretty well locked up. There were very few chances for amendment in the energy debate in Congress. But here's what it does. It locks up 9 trillion cubic feet of American natural gas. That's the Roan Plateau, a huge clean natural gas fill in Colorado that was set aside as the oil shale reserves in 1912, because of its rich energy resources.

And this legislation means that 9 trillion cubic feet of natural gas will not be available to us. It's already went through the NEPA. That's the environmental assessments. It's passed all those. It's ready for lease.

This provision was not in the original bill, but it was stuck in at the last minute, in the dark of the night. Suddenly when the bill came to the floor, not from committee, but somewhere down the line, in Rules or somewhere else, they slipped this in and removed the best potential onshore gas for America from being able to be produced.

The next part here is, I was responsible in the 2005 energy act for taking away redundant NEPA studies. NEPA studies are an important part of our environmental assessment for everything we do. It's about a year-long process. But abuse of the NEPA studies was to the point of where people would lease oil and gas in America and 5, 6, 7 years later we're still not able to produce it because of NEPA study after NEPA study. They do a NEPA study for the project, then they do a NEPA study for the roads, then they do a NEPA study for the well layout, and then a NEPA study for every well. And this process is a year-long process, a paperwork process that wasn't about the environment. It's about stopping the production of energy successfully. So we took away the redundant waste, and they want to put them back.

The next one's probably the worst. There's huge reserves in the West called western oil shale. It's even

greater than in Canada's tar sands. This oil shale has up to 2 trillion barrels. Now, we need to figure out how to produce it environmentally in a sound fashion. There are companies preparing to do that. But this legislation would say no to shale oil.

When we have \$100 oil and we're dependent on foreign unstable countries for 66 percent of our oil, increasing 2 percent a year, and if this bill passes here, it'll be 3 percent a year or 4, why would we lock up the shale oil in the West? It makes no sense to me.

National reserve in Alaska. Locking up another 10 billion barrels of oil. Making sense? No, it doesn't make sense. Alaska's a huge place. The Alaskans want to produce energy. We know how to produce energy cleanly today. But this bill that's been proposed in both the House and the Senate will remove.

It also breaches contracts, which I think will lose in the courts.

But the one down here that really makes no sense, and it's talking about taxing Big Oil. Big Oil produces a small percentage of our energy; 60, 70, 80 percent of our energy is produced by little companies. I have two refineries in my district, United Refinery in Warren, American Refiners in Bradford. This bill will force them to pay higher taxes than any other business in America. That will increase the price of energy, and when you make American production of energy more costly than offshore production of energy, you're going to get more foreign dependent. Does that make sense? I don't think so.

Now, we were talking earlier tonight about how many times they've spent that in the appropriations process. I thought it was four or five. Someone said three or four. But many, many bills have been funded with this tax.

Now, the next one does nothing for coal to liquids or coal to gas. Everybody knows I'm the big proponent of offshore, and I'm going to talk about it a little later. But there's huge potential in America of using coal in the traditional way, but also using coal to make liquids, jet fuel, gasoline, fuel oil, and coal to make gas. And some of the new processes, they want to make gas out of coal and then burn the cast to make electricity in a clean way. But to make that work, we've got to fund some of those and get them online, get the bugs out, help industry make this a productive way to use coal in a cleaner way for the environment. But there's great resistance in this Congress to do anything with coal because we're now in the carbon debate.

Now, I guess, the carbon argument is still out there. Many Americans believe CO₂ is a poisonous gas and it's causing global warming and it's a crisis. I think the crisis is available, affordable energy. And as we go coal to liquid or coal to gas, we can do it in a manner that deals with developing the process to make coal to liquids and coal to gas affordable and in a way that we capture the carbon and then use it

in another form. That should all be part of the original projects. But, no, we're finding coal plants not permitted all over this country. They're closing the door on coal. And we are the Saudi Arabia of coal. In my view, they're really trying to eliminate coal as one of our energies. And as I'll show you later, that won't work.

And then at the bottom down here, there's a mandate that's part of this legislation in the House version. And it sounds good. And I wish it was doable. And later on some charts I'll show you why it's not, that electricity, 15 percent of electricity being produced by renewables, but not allowed to count hydro. And as I show my charts later, I'll come back to that.

But it doesn't appear in the next 30 years there's any way to do that yet. Twenty States have passed laws and Congress is wanting to pass one that will severely limit what can be counted, but forcing States to produce companies in the whole country to produce 15 percent of electricity from renewables, and if they don't accomplish that then they're going to be fined. And who's the fine going to be paid for? By the electric users. We're going to pay as we pay for more expensive electricity. But it'll still be generated the same old way.

Now, if it was doable, I would say let's take the carrot-stick approach. Let's put some inducements, some incentives for producing electricity with renewables.

Here's our current use of energy. And of course, petroleum, 40 percent; natural gas, 23 percent; coal, 23 percent. Now, natural gas has had the fastest growth because about 12 years ago we took away the prohibition of using natural gas to make electricity. We didn't used to allow them to do that, only in the morning and the evening when you have that extra surge, when we're cooking and washing and doing the home duties and the factories are running too. We need more electricity than we do any other time of the day, so we had gas peaking plants because you can turn them off and you can turn them on.

Seven or 8 percent of our electricity was natural gas. Now in a short period of time we're up to 23 percent, and that's why we have the highest natural gas prices in the world, which are driving major industries out of this country, and I'll talk about that a little more later.

Nuclear, 8 percent. We need all 35 plants that have asked for a permit to expand or build a new nuclear plant to be permitted and built in the next 20 years or this 8 percent figure will continue to shrink, because as electric use goes up, everything on here has to go up or that percentage will go down. We know hydro's going to go down because we sure aren't going to build another dam. In fact, they keep taking dams out. Biomass is the only one that's really shown some growth.

□ 2230

Biomass is woody waste, any kind of fiber, and what's really growing there is that wood waste used to be a throw-away item. Sawdust was something you just got rid of. Now it burns in factories to heat the factories. I come from a heavily wooded area, the best hardwood forest in America. We dry most of our wood now in the dry kilns with wood waste. And a million Americans are heating their homes with pellet stoves made out of dry sawdust. And they are trying to now the expand of the use of them into biomass stoves where any kind of waste material that can burn cleanly could be made into a pellet and can be burned like corn stoves. There are a lot of corn stoves now, but with the surge of ethanol, corn has become quite expensive and is no longer as viable a fuel as it was but it is still being used in biomass stoves and in corn stoves.

Geothermal, not really much growth. A good, efficient way to heat a home. It's costly in the beginning. I know people who have used geothermal, and when they build a new home, they go with geothermal because they are familiar with it. And it is a less costly way to heat your home, especially in milder climates, than traditional fuels.

Then we come to the hope of the future: wind and solar. Unfortunately for many, people think that the renewables here can trickle. They bring petroleum down, coal down, nuclear down. I wish that were true. But I will show you now the chart of what the Energy Department says about the future, and that's this chart in a different way because this chart is about history; this chart is about history and the future. The left half of this chart is history. There is a line here in the middle. This is use in the past; this is use in the future, projected.

Now, I don't totally agree with the Energy Department. I think natural gas will grow and I think coal will decrease for the reasons I just mentioned. The carbon issue is going to decrease coal until we find clean ways to use coal, and we are working on those. But there is great resistance for coal. I don't agree with it. And there is a lot of reluctance in nuclear. I don't agree with that either because we need it too. But I look for natural gas to grow and oil probably to just chug along. Now, \$95, \$100, \$120 oil may decrease oil, but I don't know what we are going to replace it with because we are not doing coal to liquids, which could replace oil. We are not going to run our cars with nuclear. We are not going to run them with hydro. We could run a lot of them with natural gas.

Natural gas, in my view, is the fuel, the clean, green fuel, that's underestimated in this country. And we cannot ever be in control of our oil needs. We don't have enough. But natural gas we have lots of. And we will talk now about how we have locked it up.

First, I want to talk about what natural gas prices have done to manufacturing, manufacturing employment. As

gas prices have risen, manufacturing has decreased. Natural gas is the fuel that we use to run this country. And for the last number of years, we have had the highest natural gas prices in the world.

Here is how fast they have risen. And now we are back up between \$7 and \$8. During the winter, we will be back to \$8 and \$9. Now, that's from the well head; that's not the price people pay. So these figures are costs from out of the ground. But America's natural gas prices, historically we were down here under \$2, and we were very competitive in the world. But in these years since this rise, we have not been competitive. And in China and India natural gas prices are half of ours. And South America, a buck something; Russia, less than a dollar. Our competition in the global marketplace have much cheaper natural gas prices. And that's a problem for America. Here's the reason why:

Now, there is also a chart I have. I don't have it with me, with some big circles in here, and these are areas where there are lots of gas and oil. But they are locked up. Why? We are the only country in the world that has chosen to lock up our gas and oil. The only country in the world, offshore and onshore. Even with \$95 oil and \$8 and \$9 gas, we're locking it up.

Twenty-seven years ago, Congress, in its wisdom, prohibited the production of energy offshore in these areas. Canada produces, Great Britain produces, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Australia, New Zealand, all environmentally sensitive countries, they produce offshore. We talk about Brazil being energy independent because of ethanol. Ethanol was just a piece of it. They also went out offshore and produced oil and gas and became energy independent, and they don't have to buy this expensive energy from anybody. They have their own.

America could be self-sufficient on natural gas. We could fuel a third of our auto fleet, all short-haul vehicles, all short-haul trucks, all construction vehicles if it was affordable, more affordable than oil and gasoline. It is cleaner burning, no SO₂, no NO_x, a third of the CO₂, if that's giving you gray hair. But for some reason, here's what natural gas is used for. People just have no idea. And ladies, natural gas is the derivative of the skin softeners we all love. I have dry skin. I use skin softeners on my hands every day. I inherited that from my father. All of these products, natural gas is not only used to make them; it's an ingredient: polymers, plastics, tires, carpet. Look at these products. Insulation in our houses. Huge amounts of natural gas. Feedstocks, ethane, propane, butane to make steam, to make power. All of these are feedstocks. And if we go to our hydrogen society, which we are all hopeful in hydrogen, how do we make hydrogen? The only way we have portable to make it is from natural gas.

Natural gas should be the bridge to America's renewable future. Natural

gas is the clean fuel. And for us to lock our supply of natural gas in this country up makes no public policy sense. Natural gas has never washed up on a shore. We had an oil spill in San Francisco. It wasn't an oil well; it was a ship. There are ships everywhere that could spill oil. Every moving ship in the waterways, on a lake, a river, a dam, or the ocean spill oil from their engines every day. But we won't drill for it and we won't drill for clean natural gas that doesn't have oil, that isn't oil. I think we should be producing both. But natural gas is the vital part of our future.

We have a bill that we now have 170-some sponsors for but have not been able to get it considered yet. Now, our bill is a bill that gives a lot of States rights. Our bill will say the first 25 miles, and I don't theoretically agree with it, but I have agreed with it to try to get it passed, the first 25 miles is closed, period. You only can see 11 or 12, so nobody is ever going to see a gas well. The next 25 miles it is up to the States. They choose whether they want to produce energy. Their legislature decides. If they want out under the moratorium, they can choose to be out. The second 50 mile is automatically open, but, again, States have a right to pass a bill and have it signed by their Governor to keep it locked up. So Congress could open it, but they can close it back up with just a State-passed legislation. Then the second 100 miles, the OCS, Outer Continental Shelf, is from 3 miles, which is now controlled by the States, to 200 miles. I'm giving the States total control of the first 25 and saying you can't drill. The second 25, you can drill if you have the wisdom to. And the second 50, you can drill unless you have the foolish attitude that you don't want to produce natural gas.

This bill would bring in billions to producing States because of the royalties, \$100 billion for the Treasury. Now, we have set-aside funds. We talk about renewable energy. This bill, the NEED Act, would put \$32 billion in the coffers for energy research, clean, green energy research; \$32 billion for carbon capture and sequestration research to teach us how to burn coal and other fuels and capture the carbon. This isn't talk. This is real money that would put \$32 billion to research that.

And we have some spoils of the past that we need to clean up. They have been trying for a long time to get \$20 billion to clean up Chesapeake Bay. This bill would provide it. There is \$20 billion for Great Lakes restoration because when we first started this country, we used the Great Lakes as a depository for our waste of all kinds. Wrong. We don't do that anymore. This would give them the money they have been looking for for the Great Lakes group to clean up. And \$12 billion for Everglades restoration. I saw a complaint the other day that this year's bill didn't give the Everglades as much as usual. This would give them mandatory spending right out of the energy

bill. Also, \$12 billion for the Colorado basin restoration, \$12 billion for the San Francisco Bay cleanup, and \$10 billion for LIHEAP and weatherization. You haven't heard any energy debates on this floor, but I'm going to tell you in a few weeks when people start paying high energy bills to heat their homes, you're going to hear a lot of LIHEAP debates on this bill where people are going to say \$2 billion isn't enough, \$3 billion isn't enough, \$4 billion isn't enough. We need more money because people can't heat their homes. They can't heat their homes because Congress has locked up energy and caused energy prices to be unaffordable not only for homeowners but for the businesses that provide the jobs for the people. If America doesn't get a handle on energy prices, we won't have working people's jobs in this country. We won't have a petrochemical industry. We won't have a polymers and plastics industry. We won't do anything like making steel or aluminum or bending it or shaping it. It will all be done offshore where energy is much cheaper and labor is much cheaper and environmental standards don't exist. America cannot be the strong country that we grew up in if we don't have available, affordable energy.

I plead with this Congress, energy needs to be the number one issue facing this country. Affordable, available energy so we can run this country, so people can live their lives in a normal fashion and have jobs and we can compete.

I think America faces a challenge that it has never faced before. We have always been the big dog. We have always been the giant. We have always been able to handle competition. But we have people today that are building economic bases and they are building the energy support systems to run them. America is going to starve itself of affordable energy by choice because we locked up onshore, offshore major supplies of energy and we didn't allow the adequate trial on coal to liquids and coal to gas and we've had great resistance to nuclear and the undue hope that renewables are the answer.

□ 2245

I wish they were, but let's go back to that chart.

The first half is history. The second half is projection. I don't totally agree with it. Let's say renewable estimates are wrong. Let's say they're 100 percent wrong, and they're going to be twice as much. They still won't hardly be 10 or 11 percent of the energy needed for this country. And our energy growth is going up percentages every year. If we doubled this for renewables, if we tripled it, we would be lucky to keep up with the energy growth. We would still need all of this. And we have people in this Congress thinking we don't need oil; they won't support gas, they won't support coal, they won't support nuclear because we want this.

Yes, we want this, but how do we get this? How do we get that? When wind

and solar are just fractions, and geothermal are just fractions. They're good, they're good sources, they're clean, they're green, they're pure.

You know, we have a lot of groups in this country, I can just think of a few, Greenpeace, Sierra Club, and the PIRGs and the League of Conservation Voters and the Environmental Defense Fund, and more. These organizations are opposed to all of these. They grade legislators badly if you support the use of them and the production of them. They would all rate me badly because I know we need this to run this country. If we could run it on these, I would be for it, but we can't. We need to try to grow these, we need to try to get into a hydrogen society, we need to try to do every kind of renewable there is; but at the same time, we must produce oil, natural gas, coal and nuclear to run this country because that's what has run it, and it's what will run it for the next 30 years, according to the Energy Department.

Let's say they're wrong. I think they're off on natural gas. I think the use of gas is going to explode because of the carbon debate, because the carbon debate is going to cause us to shut down coal, not permit new coal plants, not allow us to do coal-to-liquid or coal-to-gas, which would be a clean way to use coal; but they're not even going to let us experiment.

The administration is pushing celulosic ethanol. That's good and fine, but I keep arguing with them, we need to be experimenting with clean coal technologies and liquids and gas from coals because we have it. Other countries have done it. We just need to know how to do it in a cost-effective way and then try to, if carbon is the big issue, secure the carbon. And if we passed the NEED Act, we would have the money to do it.

Energy availability and affordability will depend on whether America is a competitive Nation. If this Congress doesn't wake up out of its slumber, if it doesn't wake up and realize that affordable and available energy, and I understand why they're asleep. All of our lifetime there has been lots of energy, and it's been cheap, cheap, cheap. It's not cheap anymore, it's expensive and going to get more expensive.

Available, affordable energy will slowly shut this country's economic base down. And the working people of America that don't have white collar jobs, that go to work and make things, as we try to get back into the growth of nuclear, the new plants that are being designed, the bases of them, the big, huge cast bases will be shipped here in a ship from Japan because we no longer have a casting plant big enough to make them.

Much of the high-tech parts of our nuclear plants will be built in Germany because we haven't built them in a long time and we've lost our capacity. I say down the road, how do we defend our country? How do we build the jets and the planes, the tanks and the

equipment, the sophisticated equipment? We're going to be buying the parts from foreign countries, who may not even be our friends, built by foreign people who aren't even in this country and Americans will not have the jobs.

Energy is one of the biggest job creators. When you produce energy, a lot of people make a living. When you buy it from Saudi Arabia, when you buy it from foreign countries, when you buy it from the Mideast, the only Americans who get a job are those who sell it, a retail job. I was a retailer, and I'm not saying that in any way to cast aspersions; but right now here in Washington, DC you can buy gasoline made in Russia. Not only produce the oil in Russia, but the gasoline was made in Russia, came here in a ship. Not many Americans get a job from that. But when you buy gasoline made from an American refiner and produced from American oil, a lot of people have made a living.

I hope the next time I rise on this floor there will have been some action from this body, there will have been some voice from the White House. I haven't heard much from the Secretary of Energy about the energy crisis. Every time I talk to any of the people in the Cabinet that advise the President, I talk to them about my views and they listen intently, but not much action; and no action from this Congress, zero action.

Available, affordable energy has the ability to shut the economic base of this country and take us down and make us a second-rate Nation. And the number of poor people in America will continue to grow. Working-men jobs for the people who work with their hands, who have made this country, they're the heart and soul of this country. I was the son of a seventh grade-educated steelworker. He was a darn good dad. He taught me to be honest, work hard, always do my best, and never quit and give up. And those principles he taught me I have lived with all my life. And I thank him today and my mother for teaching me to be honest and upright. But they were working people. Neither of them had graduated from high school. They worked with their hands. They were ambitious.

There are lots of Americans that need jobs to work with their hands, to make things, build things. And this country will no longer be a country that makes things and builds things and creates things. We're just becoming consumers as we export our jobs. And energy, available, affordable energy has exported more jobs from America than any other issue. I will debate that with anybody. And it will continue to export the good jobs we have.

Dow Chemical, the biggest employer and manufacturer of chemicals in the world, used to pay \$8 billion a year for natural gas in 2002. In 2006, they paid \$22 billion, and they came to Congress and begged. I had them at hearings,

and they begged us. The President of Dow Chemical begged this Congress to take action on opening up energy supply for this country so he didn't have to go across the ponds in other countries to build his plants so he could compete. They make products for the whole world, and they can go to countries where energy is a third, a fourth, a fifth of what it costs here and labor is cheaper. And that's why they're going. They don't want to go. He said, I don't want to go. I'm loyal to America. And many companies are loyal. I talk to company CEOs that say they spend millions every year trying to cut energy use, but the energy costs just go up faster than their energy use.

Americans need to conserve. We all need to use less. We need to learn how to use less. We need to figure out how to quit wasting energy, and more fuel-efficient cars, more efficient homes. But folks, we need to have a Congress and an administration that puts energy at the front door of our future and says that we're going to do whatever it takes to compete in this global economy. We're going to provide energy for Americans. We're going to open up our reserves. We're going to produce the oil we need, the gas we need. And we're going to use coal the clean way.

And, yes, we're going to expand nuclear. And, yes, we're going to even maybe build some dams and do some hydro. And, yes, we're going to do everything we can to promote renewables, all of those. And we're going to try to get into hydrogen. It will be decades, but hydrogen society, where we can make hydrogen. If we learn to make it out of water, we've got it made. But then we still have to learn how to transport it safely and how to utilize it, how to sell it, how to process it and distribute it. It takes years and decades to do that. In the meantime, we've got to continue with what we have, and it's nuclear, coal, natural gas and oil, and renewables.

We need to make energy one of the top issues in this Congress, not tomorrow, not the next day, but now. Not next year or two years from now; it may be too late. When we open up a new oil field, if we open up the Outer Continental Shelf, it's 10 years before you have any real production out there. If we start coal-to-liquid, coal-to-gas, it will be a decade before we would have real production. We need to be starting it now. We need to be figuring out how to speed up the process of nuclear to run this country. America needs a Congress committed to available, affordable energy.

And I'm going to conclude, you know who owns the oil in the world? You know who the biggest oil companies are? It's not Exxon. Exxon is the 14th largest oil company in the world. They're pretty big. But 13, unstable, nondemocratic governments are bigger oil companies. And they've kicked out Big Oil in the recent years, taken over their investments, captured their monies. And they're running the oil production in most parts of the world. Ninety

percent of the oil is owned by unstable governments. And any one of them that tips over, along with a Katrina-type storm in the gulf, can give us unaffordable energy overnight. We're vulnerable to a storm; we're vulnerable to unstable nondemocratic governments that don't even like us.

How can America go to sleep? How can this Congress go to sleep at night knowing that we are vulnerable to those we don't even trust with our energy future?

This Congress must have an energy policy soon, and it can't be the one I talked about first that takes energy off the table. It has to be one that puts energy on the table, yes, does conservation, does all of the things to conserve and use wiser, but produces the energy this country needs to compete.

We're in a global climate, we're in a global economy today, and America must figure out soon that everything we do in Congress must enable our companies to compete in the world; and affordable energy is one of the first things we ought to be doing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and until noon on November 14.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a medical appointment.

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. CUMMINGS) 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.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, November 14.

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and November 14, 15, and 16.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 14, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the second and third quarters of 2007, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED OCT. 19 AND OCT. 22, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Lois Capps	10/19	10/22	United Kingdom	2,439.00	(³)	2,439.00
Hon. Hilda Solis	10/19	10/22	United Kingdom	2,439.00	(³)	2,439.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	10/19	10/22	United Kingdom	2,439.00	(³)	2,439.00
Hon. Louise Slaughter	10/19	10/22	United Kingdom	2,439.00	(³)	2,439.00
Amy Fisher	10/19	10/22	United Kingdom	2,439.00	(³)	2,439.00
Melissa Shannon	10/19	10/22	United Kingdom	2,439.00	(³)	2,439.00
Hon. Donna Christensen	10/19	10/21	United Kingdom	1,854.00	4,182.28	6,036.28
Committee total	16,488.00	4,182.28	20,670.28

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

LOIS CAPPS, Chairman, Oct. 30, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Helwig	7/1	United States	148.00	148.00
.....	7/2	9/30	Austria	13,748.00	13,748.00
Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin	7/4	United States	(³)
.....	7/5	7/9	Ukraine	1,575.00	1,575.00
Ronald McNamara	7/9	Ukraine
.....	7/9	7/14	Austria	1,636.00	1,636.00
Mischa Thompson	7/9	Ukraine
.....	7/9	7/14	Austria	1,284.00	1,284.32
Janice Helwig	7/15	Austria	960.00	960.00
.....	7/15	7/19	Bosnia & Herzegovnia	796.00	796.00
Shelly Han	8/12	United States	10,832.97	10,832.97
.....	8/13	8/15	Turkmenistan	399.00	399.00
.....	8/15	8/21	Kazakhstan	536.00	536.00
Kyle Parker	8/12	United States	10,938.24	10,938.24
.....	8/13	8/15	Turkmenistan	432.00	432.00
.....	8/15	8/20	Kazakhstan	425.00	425.00
Winsome Packer	9/8	United States	6,267.43	6,267.43
.....	9/9	9/15	Austria	1,937.44	1,937.44
Erika Schlager	9/22	United States	6,754.54	6,754.54
.....	9/23	10/6	Poland	3,616.30	3,616.30
Janice Helwig	9/23	United States	1,199.80	1,199.80
.....	9/23	10/5	Poland	3,507.30	3,507.30
Mischa Thompson	9/23	United States	7,763.93	7,763.93
.....	9/24	9/30	Poland	1,573.95	1,573.95
Orest Deychakiwsky	9/26	United States	7,254.59	7,254.59
.....	9/27	10/1	Ukraine	895.00	895.00
.....	10/1	10/4	Poland	808.17	808.17