

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

SUNSET MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I stand once again before this body with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is April 14, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand—just today. That is more than the number of innocent American lives that were lost on September 11th, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,866 days since the travesty called *Roe v. Wade* was handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of our own children.

Some of them, Madam Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over their vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common.

They were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone. Each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each of their mothers, whether she realizes it immediately or not, will never be the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever.

Yet even in the full glare of such tragedy, this generation clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims to date, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it is important for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves again of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government."

The phrase in the 14th amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says: "No state shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here. It is our sworn oath.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion Declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. It is who we are.

And yet Madam Speaker, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection that we should have given them.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude, in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard

this sunset memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that 12,866 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust, is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of the innocent unborn. May that be the day we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect the least of these, our tiny American brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is April 14, 2008—12,866 days since *Roe v. Wade* first stained the foundation of this nation with the blood of its own children—this, in the land of free and the home of the brave.

THE STATUS OF ENERGY IN THE WORLD TODAY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, it was a pleasure to be down here listening to the special orders of my friends from the various States, and especially my friend from Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, and I understand his compassion and concern. But I will tell you that if we don't get a handle on these energy costs, people aren't going to have the money to do the things they want to do with their families on a day-to-day basis. So we have this time tonight to talk about energy and our energy status in the world today.

We started doing this last week on a bill that came to the floor that we are going to finish this week, the Beach Protection Act of 2007. We took that opportunity to talk about that. But we ought to be addressing some of the pressing concerns of this country today.

We hear the term that America, and rural America, is bitter. It is a big phrase today and over the weekend. They are bitter. They are bitter about high energy costs, and they are bitter about the fact that this Congress is not doing anything to address the supply part of this debate.

More supply means lower costs. That is basic economics 101. Anyone who has gone to have a bachelor's degree, and even some good high school programs teach economics, it is a simple supply and demand equation. So we are going to talk about energy tonight. My focus is going to be on supply, how we need more supply.

We also hear a lot this year about change. We want change, and everybody wants change. But, you know, change is not always good. Here is an example of change.

Since the Democrats got in the majority, when they first got sworn in, the price of a barrel of crude oil was \$58.31. Today, the price of a barrel of crude oil is \$111.15. I would say that is bad change. That is not good change. So change is not always good. This is negative change, and it flies in the face of promises from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI said on April 24, 2006, about 2 years ago, "Democrats have a common-sense plan to help bring down the skyrocketing gas prices." Well, that was almost \$60 a barrel less ago, and \$1 and change per gallon of gas less.

□ 2000

Majority leader STENY HOYER said, October 4, 2005, "Democrats believe that we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices."

Well, they did. They did. What did they do? They raised their gas prices. You want to talk about not being able to pay for dental care? People are using their money to get to work.

In rural America, we drive long distances. Rural America doesn't have the access of buses. Rural America doesn't have the opportunity to take the Metro or light rail.

Those who are driving distances to get to work are harmed exponentially greater. Democrats proffered lower gas prices. What do we have? We have higher gas prices. All we are asking them to do is keep their prices. Help them lower the price of gasoline, but they won't do it. Do you know why they won't do it?

They won't do it because they really hate fossil fuels in this country. They hate crude oil, and they hate coal. They hate crude oil, and they hate coal.

They hate fossil fuels, so to address high prices, what we have to do is bring on more fossil fuels to the market, and they won't do it. That's why we are not going to have any relief on gases.

Constituents ask me, what are you going to do to lower prices? What are you going to do, Congress? I just shake my head, and I said the only thing that's going to happen is prices are going to go up because demand is going to continue to go up, supply is going to stay the same, and you are going to have higher prices.

Democrat Whip JIM CLYBURN, Democrat from South Carolina, said "House Democrats have a plan to help curb rising gas prices." Jim got it wrong. "No" is not an energy plan. They had no plan, and when you have no plan, you plan to fail, and what do you get? You get higher prices.

We know we are going to have \$4 a gallon gas this summer sometime. We know it. In fact, the newspapers are

starting to raise this issue, "\$4 gasoline seen possible this summer," the Buffalo News, April 9, 2008; price at the pump likely to reach \$4, the Washington Times, April 9, 2008; "\$4 Per Gallon Gas Creeps Closer," Fox News, Denver, Colorado, April 9.

We know we are going to have \$4 a gallon of gas. How do we stop that from happening? We have to bring on more supply. I have some friends here to join me, but I am going to finish with one solution that has bipartisan support, and that's coal-to-liquid technologies.

There are a lot of ways we can address this debate and this issue, but let me just pitch one to you. The Illinois Coal Basin, and I am from Illinois, I am biased, the Illinois Coal Basin is basically the State of Illinois and the southwestern part of Indiana and the western part of Kentucky. That's all a big coal field.

Under the ground there is as much fossil fuel energy in coal as Saudi Arabia has in oil, 250-year's worth. We have been mining and using it for generations. In fact, I am fourth-generation Lithuanian American. My great grandfather immigrated to my home town of Collinsville, Illinois, where I still live. What did he do? He worked in the coal mines. My grandfather worked in the coal mines.

In southern Illinois, we have coal mines and we have mine workers. We have an abundant natural resource.

Now, we know coal can be used to generate electricity, but I am not talking about generation of electricity right now. What I am talking about is liquid fuels, the stuff that we need to put in our cars so we can get to work. How do we lower the price of gasoline in this country? That's where coal-to-liquid technology comes in.

We also had these budget airlines, three of them went bankrupt, one is on the verge. What's one of the problems? The high cost of aviation fuel.

All those people are unemployed. They don't have a job. They are going to be a burden to the safety net. They are not going to have dental care which was provided by their employer. But now they are unemployed because of the high cost of jet fuel.

How do we bring liquid fuel back to the arena that the budget airlines and the soccer mom, who is shepherding those kids around in the minivan, can afford to do that. We bring on more supply. One option is to use our vast resources of coal in this country and use that technology that goes back to World War II, the Fischer-Tropsch technologies.

Synthetic fuel, Sasol, the South African oil company has been using it for decades. It just got permission to use synthetic aviation fuel for the British commercial air fleet.

We have not a single coal-to-liquid plant in this country. The premise is simple, you have a coal mine. This is surface mining, mostly western coal here. In Illinois it would be below surface.

At that location you build a coal-to-liquid refinery. First of all you have jobs, jobs in the coal mine. Then you have jobs that build a refinery. Then you have jobs to operate the coal mines and jobs to operate the refinery, good-paying jobs with good-paying benefits and dental care. Then you have a pipeline so you don't have to address the transportation of this fuel, and you pipe it to the major metropolitan areas of this country, or you pipe it to the air base.

You know the number one aviation fuel user in the world, you know who it is? Our United States Air Force. They are begging for this opportunity. They are held captives to imported crude oil and the high cost of jet fuel.

We can do it here. We know what Katrina did to the refineries in the gulf coast, it shut a couple of them down, causing price spikes, causing dislocations.

Well, what's the benefit of this technology? You don't have to have it on the gulf coast. You are not importing the crude oil. You can build one in southern Illinois. You could build one in Wyoming, in Montana. You could build one in Kentucky or Ohio or West Virginia, right where the coal is located, close to the pipeline that connects to our major metropolitan areas, available, low-cost fuel to turn into jet fuel, gasoline, aviation fuel, diesel fuel, things that are causing great concerns and problems in our country today.

We have got bills to do this. Many Members do. My bill, I am the primary cosponsor with Congressman RICK BOUCHER, a Democrat from Virginia, on a price-collar provision. There are provisions for long-term contracting. There are some other marketing provisions out there where we could do this, we could send a signal to industry.

We want to do this, we want to have these up and running in 5 years. We want to help decrease our reliance on imported crude oil. We want to lower the cost of fuel. This Congress could do it. I guarantee you if we did it, this administration would sign the bill.

It's up to Democrats who made promises in 2006 that they had a plan to lower the price of gasoline. You read the quotes. I read the quotes to you, Madam Speaker.

You know the promises that were made. You know the promises that were not kept. In fact, not only were the promises not kept, we have done worse. You didn't lower the cost of fuel, we raised the cost of fuel. We didn't lower the price of a barrel of crude oil.

When Speaker PELOSI got sworn in, the price of a barrel of crude oil was \$58.31; today, \$111. Now I did this part of the speech last week, it was \$110. It has gone up \$1 just since Wednesday.

With that, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman GARRETT. I thank him for joining me. I yield you some time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

As I so often say when I come to the floor, in looking back 16 months, this country has been under the control of the Democrat-led Congress. What has those 16 months wrought? We have higher food prices, a recession now in the economy with which almost everyone agrees, even former Chairman Greenspan, housing prices basically in a free fall down and, of course, energy prices going through the roof.

You made a comment about gasoline prices being up to almost \$4 a gallon by the summer. Of course, diesel fuel already, in my neck of the woods, the great State of New Jersey, is at \$4 a gallon.

It amazes me each time I drive past the pump. I don't use diesel. Truckers most often do. Farming equipment on the farms do. Of course, I am amazed that people are still able to make a living.

But 16 months under a Democrat-controlled rule here in the House of Representatives, what has it wrought? We have higher food prices, a recession in the economy, free fall of the housing prices and energy prices through the roof, causing hardships for all Americans.

I come from the State of New Jersey. When I go home, I just went home for the weekend, and I talked to my friends and constituents back home. They are paying the price, at the pump, at the food store, everywhere, and it's creating a real hardship for the American family.

When the American family sits down each week and pays their bills, gets out their checkbook, and say how are we going to pay this month's mortgage payment, this month's rent payment, first they have to pay all of these other expenses.

At the end of the week, they realize the money is just not in the checkbook anymore. One of the root causes is the price of fuel. They are probably scratching their heads saying what is the Democrat-led majority in the House doing about it? Where is that plan that you were referring to that the Democrats campaigned on 18 months ago before they took over the majority? Where is that plan during these last 16 months now that they have been in the majority?

My constituents wait. You and I wait.

In the meantime, let's take a look at the facts. Democrats make all sorts of claims about the price of energy, about the price of gasoline prices. I would like to address just three or four of them.

First of all, one of the most frequent things, and you see hearings on this over and over, Democrats will say, well, it's because of America, it's because of those American oil companies that we have skyrocketing prices. Let's get into the facts a little bit about that, though. U.S. energy companies are not even in the top 10 when you look at total proven oil reserves and gas reserves in the entire world.

For example, ExxonMobil has less than 5 percent of the stock held by Saudi Aramco. A full 53 percent of the price we pay for gasoline when we go to the pump is related to the price of the crude oil that goes into it, a world commodity.

Can Democrats really accuse American oil companies of so influencing prices when they own such a marginally small amount of the total world supply? When we think about it, this is a part and parcel of the Democrat blame America first doctrine here too in energy.

Secondly, Democrats say that the U.S. needs to decrease demand for oil. We have to live more modestly, I guess, is what that really translates out to be.

It turns out the facts are this, in recent years U.S. American families' demand for oil and all its uses has actually begun to stabilize, and we have seen over a period of time an actual decrease in the amount of use. Meanwhile, world demand for oil has actually increased to 84 million barrels a year. That's an increase of 16 million barrels just over the last decade.

While we are willing and able and want to work with the other side of the aisle to come up with ways to conserve fuel, the facts point to the fact that we should not be blaming America first with regard to increased use of oil. But it's the rest of the world that is just increasing their consumption, which is a supply and demand factor.

Thirdly, Democrats are off to say that the Americans already have reliable access to energy supplies. Well, when we get into the facts, it refutes what the Democrats are saying.

The U.S., as a matter of fact, is the only, the only industrial Nation in the entire world that locks up 85 percent of its open available deep sea energy reserves. Let me repeat that number again, 85 percent of our reserves offshore and elsewhere are locked up. We can't get to them. You and I can't use them today, our children can't use them tomorrow, grandchildren in the future, they are locked up under their plan.

Even worse, we have not even built a new refinery in this country for the last 32 years. As a result of these factors, 63 percent of our energy supplies that we should be able to use right here in this country are obtained from foreign sources instead. The Democrat plan makes us even more reliant on foreign sources, those same foreign sources that are unreliable, unstable and oftentimes hostile to the United States as well.

□ 2015

Fourthly, Democrats claim that the Federal Government, the bureaucrats here in Washington, must micro-manage, if you will, and regulate these American oil companies. Again, what are the facts. The facts are that in 2007, these very same American oil companies and themselves spent \$183 billion in new investment. What does that do,

that leads to the development of more efficient environmental fuels on the market.

Meanwhile, the Democrat majority has voted to raise taxes four separate times just during the 110th Congress. I began my remarks asking what has 16 months under Democrat control wrought when it comes to this country, well, one point there is four separate times taxes have gone up during this Congress. And where does that end up being paid from? Well, tomorrow is April 15, tax day, and we know who pays. It comes down not on the corporations and big business, it is comes down on the consumer.

So soaring prices are the result of supply and demand, and the best approach to energy efficiency and cost reduction is one that is market based. The worst approach is no plan whatsoever, which is what we have seen by the other side of the aisle, and a lack of a plan that engages in such rhetoric as blame America first, restrict the development of efficient energy resources that are American based, and the worst plan is to make the United States and the citizens of this country even more reliant on those unstable and hostile regimes.

I thank the gentleman for coming to the floor tonight and reminding all of America about the dilemma that we face going in, both in the short term with the family budget today and the future, and the great need we have to have a plan put in place and implemented. I look forward to working with you to achieve such.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague for coming down to the floor. As he was speaking I was thinking, and of course I started by talking about two buzz words that are out there because of this politicized season. I think we need to merge them together.

What we have from the Democrat majority on energy policy is bitter change. Bitter change; \$58 a barrel for crude oil to \$111 per barrel of crude oil; \$2.40 for a gallon of gasoline to \$3.50. We have bitter change, not good change, bitter change because there is no energy policy.

First there are the grand promises made by the Democratic leadership which I quoted earlier and will probably quote again. No change, bad change, bitter change. It is unfortunate because it is our citizens who are feeling the burden.

I started this last week again during the healthy beaches discussion. It is amazing as I was looking at the stories over the weekend flying home and flying back today, a whole bunch of articles. "Truckers feel the crunch of high diesel prices." This one is better. "Independent truckers join strike." It has tractor-trailer rigs, shut them down, on strike. Try \$4 a gallon; bitter change to the independent truck driver. There is no energy policy. When you have no policy, you have a failed policy.

Another article, "High fuel prices mean high costs." There is a lot of

blame being given to the agricultural sector because of the high cost of food, but the Federal Reserve Bank in Kansas City said over the past three decades, rising labor and energy costs have boosted that share steadily from 67 percent in the 1970s to 80 percent today.

The Federal Reserve Bank also estimated that a 10 percent gain in energy prices could contribute to 5.2 percent increase in retail food prices. And, John Urbanchuk in an article "The Relative Impact of Corn and Energy Prices in the Grocery Aisle" on June 14, 2007, said rising energy prices had a more significant impact on food prices than did corn.

Bitter change; no energy plan. The Democrats failed to bring supply into the energy debate. We can pass efficiencies and renewables, but the reality is it is only nibbling around the edges. The Energy Information Agency projects a 30 percent increase in demand in electricity by 2030, a 30 percent demand increase. And we are nibbling around the edges. People think we are going to do it with solar panels and wind turbines. They can help. We would like to have them. In fact, I just heard Illinois is one of the largest States to try to employ wind power. But it is not going to meet our demand. Energy prices are going to go up, and when they do, the average American citizen, especially in rural America, pays a disproportionate burden because we have to travel long distances to go to work. We don't have the commuter rails and the bus services. What we have is our truck. And we like our trucks.

I am going to talk about electricity generation. I have spent a lot of time on liquid fuels, but I am joined by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) and so I yield to him at this time.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I thank Congressman SHIMKUS, and I appreciate your leadership today and also on the Energy and Commerce Committee where Congressman SHIMKUS has worked hard on issues to help solve the problems in this country.

Congressman SHIMKUS, you are right. I didn't realize until you showed the chart, how much under Democratic leadership oil prices have gone up. It is staggering. And gas prices have gone up, too, under Democratic leadership in this Congress.

Congressman SHIMKUS knows, too, that we have tried very hard on the Energy and Commerce Committee to have rational, comprehensive solutions in this country. We had a bill recently where Congressman SHIMKUS tried to get some of his legislation into this bill that would have helped a great deal, the coal-to-liquids technology, and it was stifled. They wouldn't allow it in.

What kind of bill did we get. Congressman SHIMKUS is right, "no" is not an energy policy. We got no energy policy. We got a bill that was energy policy in name only.

What they did was they had those curly light bulbs with mercury from China in them and everybody is going to put the bulbs in their homes, and that is really going to help our energy solution. That is a step in the right direction, I guess, but it is not going to solve our problem.

Also they looked at efficiencies in our appliances, which is a good thing, but we need to go much, much further.

One of the things that Congressman SHIMKUS talked about is supply and demand, and that is what this is all about. We haven't built a refinery in this country in the last 30 years. Congressman GARRETT was talking about that. That is a problem. When all of our refineries are operating at maximum capacity, you can only get so much fuel out of them. We need more refineries in this country, and we can do it in an environmentally sound way.

Also, we need to spur domestic production, getting more oil, gas and coal in the United States instead of relying on countries, particularly in the Middle East, that we have been at war with recently. That is not a good idea. If it is in our backyard, let's get it here. Nobody wants to hurt the environment. Everybody wants to have clean air, water, and land. The oil, gas and coal companies do, too.

We also need in our energy policy to start looking at other energy sources as well. That is important, getting away from oil, gas and coal, but it is not going to be in the near future. It is a pure technology-driven issue. And we need alternative sources of energy. We need solar and wind. We need nuclear. We need alternative fuels. We need all of those things, but it is going to take time. You can't do it immediately. We need to develop those technologies to where they can be brought to the public, like batteries in cars developed to where people can afford them, and develop and use alternative energy sources. And we need to develop more gas and oil here in the United States.

You know, Cuba allows China to drill off the coast of Florida. Yet in the United States, we can't drill in a lot of places offshore here in the United States. We can't do it.

Also here in the United States there are areas where we can't explore in. We hear a lot about the Alaskan Wildlife Reserve. Let's develop that here in the United States. There is a vast quantity of oil in the Alaskan Wildlife Reserve. We can develop it in an environmentally sound way where it is not going to hurt some caribou or anything like that. The Alaskan pipeline, they said that was going to happen there, yet the caribou actually like the pipeline. They use it for shelter.

But if we develop the Alaskan Wildlife Reserve, let's put it in perspective. If ANWR were the size of a football field, the area we are talking about drilling in would be the size of a postage stamp on the football field. The footprint we drill in would be relatively small. Oil and gas companies

want to do it in an environmentally sound way. And some experts say we could produce at least 2 million barrels a day out of ANWR. We were importing almost that much from Saddam Hussein and Iraq before the war happened. We could lessen that.

It is ridiculous that we depend so much on countries that have been hostile to the United States on something that is so important.

But when we look at energy policy, we need to look at it from a multi-pronged approach. We need to look at all of the oil, gas and coal. They are here to stay for the time being. But we need to look at alternative energy sources as well. I think everybody agrees that is important.

We need real solutions. We need real energy policy in this country, and we are not getting it from the Democrat-controlled Congress. We have worked hard and Congressman SHIMKUS has worked hard in the committee to get these things done, but they stifle them every time. We need real solutions to real problems, and this is a problem that if we don't address relatively soon, it is going to come home to roost. It is a national security issue. We are putting ourselves in jeopardy, and it is wrong. It is the wrong thing to do.

Again, I commend Congressman SHIMKUS for all he does on the Energy and Commerce Committee and for doing this special order tonight.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague, and especially for again returning the focus to the national security dynamics of this.

The United States Air Force is the number one consumer of aviation fuel in the world. What are they asking for? They want a safe, reliable supply of aviation fuel. Reliable. The only way they are going to get a reliable supply of aviation fuel is if that aviation fuel is produced by a commodity product where we are not relying on importation. That goes back to this debate on coal-to-liquid technologies.

Again, just in the Illinois coal basin alone, 250 years worth, as much energy as Saudi Arabia has in crude oil, just the Illinois coal basin alone. We are not talking about the Wyoming-Montana coal basin or the West Virginia, Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky region. We are talking about the Illinois coal basin has as much energy as Saudi Arabia has in oil.

So as we go back to the coal-to-liquid debate and we are talking about national security, and we need to have the fuel to fly our war machines, coal, locally discovered, developed, brought to the surface, with a coal-to-liquid refinery, built by the building trades, operated by organized labor and our boilermaker friends, high-paying wages, good benefits, not on the coastal plain, in the Midwest, pipeline to, and this chart just happens to show an F-18 Tomcat, a United States Air Force fighter plane.

□ 2030

Our Air Force is asking for this for national security, a reliable source of jet fuel, and we continue to delay.

What's the other world doing? What's the other countries, other world doing?

Well, Russia is attempting to grab a vast chunk of the Arctic to claim to its vast potential oil, gas and mineral wells to fuel that country's economy. Russia's going after fossil fuels.

Well, what's our other friends doing? Brazil, Russia, India and China have overtaken the United States in dominating the global energy industry, according to a study by Goldman Sachs.

What's the Chinese doing? China is building 40 nuclear plants in the next 15 years. 40. We'll be lucky to have one. One. No carbon emissions in a nuclear power plant. Zero.

I think that's the biggest frustration that a lot of us have from our friends on the environmental left. They don't like nuclear power. They don't like coal. They don't like crude oil. We're trying to find out what they like.

China is planning 40 nuclear power plants in the next 15 years, and I pray that we have one. I would be ecstatic to have four. There's no way we'll have 15. There's just no way. The United States has not licensed one nuclear power plant in 30 years, not one, due to my friends on the other side's continued opposition to nuclear power.

We could bring nuclear power legislation to the floor in this Congress. And it would have bipartisan support. All the Republicans would support it. Well, we might lose about three. And I bet we could grab 40 Democrats that would support it. I bet we could have a bipartisan majority vote on coal-to-liquid technologies. I'd bet it'd be the same. We'd have all the Republicans minus a handful, and we'd get about 40 Democrat votes. But this Democrat leadership will not bring a bill to the floor that addresses the supply debate.

China opened new domestic energy reserves in 2004 and has planned to increase production by about 8 billion barrels by 2010.

Democrats refuse to allow American workers to produce American oil. In fact, in the energy debate last year, not the final bill that passed, but the two that didn't get signed into law, they put another area of natural gas off limits.

We need increased supply. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that if you want lower prices, you have to have more supply. We don't get any help.

China's increasing offshore energy production to reduce its own dependence on foreign oil. Let me say that, because I've got some friends over there who live on the coast. China is increasing offshore energy production. In fact, we know just 50 miles off of Florida, 50 miles, it's not a U.S. energy company or a U.S. energy exploration to go after the oil in the Gulf 50 miles off Miami. It's China. China has better access to our oil reserves on the Outer

Continental Shelf than we have. Isn't that crazy?

China's increasing offshore energy production to reduce its own dependence on foreign oil, growing that production at an average of 15.3 percent per year, with plans to make offshore oil production China's largest source of oil by doubling production by 2010.

And we know what happens any time we talk about offshore exploration, a counting of gas and oil reserves, just trying to figure out what's there we have a fight.

China invested \$24 billion in large scale coal liquefaction technologies. Oh, that sounds familiar. Coal-to-liquid technologies.

The United States, what are we doing? Zip, zero, nada, nothing.

What's China doing? China invested \$24 billion in large scale coal liquefaction technology. We can't get a vote on that on the floor. China's expanding its natural gas infrastructure by constructing pipelines. We can't get a pipeline bill moved.

China rapidly is expanding its refining capacity. Democrats have repeatedly voted against expanding American refinery capacity. In fact, one of the huge problems we have, which I find is really—I think people understand that we import crude oil. We're relying on imported crude oil and that's bad.

What the public, I think, would even get angrier at is we import refined product. We import gasoline. So not only, we lose the refining jobs. It would be better for us to import the crude oil and refine that crude oil, or at least we'd have our friends in the refining industry, many of those bargaining unit employees would have jobs. But we are importing refined product. Criminal negligence.

China is ambitiously developing its nuclear power industry with plans to spend approximately \$50 billion on 30 additional nuclear reactors within the next 15 years. China is planning on constructing many new large scale hydroelectric projects over the forecast period, including the 18.2 gigawatt Three Gorges dam project, which is scheduled to be operational by 2009.

In fact, we're tearing down dams. We're not expanding hydroelectric power. 50 percent of the electricity we use is produced by coal in this country. 50 percent. 20 percent by nuclear power, 20 percent by hydroelectric, and the rest the others.

I'm going to move to the concern. With no plan to address this problem, which is the escalating costs of crude oil, again, when Speaker PELOSI took over, \$58 a barrel, crude oil.

I'll be honest. Bush took over it was \$27. I always say that. Bush it was \$27, PELOSI, \$58, now \$111. With all the promises, and maybe I'll just read those one more time as I end.

But the basic premise is, under Democrat leadership of the House, the average American is paying more. We're paying more. We're going to pay more in taxes. We know that. But this isn't

a special order on taxes. This is a special order on energy.

We're paying more at the pump. Here's the reason why. The high cost of a barrel of crude oil, we're relying on imported crude oil. One solution would be technology. Another would be to move into electric cars. But guess what? Electric cars need an electric supply. They'll need nuclear power plants. They'll need coal generating, coal, then the electricity generation plants buy coal. There's going to be, we have to have something to charge the batteries to allow these battery-run cars to run.

Let's talk a minute about global climate change. We know that the public is paying more at the pump when the Democrat majority promised lower prices. That's a given.

We had a hearing in the subcommittee last week. My issue to the panelists was, the American public, they need to understand that if we address global climate change there is going to be a cost.

Of course, some on the environmental left said no. We're going to have all these efficiencies. We're going to have all these new jobs. It's going to be a wash.

Well, it's funny, flying home, an AP story on the 12th, the State of California is going to put on the electrical bill, a 25 or 30 percent surcharge on customers' electric and gas bills for global climate change. So your electricity bills are going to go up. Gas prices are up. Electricity prices are up. You're going to pay more in taxes.

This is bitter change, bitter change, not good change. Bitter change. Bitter change for the average American who all they want to do is go to work and pay their bills, take care of their family, try to save some for the future. They can't save with these high energy prices.

And you saw the independent truckers, the article I held up.

If we could have effective change, let's assume that we do all we can as Americans to lead the way, go through all this pain. Do you really believe that our Chinese friends, after I gave all the stats on what they're doing, are going to comply with an international agreement? Not only do I not believe it, they've told me no. And I've mentioned this in many committee hearings.

In fact, the senior Chinese official said twice to two of my Democratic colleagues' questions when they said, if the United States led, would you agree to an international agreement to coal carbon?

And their answer was, you all have had, well they didn't use you all. That's kind of a Southern Illinois thing. They said, you have had 200 years to develop a middle class in your country using fossil fuels, and it's our turn. That doesn't sound like a country that wants to address carbon debate in an international arena.

So should Americans, should we go through all this pain on global climate

change, and have no gain? Do we go through all this exercise, all these job dislocations, all this pain, for not one single benefit?

And if we do, you know, I just want us to be transparent with our citizens. Intellectually honest. Chairman DINGELL said, you know, if we want to be honest with the American people, what we should do is put 50 cents additional tax on gasoline and take that money, and address our carbon debate.

Well, that works great. That now takes \$3.50 a gallon of gas, which people are outraged about, and brings it up to \$4. And it's going to get to \$4 without the additional 50 cent tax. But at least it's intellectually honest, saying that there's going to be a cost.

The California Public Utility Commission is honest. 25 to 30 percent increase on your energy bill for climate change. Great.

Well, it wasn't a front-page story. It was, I don't know, I ripped it up. I think it was, like, the Business Section, like D6, way in the back. So I'm not sure if it made the front page of the California papers, but that's what their public utility commission has agreed to do.

All pain, no gain. The public needs to know the cost and be prepared to assume the cost.

All I see in this debate on energy is bitter change, bitter change for the working men and women of this country. This is contrary to the promises made.

April 24, 2006, Speaker NANCY PELOSI said "Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices." Bring down skyrocketing gas. They weren't even skyrocketing then compared to what we have now. Now we've got skyrocketing gas prices.

Majority Leader STENY HOYER said, "Democrats believe that we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices."

Y'all did more? You raised gas prices even more.

Democratic Whip JIM CLYBURN said, "House Democrats have a plan to help curb rising gas prices."

□ 2045

No energy plan is a plan to fail. We go from \$58.31 a barrel of crude oil to today, \$111.

Now, I got these on little, kind of like a Blue Dog type of thing. I got this on a moveable type of a number system here. So that if it goes up, I can add. If it goes down, I can adjust. But the reality is, the spread, under the leadership of this House, has only gone up. And I believe, and the economists today believe, it will continue to go up.

We can do better. We can do better. I talked to many of my friends on the other side. I actually voted for CAFE language. That was a hard thing for me to do. Helped expand the renewable fuel standard. Brought biodiesel and ethanol into the national energy debate. That's all good stuff. Energy Star provisions. Electricity savings provisions.

We want the deployment of solar cells. We want wind power. As I mentioned earlier, Illinois could be at the forefront of electricity generation by wind.

What we do know, Texas had to call their high electricity users when their wind turbines stopped turning because the wind stopped blowing. That's the challenge of renewable energy. Instead of having a consistent base-load energy, and in this country it's undisputed that coal is the primary commodity product that produces 50 percent of the electricity generation in this country. The electricity we're using in the Capitol building tonight is produced by coal. The electricity on the Capitol grounds is produced by coal.

There are some of my friends on the other side that would like us to not use another ounce of fossil fuels ever in this country. I am afraid of those days because those days will only occur when there's another worldwide recession. And you want to see the pain and the agony and the frustration on the middle- and the lower-middle class of our country, wait till there's no jobs. We won't be putting carbon in the air. That will be good for some people, but we won't be employing our citizens either. And that will be a shame.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this time. I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman GARRETT and Congressman SULLIVAN, for joining me in a plea to my friends on the other side that, as we continue to talk about energy, we don't disregard the supply debate. That's got to be part of the solution. It just has to be because just so much of the electricity that we use today is based upon 50 percent coal, 20 percent nuclear, 20 percent hydroelectric. They have to be part of the mix. It's my plea that, as we move forward and try to address the high cost of electricity and liquid fuel, we remember the great resources that we have in this country and have a plan to use them.

WEEK OF THE YOUNG CHILD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity that has been given to us by Speaker PELOSI tonight to talk about an issue that is affecting literally mil-

lions of families across America, and that is the lack of affordable child care and early childhood education. It is especially important to highlight these issues as this week marks the Week of the Young Child.

For the next hour, we're going to focus on young children and how, over the last 7 years, we have failed to provide adequate and necessary funding for vital child care and early childhood education.

And I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that as a mother of three young children—I have 8-year-old twins and an almost 5-year-old, 4½-year-old little girl—this is something that is near and dear to my heart.

I remember the struggle that I went through when I first gave birth to my twins and had to go back to work, and we searched and searched for a quality child care program. We were turning our newborn babies, 3 months old, 4 months old, over to really, basically, someone we didn't know, someone to care for our little ones all day long. You know, we just couldn't even imagine turning over the care of our babies, our most precious resource, we couldn't imagine turning over our babies to anyone.

So you can imagine the struggle that people go through when, on top of having to decide where they can take their children to be cared for while they work, that they also have to struggle through the angst of not knowing or not expecting that they can afford that care. And because we have continued to slash and burn from this administration the funding for Head Start and for the Child Care Development Block Grants programs, we absolutely wanted to come to the floor tonight and spend an hour, at least an hour, highlighting the needs that children in this country have, and particularly those of working families. And I'm going to be joined tonight by several of my colleagues.

Before we begin, though, I do want to recognize and thank our good friend, Chairman GEORGE MILLER of the Education and Labor Committee, and Chairman KILDEE, DALE KILDEE, for their leadership and their commitment to child care issues and education, as well as the Head Start and Child Care Development Block Grant Program funding. These are all programs that are near and dear to their hearts, and a number of these Members have submitted statements.

We just have to highlight that there are children, especially those from low-income families, that need better access to high-quality early childhood programs. Across the Nation, Madam Speaker, child care fees average from \$4,000 to \$10,000 per year which exceed the cost of public universities in most States. Yet nationally, only one in seven children who are financially eligible for child care subsidies is being served. One in seven.

And at this time, I would like to turn the podium over to a champion for America's children, the voice in this

body that is consistently there for those who have no voice. She is the current Chair of the Woman's Caucus, Congressman LOIS CAPPs of California.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognition of the Week of the Young Child. I want to thank our colleague from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who is such a good role model, and often-times her children are here, and they give testimony to the fact that working moms can be successful parents as well as wonderful professionals in this business that we're in.

And I'm pleased to be with some of my colleagues, MAZIE HIRONO and JASON ALTMIRE and others who may join us, to call attention to the importance of the Week of the Young Child. My daughter and her dearest friend, whom she met in preschool, are visiting and taking part in this; and it's a testimony to the importance of those early years and some life-long friendships that can result as a result of that.

As we celebrate this important week, I want to take the opportunity to highlight two very critical programs which our colleague has already mentioned that are so important to young children: The Child Care and Development Block Grant, CCDBG, and Head Start. As someone who has spent most of my life working with our kids in our public schools, I know firsthand the power and the importance of these programs for both our kids and our families.

Due to the realities and demands of today's family life, there are many young people, many children who are left with too much unstructured time, and we know the hours right after school are the most dangerous and important hours of the day.

Unfortunately, parents are working longer hours and often have to leave their children in the care of their siblings or others who should not have to have the responsibility to do this. Child care can often be the second highest cost in the family budget. Sometimes, it's the highest. Child care costs consume roughly 42 percent of the median single parent's family income, at around \$10,000 annually.

With a growing home mortgage crisis and stagnant economic outlook, parents cannot afford this. It's simply a matter that is of dire consequence to many of our families today.

Child care and development block grants enable 162,000 children a month in California to receive adequate child care. As the only source of Federal funding to subsidize child care for low-income families, CCDBG has life-changing effects on thousands of families in California and therefore needs our full support.

Unfortunately, this program has been level funded for 6 years, and that is why I'm fully supporting an \$874 million increase in CCDBG. This funding would restore the program to an adequate level and provide child care to an additional 39,400 children in California