

want to commend those that came forward. I want to commend those individuals that have been working for 15, 20 years, taking care of our wounded, taking care of our men and women in said communities, and we look forward to continuing to support them in that effort, and help is on its way. As a matter of fact, help is already there.

You can e-mail us, Members, at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, and our Web site is www.speaker.gov/30something.

I want to thank Mr. RYAN for being a part of this hour. I want to thank the Speaker and the Democratic leadership for allowing the 30-something Working Group to come to the floor one more time. It was an honor to address the House of Representatives.

EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT AND PEAK OIL

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is a question that often comes to my mind, as I sit here in these Chambers. I have spoken about it often, what made America great. I have been reminded of this question in my past speeches on this topic as the debate evolved regarding the inappropriately named Employee Free Choice Act, H.R. 800. We had a debate that I never thought would take place here in the Chambers of the House of Representatives of the United States, questioning the use of the secret ballot.

Now, I am asking myself again, what keeps America great? It is what our military is fighting for in Iraq, it is what they fought for in our American Revolution, our Civil War, World War I and World War II and every war great and small when our country has put our greatest treasure, the lives of soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen at risk.

What keeps America great is our commitment to the vigilant defense of the cause of freedom as expressed by the will of the people. Expressing their will by voting with secret ballots is integral to keeping America great.

Our Constitution guarantees us freedom of speech and of religion. These are precious freedoms that allow us to prosper, to learn, to own property, to start a business, to teach our moral and civic values and build a legacy of wealth and knowledge for the next generation.

But it is the greatest freedom for citizens to decide or to vote using a secret ballot that sets our Republican forum of government apart. Secret ballots allow people to freely make decisions through our elected process, decisions made about not only who will represent them here in the Congress but also in their hometowns, decisions about what new amendments will be made to the Constitution, State or Federal.

□ 1900

There are codicils in the contracts we have with our government about how we want to be governed. Voting is a basic tool of a free society. Thomas Paine said in his dissertation on first principles of government that, and I quote, "the right of voting for representatives is the primary right which other rights are protected."

Voting is basic and natural to us. We have learned from an early age as school children voting for class presidents, and we expect it in adulthood as we elect representatives to our local, state and Federal elections.

It took a long time in this country to universally use secret ballot to make freedom's choices. But once in use, the secret ballot is not only the norm, but also the pinnacle tool which permits our countrymen to make these decisions, great and small, freely, without fear of intimidation or reprisal.

Mr. Speaker, we surely can't be serious when we pursue taking away from the rank and file worker the use of the secret ballot as the main vehicle for making decisions to unionize or remain an open shop. There may be problems with the unionizing process, but voting by secret ballot, I can assure you, is not one of them.

We here in the United States have acted as counselor to other governments and governing bodies on the requirements of a free and fair election. After all, we are the longest enduring republic in the history of the world.

I am going to reference such advice given on the U.S. Department of State Web site. If you search for principles of free and fair elections, you will find the requirements of an election. We here in Congress can benefit from relying upon this advice when considering the path to conducting union recognition process. And I quote, "universal suffrage for all eligible men and women to vote, democracies do not restrict this right for minorities, the disabled, or give it only to those who are literate or who own property." Obviously, we want all people affected by union decision to have a right to vote.

I am going to add a few words about American history's path to universal suffrage here, because it is useful to understand our painful evolution to reach a point where voting went from the select few to every adult.

It has only been in my lifetime that true universal suffrage has been realized in our great country. We fought a great civil war that only put us on the path toward universal suffrage. We still had many battles to come. From 1865 to 1870 the Constitution was amended three times to guarantee equal voting rights to black Americans, but still the struggle continued. There were setbacks as States and localities undermined this Federal guarantee.

At the turn of the last century, there were barriers to achieving universal suffrage. Poll taxes and literacy tests denied many black American men the ability to exercise their right to vote.

Jim Crow laws protected segregation. Not until the 1950s did our laws begin to change to put an end to segregation. The 1965 Voting Rights Act provided the means to the Federal Government to ensure the ability to vote by black citizens that is guaranteed under our Constitution.

Suffrage for women was long in coming. In 1776, Abigail Adams wrote, to her husband, John, who was attending the Continental Congress in Philadelphia, she asked that he and other men who were working on the Declaration of Independence remember the ladies. John responded with humor but got his point across; that the Declaration says that all men are created equal applied equally to women, he told her.

After the Civil War, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony formed the American Equal Rights Association, an organization for white and black women and men dedicated to the goal of universal suffrage. Other organizations followed. Still, in 1868, 3 years after the end of the Civil War, the 14th amendment was ratified but only provided for male suffrage. It was not until 1920, after many struggles, and only 86 years ago, that the 19th amendment was ratified and women in this country achieved the right to vote.

Let me go back now to that Web site of the U.S. State Department. Principles of free and fair elections: And I quote again, "freedom to register a voter or to run for public office, these are the qualities, the characteristics that society must have if they want to have free people and fair elections."

"Freedom of speech for candidates and political parties: Democracies do not restrict candidates or political parties from criticizing the performance of the incumbent."

"Numerous opportunities for the electorate to receive objective information from a free press: Freedom to assemble for political rallies and campaigns."

"Rules that require party representatives to maintain a distance from polling places on election day: Election officials, volunteer poll workers and international monitors may assist voters with the voting process, but not the voting choice."

"An impartial or balanced system of conducting elections and verifying election results: Trained election officials must either be politically independent, or those overseeing elections should be representatives of the parties in the election."

And now, the next two points, especially the last, are points that we really should well remember. "Accessible polling places: Private voting space, secure ballot boxes and transparent ballot counting."

And then this one, Mr. Speaker. "Secret ballots."

This is our advice on our State Department Web site to those who would like to emulate us and establish a government as free and fair and great as ours.

This is what it says. "Secret ballots. Voting by secret ballot insures that an individual's choice of party or candidate cannot be used against him or her."

It is only through the use of the secret ballot allowing for privacy voting without fear of reprisal that we can determine the true will of the people or the true will of workers. Do they want to be represented by a union or not?

If we keep in mind the advice that we so freely give to those outside our country, we can create a system for America's labor which will work for them. And frankly, who should be more protective of this basic tool of our society? Who should understand that the secret ballot should be the tool of choice for the members and their political members, but the union leadership themselves?

The union history is as painful as the struggle for the basic right to vote endured by blacks and women. The Industrial Revolution did usher in one of the most ugly periods of our history. Worker abuse, child labor abuse was, in fact, a huge problem. Brave men and women who formed unions led the efforts that addressed intolerable working conditions.

There will always be a place for employee unions. However, employee abuse by employers should not be replaced by employee abuse by unions.

In today's Los Angeles Times, not, I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, a conservative paper, in today's Los Angeles Times, there is an editorial entitled "Keep Union Ballots Secret. Doing away with Voting Secrecy Would Give Unions Too Much Power Over Workers." This is the title of their article. This editorial outlines the issue well and, I believe, reflects the sentiment of the country.

Indeed, in recent polls, 87 percent of the American people believed that we should have secret ballot elections for determining whether a group of employees wanted to unionize or not.

We, in this body, are privileged to serve, because we were elected to represent our constituents in secret ballot elections. We took an oath, and we have the obligation to serve not big labor or big business. Our sole obligation is to uphold the Constitution and serve the individual residents of our districts.

I agree with Los Angeles Times editorialist. In part, I would like to quote that editorial, with which I wholeheartedly agree. And this is what it says. "Unfair labor practices deserve tougher penalties. But improper influence can work both ways. As a rule, union membership improves worker prosperity and safety. Even so, the bedrock of Federal labor law is not unionism under any conditions, but the right of workers to choose whether they want to affiliate with a union."

This, from the very liberal Los Angeles Times. "Unions once supported the secret ballot for organization elections. They were right then and are wrong

now. Unions have every right to a fair hearing. And the National Labor Relations Board should be more vigilant about attempts by employers to game the system. In the end, however, whether to unionize is up to the workers. A secret ballot insures that their choice will be a free one."

Mr. Speaker, I ask again, in conclusion to these remarks, what keeps America great? It is our commitment to a vigilant defense of the cause of freedom as expressed by the will of the people, and the will of the people is best and freely expressed by secret ballot elections.

As I read this, Mr. Speaker, my mind goes back to a comment made by Benjamin Franklin as he came out of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Many copies of the Constitution may have this little quote on the front leaf page. He was asked, tradition has it, by a woman, who said, Mr. Franklin, what have you given us? And his answer was, a republic, madam, if you can keep it.

There are two things about this statement, Mr. Speaker, that deserve some reflection. The first is a republic. We do the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag and we note the republic for which it stands. And then we all too often get up and talk about the great democracy in which we live.

What is the fundamental difference between a democracy and a republic? And why was Mr. Franklin explicit in a republic, madam; if you can keep it?

A couple of examples of a democracy may be helpful in permitting us to understand why Benjamin Franklin was so specific. A somewhat humorous example of a democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what they are going to have for dinner. You see, in a democracy, the will of the majority controls. And if these two wolves and a lamb were in a true democracy and they were voting on what they should have for dinner, I suspect that the result might be lamb.

Let me give you another example of a democracy. And I kind of hesitate to do this because I don't want to be misunderstood. But I think it says very clearly what the difference between a republic and a democracy is.

If you will stop and think about it, I think you will agree that a lynch mob is an example of a democracy. Surely, in a lynch mob, the will of the majority is being expressed. Aren't you glad, Mr. Speaker, that you live in a republic?

Now, what's the fundamental difference? To help me understand this, I reflect back on an experience in our country with a President, Harry Truman, "Take Charge Harry," who made a very abrupt decision when the steel mills were going to strike. Then we did some manufacturing in this country, and it would have mattered. And our economy was already in trouble and was going to be in bigger trouble if the strike occurred. And so President Truman nationalized the steel mills. What that meant was that the workers at the

steel mills were now Federal employees, and as such, by law, they could not strike. And so this averted the strike. This was a very popular action.

The Supreme Court met in emergency session and, in effect, what they said was, and by the way, Mr. Speaker, this is just one of two times in our history that the Supreme Court has set aside an executive order of the President.

□ 1915

This is in layman's language what the Supreme Court said to the President: Mr. President, you can't do that. You can't nationalize the steel mills because that is unconstitutional. You see, in a Republic we have the rule of law, no matter what the majority wanted, and clearly then the vast majority of Americans wanted what their President did. They were approving of nationalizing the steel mills, which avoided the strike. But the Supreme Court said you cannot do that because, you see, that is unconstitutional. The fundamental difference between a republic and a democracy is that in a Republic, we have the rule of law.

This Constitution that I hold in my hand is the fundamental law against which all other laws are measured. Now, we can change it. We have done it 27 times. But that is a very thoughtful process. It is two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate and it bypasses the President and goes to the State legislatures, and three-fourths of the State legislatures must ratify it.

It has been quite a while since we amended the Constitution. The last time we tried to amend the Constitution, it was the so-called "equal rights amendment." Nobody argued that women should not have equal rights, and nobody argued that we didn't need to do something to assure that women had equal rights. And that amendment almost made it through the three-fourths of the State legislatures. But suddenly it began to dawn on people that what that amendment required was not quite what we wanted. What the amendment required was that you could not differentiate between men and women. If you are going to have a draft for the military, you would need to draft women as well as men. And so ultimately the equal rights amendment failed. It did not pass.

I think that if we could be so fortunate as to have some of these Framers of our Constitution be resurrected and join us here that they would counsel, as Benjamin Franklin did when he answered the woman's question by saying "A republic, madam, if you can keep it."

Abraham Lincoln understood that this was a new experiment that might not work: "Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

We read those words and we slide through them so easily: "that all men

are created equal.” Of course, they are, you say. But to most at that time this was a revelation because most of the pioneers that established this great country came from either the British Isles or the European continent. And in almost every one of those countries there was a king or an emperor who incredibly, from our perspective, demanded and was granted divine rights, which said that the rights came from God to the king or the emperor and he would give what rights he wished to the people. Sometimes they were few, and sometimes there were more than a few rights that were given to the people.

But our Founding Fathers declared in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator. Mr. Speaker, do you think our courts might declare the Declaration of Independence unconstitutional because it mentions God, it mentions our creator? Endowed by our creator with inalienable rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I don't know what was in Benjamin Franklin's head when he made the second part of that statement to the lady: “A republic, madam, if you can keep it.” Do you think he was concerned about some foreign power coming and conquering our country and taking our Republican form of government away from us? I doubt it. We are on the other side of a really big ocean. It took a lot of ships and a long time to gain any meaningful number of troops here. I suspect that he was more concerned about the threat to our Republic from within.

It has been said that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. You just can't ever, ever let down your guard. We are the longest enduring Republic in the history of the world. And I have asked myself many times how did we get here and why are we so fortunate, this one person out of 22, or less than 5 percent of the world's population, and we have fully one-fourth of all the good things in the world?

I think very often about this question as I recognize that we no longer have a population with the best work ethic in the world. I just came from China about 6 weeks ago. We no longer have a population that is focused on science, math, and technology. We no longer have a country that prizes the nuclear family. We no longer have a society that prizes that. Nearly half our kids are born out of wedlock today. I would suggest today society is at risk when half of the kids are born out of wedlock. So what is it about this great country that makes us so special that we have a fourth of all the good things in the world?

I think there are two things, and I want to focus for just a couple minutes on one of them, and that is the incredible protection that our Constitution gives to our civil liberties. There is no other constitution, there is no other country that has such respect for civil

liberties. I think that in large measure it was this respect for our civil liberties that established a climate in which creativity and entrepreneurship could flourish. And I rise tonight because I am concerned about any threat to these civil liberties, and I think when we change the way we vote for any process from the traditional secret ballot process to something where your vote is exposed that in some little way you put at risk the civil liberties and start down a path that I don't think America needs to go down or wants to go down. Civil liberties are always a casualty of war, and I guess I am a little sensitive now because we are in a war.

Abraham Lincoln suspended habeas corpus. In World War II, my friend Norm Mineta, with whom I served here, a few years younger than I, a Japanese American, now Secretary of Transportation, told me, he said, “Roscoe, I remember holding my parents' hand when they led us into that concentration camp in Idaho.”

That war is over and we are embarrassed we did that. Civil liberties are frequently, perhaps always, a casualty of war. And I remember that counsel that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. So excuse me, Mr. Speaker, if I seem to have maybe a bit overreacted to the dialogue that occurred here today because I am just so jealous of who we are and the great privileges that we have.

And now I want to turn our attention in the remaining time to a subject that I have come to the floor 22 previous times to talk about. And I think the great freedoms that we have are going to be tested as we meet the challenges that are ahead. I want to begin this discussion and will be discussing energy and one particular aspect of energy which is now fairly conventionally referred to as peak oil. I would like to note that it was the 14th day of last March that I gave my first speech on the floor here on peak oil. What I wanted to talk about was the probability that the world was about to reach its maximum ability to produce oil.

Obviously, that had to come at some point. The Earth isn't made out of oil. The amount of oil is finite. At some point we would reach our maximum capacity for producing oil. Few people ever thought about that because oil was just so ubiquitous. It was everywhere. Thousands of cars on the road. Electricity, heat whenever you needed it. And I was trying to decide what to call this and to label the charts, and you may see in the charts we use in a few moments some labels on top of the charts and they are put on with scotch tape because I wasn't sure what to call it.

I was debating between the “great rollover.” You see, when you have reached your maximum production of oil, you then roll over and start down a slope where you produce less oil, and it becomes harder and harder to get. So I

thought maybe I would refer to it as the “great rollover” and finally decided that I would refer to it as “peak oil.” It is a good thing because now everybody is referring to it as “peak oil,” and I would have been a little out of step talking about the “great rollover.”

I have here an article that appeared today from the Associated Press published March 1, 2007. That is today. And it is an interview. T. Boone Pickens says global oil production has reached its peak. T. Boone Pickens. I didn't really know who he was. I knew he was a very rich and capable man who had an incredible talent at deciding where the market was going and has become very rich as a result of that. I didn't know that Pickens started his career in the 1950s as a petroleum geologist. I don't know if in 1956 on March 8, and we are coming up to the 51st anniversary in a few days, I don't know if he was in that audience in San Antonio or not when a very, very famous speech was given by M. King Hubbert that I will refer to in a few moments.

The article begins by saying: “Legendary Texas oilman T. Boone Pickens sees today's stubbornly high oil price as evidence that daily global production capacity is at or very near its peak. ‘If demand for crude oil rises beyond the current global output of roughly 85 million barrels per day,’ Pickens told the Associated Press, ‘prices will rise to compensate and alternative sources of energy will begin to replace petroleum. If I'm right,’ he says, ‘we are already at the peak. And if I'm right, the price of gas will go up. I think there are less reserves around the world than are being reported. There are no audited reserves in the Mid East. It makes me suspicious,’ he said.”

Now, he was challenged in this by a friend of mine, a person that I really admire, Steve Forbes. Forbes publisher Steve Forbes challenged Pickens' assumptions during an exchange in the conference, saying political, not technological or geological, roadblocks stood in the way of increasing the world's oil output.

□ 1930

Just give them an incentive to go drill and they will find more oil. With the right incentives in place, more oil could be brought to market and prices could drop, Forbes said.

Forbes referred to Mexico and what was happening there. Pickens responded by saying Mexico is a declining producer of oil, as are most other countries. Indeed, 33, I think, out of the 45 oil-producing countries have already reached their peak and are already in decline.

Pickens responded by saying that Mexico is a declining producer of oil, as are most other countries, naming the United States, Norway, Britain and soon Russia. Indeed, I think Russia now has a second peak that they are declining from. They had an earlier

peak, the Soviet Union before the Soviet Union fell apart, and they now have recovered from that and are reaching a second but smaller peak.

The world has been looked at, Pickens told Forbes. There is still oil to be found, but not in the quantities we have seen in the past. The big fields have been found, and the smaller fields, well, there are not enough of them to replenish the base. This is T. Boone Pickens.

Pickens predicted oil prices will rise this year to an annual average of around \$70 per barrel. It was \$62 a barrel today. Global consumers led by the United States have already burned through 1.1 trillion barrels of oil, or what Pickens described as nearly half. Many observers will tell you it is half of the world's estimated 2.5 trillion barrels of oil.

This is his prediction. This is a man who has been able to make really good predictions, because he has gotten incredibly wealthy doing it.

From now on, Pickens said, rising demand will be met by higher prices rather than ever larger crude production. He says the days of meeting the demand with producing more are ending. Alternative energy sources will begin to take a share of the energy market until the world evolves from a hydrocarbon-based economy to something that is a mix of hydrocarbons and something else.

Now, since hydrocarbons are not infinite, they are finite, ultimately everything will be the something else. Everything from nuclear, coal, wind, solar, hydrogen and biofuels, stands a chance to assuage growing demand for energy, Pickens said.

I will put up the first chart now. What this chart does is to list the predictions of many of the world's experts, and T. Boone Pickens is not on here because he just made this prediction today and this is a chart made some time ago. It shows here a number of authorities, their background and references and the projected peaking date. What you can see here is that most of the authorities believe that peaking will occur quite soon.

I would like to digress for just a moment to talk about what we mean by "peaking." Traditionally, peaking has meant to refer to conventional oil sources, the kind of oil you will get by drilling a hole in the ground and then pumping it out.

It is almost certain that the production of conventional crude oil has peaked, but we now are able to get the equivalent of crude oil from other sources, like gas to liquids, like oil from the tar sands of Canada, where it is really thick. It won't flow. They lift it up in a shovel that lifts 100 tons, they dump it into a truck that carries 400 tons, and then they cook it, add some volatiles to it so it will flow, and then you have the equivalent of oil. Or really heavy oil, like some of the oil that Venezuela is producing.

Then you might also include an unconventional oil, oil that is in places

that is really, really hard to get to, like that last find in the Gulf of Mexico, which I think was under 7,000 feet of water, more than a mile of water, and several miles of dirt. They aren't pumping that yet. I have been told, and you are told a lot of things that may or may not be true, but I have been told that we will start pumping that oil when oil is \$211 a barrel, because that is what it will take to get it out.

There are some who believe that the peak is a bit down the road, but you see that they all are pretty close.

There are several others who have made predictions about when peaking will occur. I have been talking about T. Boone Pickens and his prediction that it is now, that we are here. I noted all of these.

I have some remarks here from one of those, and we will look at the next chart now, and this is the chart from a study that was done at the request of the Energy Department and paid for by the Energy Department, by the SAIC, big SAIC organization. The principal investigator was Robert Hirsch, so it is frequently referred to as the Hirsch Report.

In this report, and I have highlighted here something that I thought was significant, he says, the world has never faced a problem like this. World production of conventional oil will reach a maximum and decline thereafter. That maximum is called the peak.

A number of competent forecasters, I have just shown you a list of those, project peaking within a decade. Others contend it will occur later. Predictions of the peaking is extremely difficult because of geological complexities, measurement problems, pricing variations, demand elasticity and political influences. Peaking will happen, and he should have really underlined that, peaking will happen, but the timing is uncertain.

The next chart shows some additional quotes from the Hirsch Report. The peaking of oil presents the United States and the world with an unprecedented risk management. Remember in the previous chart it said the world had never faced a problem like this.

As peaking is approached, and note how similar this is to what T. Boone Pickens said in the article today, as peaking is approached, liquid fuel prices and price volatility will increase dramatically, and without timely mitigation, and then he says this, economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented.

Another chart from the same Hirsch Report makes reference to another projection of when oil will peak, and this is a projection made by our own Energy Information Agency using data from USGS. I will spend just a moment on this chart because it holds the essence of a pretty big debate that is going on out there.

The black curve here represents our use. Notice what happened in the 70s, the Arab oil embargo. If that line had kept on going up, as it had been going

up for years, it would be way up there, wouldn't it, and there wouldn't be anywhere near enough oil. Eighty-five million barrels wouldn't begin to meet the world's demand if that were true.

There was a stunning statistic during this rapid rise up to the seventies. In every decade up until the Carter years, we used as much oil as had been used in all of previous history. That is stunning. What that means is that when we had used half the oil, there would only be 10 years left. That is not 10 years at that use rate, because it is going to be harder and harder to get, so it is going to fall off in what can be pumped.

But, fortunately, we had a wake-up shock, and we found out how to do a lot of things a lot more efficiently. Your refrigerator and air conditioner today may be three times more efficient than it was at the time of the Arab oil embargo. I don't think anybody will argue that we aren't living as well today as we did in the seventies, and we are using precious little more oil than we did in the seventies with a fair sized increase in the population. So efficiently really is possible, isn't it?

Well, back to this chart. USGS uses a very interesting technique for predicting how much oil is yet to be discovered. They have some very elaborate computer simulations, and they make some assumptions, and they put these assumptions into the computer simulations and then run these simulations. And they change the assumptions, because it might be a little higher or might be a little lower. So they have done this a very large number of times. Then they graph the frequency of certain predictions, of how much oil will be produced against the quantity that will be produced. Then they pick the mean of this.

This is the mean of their computer projections. They pick the mean of this and they say that that mean is the expected value. This is simply the result of putting some assumptions into some computer models and then running it a number of times.

Now, this says probability, but in their charts it says frequency. I don't know how frequency got translated to P for probability, but there is a bit of miscommunication here. They say that the low probability is the 95 percent probability. Of course, this was the number where there was 5 percent of predictions on one side and 95 percent of predictions on the other side of this point on their graph.

Now, what they called the 95 percent probability is what T. Boone Pickens said, you remember he had 2.3, that is slightly different from this, 2.5, something like that, slightly different from that, as the total amount of oil that had been discovered in the world, a little over 1,000 gigabarrels. And we use "giga" rather than billion, because a billion in England I think is a million million, and a billion here is 1,000 million. So if you use billion you may be misunderstood, but giga apparently around the world means a billion, and,

of course, 1,000 gigabarrels is a trillion gigabarrels, and this is 2.248 trillion gigabarrels, 248,000, which is 2.248 gigabarrels of oil.

Now, their mean, they say, reflects the probability that we are going to find half as much oil as we have ever found, half as much more oil as we have ever found in the past. And they even have a high 5 percent probability where they say we might find twice as much oil as all the oil we ever found in the past.

Now, even with this assumption, and this is really important, even with this assumption of the mean, and that is the red line here, you see, the mean, even with the assumption that we are going to find half as much more oil as we ever found, or to put it another way, we are going to find as much more oil as all of the reserves that now exist, even with that assumption, look where peaking occurs. 2016. That is just around the corner.

□ 1945

Now, if we don't find that additional oil, then the peaking would occur here. This is 2000. We are now in 2007, slightly after that, which is when T. Boone Pickens said it has occurred.

The second part of this chart shows another interesting thing, and that is if you use enhanced oil recovery, you will certainly get the oil more quickly. You may get some more oil, too; but the primary thing you will do is get it quicker. But if you pump it now, it won't be available later; and so they show a very steep drop there.

The next chart shows a comment by one of the giants in this field, James Laherrere, and he made an assessment of the USGS report which was the basis for this prediction of our Energy Information Agency that we are going to find this incredible amount of new oil. This is what he says: "The USGS estimate implies a fivefold increase in discovery rate and reserve addition for which no evidence is presented," no evidence other than their computer modeling. "Such an improvement in performance is utterly implausible given the great technological achievements of the industry over the past 20 years, the worldwide search, and the deliberate effort to find the largest remaining prospects."

We now have vastly better discovery techniques. We have computer modeling. We have 3-D seismic, and we pretty much have mapped the world. And oil and gas can occur only in fairly unique geological formations, and we know what those formations are, and we know pretty much where they are.

The next chart is very interesting. It shows the EIA projections of discovery, how much oil we were going to discover. This is the discovery peak, not the use peak because we in the past discovered enormously more oil than we used. But this is the discovery peak. They made this chart in about 2000 and this red line was the discovery peak in the past up to that time. Then they made three projections for the future.

One was their 50 percent probability. The mean, which is the 50 percent; the P 95 which is the yellow one; and the blue one, which is the 5 percent probability. They said there was a 5 percent probability we would find an incredible amount of oil, and they said there was a 95 percent probability that we would find only this tiny little bit done here. And the mean was this green line, and they saw it going up better and better.

But look at what happened. The red data points show that the discoveries were precisely what you would have predicted them to be if in fact it is a probability, 95 percent probable, it is certainly a whole lot more probable than 50 percent probable, and the actual production curve has followed the 95 percent probability.

All of this has given rise to a statement by Condoleezza Rice, and this is a very insightful statement on April 5, 2006: "We do have to do something about the energy problem. I can tell you that nothing has really taken me aback more as Secretary of State than the way that the politics of energy is, I will use the word warping diplomacy around the world. We have simply got to do something about the warping now of diplomat effort by the all-out rush for energy supply."

Let me put the next chart up, and this chart comes from an incredible speech given by Hyman Rickover, the father of our nuclear submarine. I just want to quote a couple of things. By the way, if you do a Google search, Mr. Speaker, and ask for Hyman Rickover and energy, I think you can probably pull up this speech he gave on May 14, 1957. He gave this speech at a banquet of the annual Scientific Assembly of the Minnesota State Medical Association in St. Paul, Minnesota. Let me just read a couple of things that he says in this speech because he was so prophetic:

"With high energy consumption goes a high standard of living." And this was 50 years ago. What would he say today? "Thus, the enormous fossil fuel energy which we in this country control feeds machines which make each of us master of an army of mechanical slaves. Man's muscle power is rated at 35 watts continuously, or 1/20th horsepower. Machines, therefore, furnish every American industrial worker with energy equivalent to that of 244 men, while at least 2,000 men push his automobile along the road, and his family is supplied with 33 faithful household helpers. Each locomotive engineer controls energy equivalent to that of 100,000 men; each jet pilot of 700,000 men. Truly, the humblest American enjoys the services of more slaves than were once owned by the richest nobles, and lives better than most ancient kings. In retrospect, and despite wars, revolutions and disasters, the 100 years just gone by may well seem like a golden age."

Then he says: "Whether this golden age will continue depends entirely upon our ability to keep energy sup-

plies in balance with the needs of our growing population."

And if all of these experts that I have quoted are right and if T. Boone Pickens is right, we have now reached the maximum production of oil, which means that we are going to have to learn to live with what we have got for the moment, and then there will be a time when it is going to be harder and harder, and less and less will be found.

Ultimately the nation which controls the largest energy sources will become dominant. We don't own them, but we control them with our dollars because we now are buying a fourth of all of the oil in the world. China is buying oil around the world. Why would they do that? You don't need to own a single oil well and will get all of the oil you want if you simply have the dollars to pay for it. I think it is an interesting exercise to reflect on why China might be buying these oil wells.

If we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have, I have a notice we haven't been doing much of that, and prepare well for necessary future changes, we shall ensure this dominant position for our own country.

What are these people talking about? What is peak oil, the next chart, and this chart is a chart from the Cambridge Energy Research Associates, and you will see them referred to as one of the major authorities in this area. They do not believe what T. Boone Pickens said today. They think that peaking is quite a ways out, and they created this little chart to ridicule the scientists who predicted that the United States would peak in 1970 and we did peak in 1970. By the way, he predicted the world would be peaking about now. If he was right about the United States, why shouldn't he be right about the world?

They used this chart to ridicule him, and I think it gives credibility to what he said. The total U.S. production is the red curve. M. King Hubbert predicted that we would peak in 1970. In 1970 we reached a peak. He was making that prediction only from the lower 48. He couldn't have known that we were going to find a lot of oil in Alaska, and we did. What that lot of oil in Alaska did was to produce this little bump here.

I have been at zero miles of that 4-foot pipeline that for many years produced a fourth of all the oil that we produced, and it only made this little blip in the downslope of Hubbert's peak. CERA says because this was the curve rather than the predicted curve of Hubbert here, he was therefore a fraud and not to be believed. I think there is reasonable concurrence between these.

The actual, by the way, for the lower 48 which he produced follows pretty well his prediction, and we found the additional oil in Alaska which kicked it up a little. But in spite of everything that we have done, we now are producing half the oil that we produced in 1970.

My last chart, and this chart, I could spend the whole hour talking about this, and I may do that some evening, but this chart has an enormous amount of information on it. These are the discoveries. This is when we discovered it. The black curve is how much we used. For many years we found very much more than we used. But starting in 1980, we started finding less and less and less, and our use rate went up and up and up. Here is the 1970 blip, and it keeps on going up. For all of this time we were dipping into reserves. We have a lot of reserves left.

What will the future look like? One thing is certain, you cannot bump what you have not found. These graphs, the area under these curves represents the volume, the amount. So the area, if you put a smooth curve over this one, the area under that curve would represent the amount of oil that we have found.

The area under this consumption curve would represent the amount of oil that we use. You can't use oil you haven't found. Within some limits we can make the future look like we want it to look with enhanced recovery and feverish drilling and so forth. But I would submit that you can't pump what you haven't found, and I would like the listener to make his own judgment as to how much we can change what they predict here will be the future production of oil.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of official business.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, March 6.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the fol-

lowing titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 49. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 North Frontage Road West in Vail, Colorado, as the "Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 335. An act to designate the facility of the United States Post Service located at 152 North 5th Street in Laramie, Wyoming, as the "Gale W. McGee Post Office".

H.R. 433. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1700 Main Street in Little Rock, Arkansas, as the "Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building".

H.R. 514. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16150 Aviation Loop Drive in Brooksville, Florida, as the "Sergeant Lea Robert Mills Brooksville Aviation Branch Post Office".

H.R. 521. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building".

H.R. 577. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas, as the "Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 5, 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:

658. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of both an Average Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) and a Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) breach for the enclosed program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

659. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of the decision to conduct a standard competition of the Communications Operations and Maintenance function at Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

660. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the status of female members of the Armed Forces, pursuant to Section 562 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

661. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a biennial strategic plan for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2352; to the Committee on Armed Services.

662. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Program Acquisition Unit Cost and the Procurement Unit Cost has exceeded both the current UCR and Original UCR baseline for the enclosed pro-

gram, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

663. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas L. Baptiste, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

664. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report as of December 31, 2006, entitled, "Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects and activities; Defense Cooperation Account"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

665. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on Assignment Incentive Pay (AIP) Criteria for Reserve Component (RC) Personnel, pursuant to Public Law 109-702, section 678; to the Committee on Armed Services.

666. A letter from the General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of the 2006 Annual Report to Congress on the HOPE IV Program, pursuant to Section 24(1) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

667. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) program report for FY 2006, as required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

668. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land Management and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's determination of the practicality of issuing regulations to provide royalty relief for marginal oil and gas properties on the Outer Continental Shelf, pursuant to Section 343 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

669. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Alabama Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

670. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Mississippi Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

671. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Savannah, GA [COTP Savannah-06-068] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

672. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Lake Washington, Medina, Washington [CG13-06-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

673. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; United States Coast Guard Cutter MIDGETT (WHEC 726), Fairhaven Shipyard, Fairhaven, Washington [CGD13-06-031] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.