

and its great talent and abilities in a scientific way to be used on weapons of mass destruction and other arms of the military industrial complex rather than science and research to save lives and save humanity.

Who knows which person, which young person or older person, could do something to save other people's lives let alone give love and hope to families?

And so with national health care insurance, we could cover people, we could save lives because if we had insurance for the people, you could scope out illnesses earlier whether you're wealthy or poor. You would have the same opportunity to have preventative care, early treatment, and diagnosis of illnesses that can cause loss of life. And that early detection can save lives.

Right now if you're poor, you don't have the opportunity to have that early detection and your life is taken. And that's an inequity that this country should not allow to continue and shouldn't have permitted for all of these years.

There are so many accomplishments that we have seen in this country, particularly in this year. We've seen our Nation become a more perfect union in so many ways. But the fundamental right to health care is one that we have not recognized yet and we must.

We're all here because of the grace of God, and it seems like we should all have the—at our access and at our disposal what God's creatures have been able to discover, refine, produce, in the way of medical care to keep people alive. That just seems like a minimum thing.

And this country is the only great industrialized country on the face of the earth without some national health care policy. It seems like in this area, we are not the first in the Nation, in the world, but we're last in the world. And that's terrible.

There are doctors that serve in this body, and they're to be admired for giving their time. And I'm sure—I have many friends who are doctors who give a lot of charity care. But it shouldn't have to be doctors providing charity care to treat people that otherwise wouldn't be treated. It should be something that we all give. And I think that that's the real social need in this country. And when people talk about values and social consciousness and really religious thought and caring about others, it really begins with caring about people's health and sacrificing maybe some of our own resources to have a government system that can help others with their health care.

So I'm pleased, Madam Speaker, to speak as I have. You have inspired me with your remarks, the letters you read; and I'm just pleased that Chairman CONYERS has this issue before us.

Madam Speaker, I enter the following for the RECORD.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
H-232, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.
Chairman DAVID OBEY,
Committee on Appropriations, H-218, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND CHAIRMAN OBEY: I am writing to request that NIH funding in the President's FY09 budget for the research of cancer, diabetes, heart disease, AIDS, Parkinson's disease and Alzheimer's disease be doubled in the final FY09 budget set forth by Congress.

The following are the estimates included in the President's FY09 Budget request at the National Institutes of Health (NIH): Cancer: \$5.654B; Diabetes: \$1.033B; Heart Disease: \$2.111B; Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis under National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases: \$300M; Alzheimer's Disease: \$644M; Parkinson's Disease: \$186M.

These debilitating diseases affect millions of people each year across the globe. Families are torn apart, emotionally and financially, by the effects of their contraction. Congress has a serious responsibility to provide adequate funding for research that could not only find promising treatments, but permanent cures.

I cannot imagine a more pressing issue than ensuring the healthy future of those we are here to represent. The disparity between the amounts of funding requested for the war in Iraq and that requested to treat deadly diseases is incomprehensible. The successful findings of research programs made possible through increased funding will not only aid people in the United States, but the rest of the world, as well. It is my hope that, by taking full advantage of the scientific resources we have here at home, we can better our relationships with research teams across the globe to reach our common goals: finding a cure and establishing peace.

As always, I remain,

Most Sincerely,

STEVE COHEN,
Member of Congress.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close out this hour by saying all those who came forward this evening we appreciate so much because you represent different areas of the country, and we hope this word can get out across the country that we're ready to move forward.

And I do hope that we can follow through on our plans to go over the media to present the case. So I'm going to request that all Members who have stories such as the ones I read, submit them to Congressman CONYER's office so we can compile these and be sure that we've referenced them as we move closer to accessible health care for all Americans.

And with that, I would like to close out this hour, reserve the balance of our time for another evening.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, for the time.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And just to make sure that my constituents know that I have not changed States, it's Michigan. It starts with an "M," it's up north, it's cold, generally. I can understand that. But I'm sure proud to represent Michigan, and more importantly, the Seventh District of Michigan in this great House of Representatives.

Tonight I am committed to talking about an issue that is of extreme importance to my constituents, and in fact from what we read, constituents of all of our districts all over this great United States because we are in a time and place and setting right now that, frankly, we aren't used to.

And may I submit tonight to all who would listen that, frankly, I don't think we should ever get used to it for America is too great of a Nation and has been the ambassador of great blessing to the rest of the world in many cases. It has set the course, has charted the way toward greater economic achievement, standard of living, advances in technology, business, industry, education, medicine, and transportation.

I happen to come from the district where Henry Ford had his home, made homes and schools for his employees in a great part of my district, used the resources from that district, including during some wartimes some Sassafras trees just three miles from my house that were used to make a light but strong frame for his motor cars with the absence of steel at that point in time because of the war effort.

I come from the State that has been known as the Motor Capital of the World, Michigan. Detroit has set the standard that the rest of the world has followed, emulated, copied, and sometimes even expanded upon, and yet still America, Michigan, the Motor Capital, charts the way.

Just the other day—I tell this story for a purpose, but just the other day I had something of an experience happen to me that has never happened before, nor did I expect it to happen. I filled the tank of my Harley Davidson motorcycle, which has a 5-gallon tank, and it cost me over \$20. Now, for those of you that have ridden motorcycles, it is almost unbelievable to think that a vehicle that gets great gas mileage, that has a small tank like that would ever cost double digits, let alone over \$20 to fill. But that's the place we're in right now with gas today on average across the United States at \$4.04 a gallon. My Harley happens to take premium. So I paid \$4.27 a gallon for that 5-gallon tank fill.

□ 1930

Less than 2 years ago, very seldom, if ever, would I double-digit fill my tank, even if it were on empty. Now, I don't ride my Harley Davidson for transportation anymore.

It's primarily for recreation, but 38 years ago when I started riding my first motorcycle it was for transportation, to get to and from my work.

Over the course of successive years, I would use my motorcycle in the better seasons of the year, the warmer time, to ride to work and enjoy that experience but also as commuting. I don't do that anymore, but we're paying gas prices now that should not be part and parcel of what America is.

We talk a lot about energy independence and being willing to compete and make sure that the rest of the world has to compete with us, as opposed to the other way around. And yet, up to this very day, in the outcome of what has gone on in Congress, it has been just talk and no action.

Last week, I heard the governor of our great State of Michigan announce on a major radio talk show that she was now riding a bicycle to the Capitol from her governor's residence each day, and when the host expressed concern about her safety, she said, oh, no problem, my security detail are following me on their bicycles as well.

Now, that's a nice story. I don't give any negatives toward our governor for being efficient in her use of energy resources, but you've got to understand that, when I heard that, it shocked me. And in fact, if not angered, it frustrated me to think that the governor of the motor capital of the world was riding a bicycle to work, even though she has an energy efficient, flex-fuel vehicle that I've seen her use and seen her actually fill the gas tank with fuel.

Right now, more importantly, getting to the real world of real people, people who pay those gas prices each day, people who pay their taxes, that includes supporting this Congress in what we do, right now most Michigan families that I know of, as I go back to my district each weekend, are giving up things like nights out eating at restaurants or family vacations or traveling to family events in order to cover the rising cost of gasoline. If Congress does not take action soon, families will be giving up much more than that. They will be giving up very specific needs, necessities in their life. And in fact, what I've heard in many town hall meetings, some are already giving up even necessities of their life in order to pay for the gasoline to get to their workplace the next day in order to sometime hopefully pay for some of these necessities.

Just this past weekend, AAA announced that the nationwide average gas price finally reached over \$4 per gallon. It's been much higher in Michigan for several weeks. High gas prices are affecting families, truckers, farmers, small business owners. I met a small business owner in my office today who said the cost of transporting copy machines, office equipment to and from her client is getting almost prohibitive. Emergency services, public safety, and numerous other entities in Michigan's Seventh District and all over this U.S. are being negatively affected by the high cost, and I say the unnecessarily high cost, of fuel.

Despite fuel costs at levels previously only seen in Europe, leadership in this

Congress refuses to increase American energy production. Instead, Speaker PELOSI and leading House Democrats would rather increase taxes on domestic energy production and increase our reliance on OPEC or, as suggested last week, sue OPEC for what all that's worth.

On a related note, the United States Department of Commerce recently announced the U.S. trade deficit reached its highest level in 13 months in April. Our trade deficit also increased by \$4.1 billion between February 2007 and February 2008.

This is why our country is facing a rising trade deficit, even though American-made exports grew by 12 percent in 2007. The issue related to energy and the cost of energy has a direct influence on this. This is why we need to provide incentives to increase America's investment in alternative energy and overall production of energy.

The United States imports around 12 million barrels of oil a day, and a barrel of oil has gone from \$70 to \$140 over the last year, dramatically increasing our trade deficit. Our reliance on imported oil and increased oil prices means we are sending even more money to foreign countries and some that don't like us very much at all and certainly don't share our interests.

For both economic and national security purposes, and again, I want to reiterate that, national security purposes, Congress needs to finally get serious about an energy plan that truly lowers prices at the pump, reduces our dependence on foreign oil, and makes real progress towards energy independence. Instead of increasing our dependence on OPEC, America needs to return energy production to the United States. Doing so will create American jobs and provide needed economic stability and transportation that's efficient and usable to our American taxpayer.

The answer to our current energy crisis must be multi-pronged, and I have cosponsored legislation to provide incentives along those lines for solar, wind, cellulosic ethanol, biodiesel and other green alternatives. We must increase domestic energy production through carbon-free nuclear power and clean coal technology as well. I'm also cosponsoring legislation that would encourage conservation with tax credits for green buildings and legislation that would spark a revolution in clean hydrogen technology.

There are many sources where we can move toward if we're willing to dig down deep and do what's necessary and walk away from those unnecessarily strong, critical, excessive environmental forces that don't speak to the welfare of this great country.

Today, I introduced a discharge petition, something that isn't done regularly in Congress, something that isn't successful regularly but has been. I trust that this discharge motion will be. As of this point in time, with just a few hours with that discharge motion being on the floor, 93 of my colleagues

have signed on, moving toward the 218 that are necessary.

This petition, if effective with 218 signatures, will force a vote on Congressman Mac Thornberry's No More Excuses Energy Act, an Act suitably entitled, legislation to increase U.S. energy production and invest in alternative sources of energy as well.

This appropriately named legislation would impact the price at the pump and lower electric bills. It would encourage the construction of new refineries, boost alternative energy, supplemental energy development by extending the wind production tax credit for 10 years, giving some certainty that if I were to invest in wind energy production, I would have a reasonable amount of time to see a return on my investment.

It would increase American oil production by allowing environmentally sound drilling in Alaska, the Outer Continental Shelf and the Gulf of Mexico, and it would help increase our supply of electricity by encouraging the construction of new nuclear power plants. Even leaders, in fact, one of the founders of Greenpeace, have come out strongly encouraging the use of nuclear power as being clean, green energy, not given over to continuing production of greenhouse gases.

Rather than increase taxes on domestic energy production, as some in Congress have proposed, I'm working to pass sound legislation that will bring down the price of gas and reduce our dependence on Middle East oil. Legislation like the No More Excuses Energy Act of MAC THORNBERRY would increase the supply of American energy and increase the number of good paying jobs in this country and in my district, the Seventh District of Michigan.

Policies such as a 23-year moratorium on exploring and developing offshore production of clean and green natural gas need to be lifted in order to lower prices and reduce our dependence on foreign gas. Natural gas provides 23 percent of our Nation's energy. It should be more. And America is the only developed Nation that prohibits offshore production and exploration of this clean, green, clean burning resource, and Americans are paying higher electricity and heating bills as a result of this.

Like all of you, I'm tired of paying these high prices. Whether it's for my motorcycle, whether it's for my car or whether it's for my pick-up truck, I'm tired of paying this because it's unnecessary, as we've done nothing to change that except talk, and it's time to put action into place.

I know high prices are affecting all of us. This is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for America to put up with this. The good people of south central Michigan, the good people of Michigan, the good people of the rest of the States in this wonderful country who depend on gasoline or diesel to get to work, drive their kids to baseball practice and visit family members deserve better.

The volunteers who offer to drive veterans to VA hospitals in my district and other districts in other States deserve better.

The volunteers who offer to drive Meals on Wheels to needy senior citizens deserve better than this.

Our churches and synagogues, our places of worship all across this great country that will be looking at looming fuel bills that many will be unable to pay this coming heating season deserve better than this because America doesn't need to be in this situation.

So I'm delighted that tonight I'm joined by a number of my colleagues who will add to what has been stated already, probably more eloquently, with points of experience that come from all over this country. I appreciate their commitment to doing something more than talking about energy independence, doing something more than talking about resuming America's position of leading the world in all areas, including the area of energy production and usage.

We have blessed the world with our standard of living, with our technology and with our energy, and it is time to get about that project again.

So at this time, I would like to ask my good friend and colleague from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROUN, to add to what has been said. I appreciate you taking the time to be with us this evening.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my colleague.

According to AAA, the average American is paying over \$4.04 per gallon of gasoline today. Meanwhile, Communist China and Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba are moving forward with drilling for oil and gas just 45 miles off of the coast of Florida and Key West.

We cannot even drill for oil or gas 200 miles off our own shores; yet congressional Democrats continue to refuse to allow access to American gas and oil supplies. The average price of gasoline has gone up \$1.71 per gallon since Speaker PELOSI's promise, promise, to lower energy prices at the beginning of the 110th Congress, this Congress.

What have the Democrats done to try to help hardworking Americans? They're simply seeking political gain from America's pain. Democratic Presidential candidate Barack Obama said he wants to impose more taxes on U.S. oil companies. Is that really a smart solution? This will only drive up prices on Americans, not just for gasoline but for every product or service purchased. Even worse is that foreign oil companies will not be subject to this joke of a solution.

The liberals propose raising the Federal tax on gasoline and diesel by 50 cents per gallon. This is on top of the already existing Federal tax of 18.4 cents per gallon for gasoline and 24.4 cents per gallon for diesel. Under this proposal, you will be paying at today's prices \$4.54 a gallon for gas.

Liberals also suggest mandating ethanol and renewable fuel production and

selling it as the answer to America's energy needs. The 2007 lack of energy bill has already proven that the Democratic solution is wrong. Mandating the production of renewable fuels has only led to an increase in world food prices.

□ 1945

It is, at best, disingenuous, and at worst, an outright lie to say that renewable fuels can meet America's needs in the near future. As a good southerner, I love my corn bread and grits. It makes no sense to put corn in the tank of my truck.

The Department of the Interior estimates that there are 112 billion particles of recoverable oil beneath U.S. Federal lands and coastal waters, enough oil to fuel 60 million cars for 60 years. The United States is the only nation in the world that forbids any production on its Outer Continental Shelf. Despite a decades-long record of environmentally responsible offshore production, over 80 percent of America's oil and natural gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf are completely off limits to exploration and production.

The OCS, Outer Continental Shelf, is estimated to hold at least 419 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas resources and 86 billion barrels of oil. To put it in simple terms, this is enough natural gas to heat 100 million homes for 60 years, and enough oil to drive 85 million cars for 35 years, and enough oil to completely replace current Middle Eastern oil imports for 59 years.

We've heard time and time again about how drilling off the OCS will harm the environment. This is hogwash. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita destroyed or damaged hundreds of drilling rigs without causing a single drop to be spilled, yet congressional Democrats continue to pander to far left environmentalists instead of mending the pains of hardworking Americans.

Liberals also prevent any access to billions of barrels of oil located in ANWR. The entire area of ANWR is larger than the combined areas of five States—Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware—yet the proposed drilling area is equal to one-sixth the size of Dulles Airport here in Washington, D.C.

Energy prices are soaring. And the financial pain that families are feeling at the pump is forcing them to decide what they can and cannot spend. Congressional Democrats act as if they have been living under a rock by continuing to ignore the demands of the American people and refusing to do anything to lower these burdensome prices.

Skyrocketing gas prices and a risky dependence on fuel supply by volatile foreign nations highlight our need for an American energy policy that emphasizes production and decreases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil.

The United States is the only nation on Earth that forbids development of

its own natural resources. Right now, America is drilling for ice on Mars, but we cannot drill for oil in America. This makes no sense. It's crazy. It's idiotic. We must drill on our own lands, and we must drill now. We must streamline the permitting process and the refinery processes to get new refineries online, and we must end our dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

Mr. WALBERG, I greatly appreciate your doing this tonight; it is absolutely critical. I'm a medical doctor, as you know. I have patients who have to decide whether they can go to the doctor or not because gasoline prices are so high. I have patients who have to decide whether they can put a tank of gas in their car or they can go buy medications. This has to end. And we can do something about it. We can do something about it now if we have a responsible energy policy.

Our conference, as you know, has put forth a plan, a reasonable plan, an economically viable plan, an environmentally sensitive plan, a plan that will end this dependence upon Middle Eastern oil. It's a plan where we can provide the energy sources, not only our oil resources, but provide electric resources by permitting nuclear energy.

We have not built a new refinery in America for 30 years. We have not built a new nuclear reactor in 25 years. This is nuts, it's absolutely crazy. And we've got to end this idiocy of this current policy.

I applaud what you're doing here tonight. I look forward to further discussion from our other colleagues. I know that we have colleagues that want to ask questions and want to engage in a colloquy, if that's agreeable with you.

Mr. WALBERG. Well, Congressman BROUN, I think we want to do that. And I think you've brought up some points that are interesting to think about. Not only do we have a governor riding a bicycle to the Capitol, we are exploring for ice on Mars, but not doing exploration for oil—that we know is there—

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. That's right, it's just nuts.

Mr. WALBERG. In Alaska, in ANWR.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Anywhere. We've got oil under South Dakota, North Dakota and Montana. Those three States evidently are just floating on a sea of oil. There is supposed to be more oil, from what I understand, than is in the Middle East.

We can end our dependence on these foreign nations that want to destroy us, that want to destroy America. They hate us. And we're fueling the insurgency in Iraq. We're fueling these people who hate us. They hate our freedom, they hate America, they hate everything that we stand for.

Mr. WALBERG. And for those nations that love America and appreciate America, we're not standing in a

strengthened position that we can afford to them the assurance that America will be there when necessary because we can take care of ourselves, we're independent. And I think those are issues you bring up.

I'm delighted that we have the Dean of the Michigan delegation here, Congressman FRED UPTON, who has been here through a lot and I'm sure has taken a lot of grief on this issue.

And Congressman UPTON, before I turn to you, let me just, for the record, state, as you and some of my longer serving Republican colleagues are chastised for not getting this done in the House, you have attempted to get it done on numerous occasions. If we look back at the last decade, by the numbers, votes on ANWR exploration: House Republicans, 91 percent support it; House Democrats, 86 percent opposed.

Coal-to-liquid: House Republicans, 97 percent support it; House Democrats, 78 percent opposed. Oil shale exploration: House Republicans, 90 percent supported every vote on that in the House; House Democrats, 86 percent opposed.

Moving to the Outer Continental Shelf exploration, where right now foreign countries like Japan, China and Mexico are within 44-50 miles of our shores, and they are drilling and taking out natural gas and oil. On these votes, House Republicans, 81 percent support it; House Democrats, 83 percent opposed.

And then finally, refinery increased capacity, and now that we're offering the "no-more-excuses" Energy Act, the opportunity to put them on abandoned military facilities, government lands, House Republicans, 97 percent support it; House Democrats, 96 percent opposed.

Who is willing to take action? Who has evidenced that by their votes in this great body, this House of Representatives? Republicans, 91 percent, when you put it all together, of House Republicans have historically voted to increase the production of American-made oil and gas while 86 percent of House Democrats have historically voted against increasing the production of American-made oil and gas.

And so why do we see an "energy-less" energy bill that you talked about that gives incentives for bicycle riding and not energy? I think we have to say it's a leadership problem. So I thank you for bringing up those points.

Congressman UPTON, from my home State of Michigan, I want to turn it over to you as well for a little perspective.

Mr. UPTON. Well, I thank my good friend from my neighboring district. And I am pleased to join you tonight and my colleagues from Georgia here and Texas now as well. I'd like to just make a couple of points.

First of all, I'm not on your list of 93 that signed that discharge petition, but that's because the line was too long. I hope that I can be there tomorrow

when we're on the floor for votes, because you have to do that, of course—as any student knows of this Chamber—you have to sign the discharge petition in the well of the House. And when I was available to do that, the line was way too long. So hopefully tomorrow I will put you over 100 and get closer to the 218.

I want to say just a couple of things that perhaps haven't been said yet and enter into a dialogue with my good friend, Dr. GINGREY.

First of all, when we talk about Alaska, I did support drilling in Alaska multiple times over the last couple of years. It was adopted, actually, in the House and in the Senate with some bipartisan votes, and sadly, President Clinton vetoed that bill 10 years ago saying it's 10 years away. Well, here we are today.

We had a couple of very good provisions in that bill that were important; that all of the oil drilled in Alaska had to stay in the United States. It couldn't go to China, couldn't go to Korea or Japan, it had to come here. Of course that meant we would have to have the refining capability to do it as well. We also made it so that we limited it to no more than a couple thousand acres. And as the gentleman from Georgia indicated, that's about the size—for me, it's the size of Western Michigan University, not Dulles Airport—in an area that's the size of the State of South Carolina. So that's pretty small.

And of course what we know, too, is that if that oil can be drilled successfully, we can just build that tangent a little bit to the spine—you know, those of us from Michigan, you put your hand up like this. I can't quite do that with Alaska. But if this was Alaska, you only have to drill that pipeline to the spine, and then it comes down, and it's economical to do that. So that's number one.

Number two, you know, right now President Bush and other world leaders are talking to a number of the nations in Arab lands talking about what they can do to increase production. Because we all believe in supply and demand. And as the demand continues to rise, because the supply has stayed relatively stable, the price has only gone up over \$4 in my district and yours, and now across the country.

Well, how can we ask the Arabs to increase their production and we won't do it ourselves? We've said no to Alaska. We've said no to the offshore drilling off our west and east coasts and even parts of the Gulf of Mexico. Eighty-five percent of our coastline is off limits, and yet we know oil is there.

Let's look at different alternatives. One of the alternatives, of course, is the development of oil shale out west, where it's anticipated that there could be as much as 1.5 trillion barrels; don't quite have the procedures down right, it's a couple years away, but you've got to begin that process, to begin the permit process. Much of it is on Federal

land. No, I'm not talking about Yellowstone Park and our national parks, but in BLM land. And yet, on a vote that we had in this House last summer, by six votes we failed to allow the Department of the Interior to allow the first permits to be approved to allow the private sector to go out and explore for this oil shale—which we could develop, I would like to think, within a couple years, four to six, something along that line. But, in fact, a trillion and a half barrels are available.

We have to do more on conservation. I was one, coming from Michigan, a tough vote was increasing CAFE. You know that. We have to have the R&D, the research and development to help our auto companies develop the technologies that we, the consumers, want. And JOE KNOLLENBERG from our State has a great bill that does that that he unveiled just a couple weeks ago.

We have to do more on conservation, and a number of different steps that I know can be taken along that front.

But the bottom line is this: If we want the price to come down, we have to increase the supply. That means we have to get away from where we're drilling today. We have to look at new sites, new techniques, and in fact we can do something, I think, about that \$4 plus gasoline that all of us are pained to pay.

And if I could, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia to talk a little bit about an issue that I know a little something about as well, and that is Section 526 up in Canada.

Mr. GINGREY. And I appreciate my colleague from Michigan—both of my colleagues from Michigan—and my colleague from Georgia. We've got a number of other Members here as well tonight.

But this issue that Mr. UPTON is talking about is Section 526, Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Now, this is the bill, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic majority passed back in February of 2007 that had in it this Section 526. It basically said this, my colleagues—and I hope that you all will listen very carefully to this because it's so crucial. Section 526 will not allow, it prohibits any agency of the Federal Government, our Federal Government, including our Department of Defense and including NASA, from utilizing any fuel source other than conventional fuel if it results in one nanogram increase in carbon footprint.

□ 2000

I am not talking about tonnage of CO₂. I am talking about any increase. So what my good friend from Michigan was talking about in regard to shale, s-h-a-l-e, shale is a solid product. It is a granular product. And we have, as FRED UPTON pointed out, Mr. Speaker, an abundance of that product out in the West. There are about five States. And I think Mr. UPTON said that it is estimated that you can get something like one and a half trillion, with a T,

one and a half trillion barrels of petroleum from that source.

But this section 526 that the Democratic majority put in their "no energy bill" back in February of 2007 means that we can't utilize that. We can't get that source increase of supply so that the prices will go down. And the reason I am so outraged about that, Mr. Speaker, is that tomorrow, on the floor, we will be doing the rule on the NASA reauthorization bill of 2008, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Well their price of fuel in the last 5 years, my colleagues, has gone up 400 percent from something like \$4.5 million to \$18.3 million. That is what NASA is having to pay on an annual basis for jet fuel.

And yet they are the very agency of the Federal Government that is doing research. A lot of the research that NASA has done, we all know, we have utilized in the private sector. There are many things. I can name several. But they are doing research on shale. They are doing research on tar sands. They are doing research on coal to liquid and carbon sequestration and sharing that information with the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force, which could save us a tremendous amount of money.

So I yield back to my colleague for a colloquy on this issue because it is so important and so timely.

Mr. UPTON. Well the gentleman is exactly correct. And let me just say one quick thing. When you look at oil shale and you look at tar sands, it takes a little bit of energy to then derive that oil from those bodies, the shale, the tar or the sand. Basically you have to heat it up. And for tar sands, the Canadians are producing literally one million barrels a day up in Alberta. And they are going to make that whether we are the buyer or not. To use the analogy of the Clampetts, and maybe they still have that technique back in Oklahoma and Texas, I see some of my colleagues, and I'll be careful, but the Clampetts, they put that pipe down and the oil came up. And it didn't take any energy to get it out of the ground.

Well it is different today. That easy energy is gone for the most part. So we have to do a lot of things. We have to inject carbon to bring it up. But in essence in Canada they have to have the heat to separate the oil from the sand, and then you have to refine it. And that takes a little bit more energy than the Clampetts, just to use that analogy.

Mr. GINGREY. This is just the kind of research, and the colleague is absolutely right, we all remember the movie, most of us have seen the movie.

Mr. UPTON. I am looking at the pages. I don't know if they know about the Clampetts or not. Do you know about the Clampetts? Have you heard?

Mr. WALBERG. As long as my colleagues don't yield and sing them the theme song.

Mr. UPTON. I am glad I didn't date myself.

Mr. GINGREY. Reclaiming your time. I am sure the pages don't remember the movie "Giant," but we all do, and how that oil just came bubbling up out of the ground. I believe that was in Texas. It may have been Oklahoma.

In any regard, what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is saying is that these tar sands and shale, shale has to be mined. And then you have to go through a process, as he is saying, and you have to extract. And it is a little bit more difficult.

Again, we're about to reauthorize NASA in the next day or two. They are doing research on that very process now where they can get that petroleum, and I said to you 1.5 trillion barrels probably from the shale in our West, western part of the United States, and Mr. UPTON pointed out that these tar sands in Canada, it is estimated that it is probably another 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum that we can get from that. And they are producing it in Canada. And they are selling it to somebody. And yet we can't utilize it. It absolutely makes no sense. As my colleague from Georgia said earlier, I think he used the word "idiotic," "insanity" or "crazy." He is right on all three points. But I will yield back to my colleague.

Mr. UPTON. If the gentleman would yield just briefly. The Canadians have said that they are going to increase production up in Alberta. They want to go to four to five million barrels a day. And they have the buyers. Let's face it. Wouldn't we rather have that pipeline come down to the Midwest and have us refine it here and be able to sell a cheaper product to Americans than have it come from overseas some place else? And if we're not going to buy it from them, and the Canadians told me this, they are going to build a pipeline out to the Pacific. They are going to put it on one of those big freighters. They're going to spend a lot of carbon going up into the air shipping it to someplace else, China, Korea, Japan or some place else. Let's have it come here. We'll actually save energy. We will help pollution wise in terms of reducing greenhouse gases from where it otherwise would have gone. And our consumers will be a lot better off.

And with that, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WALBERG. If my colleague could yield just a moment here on one point that ties into that. We heard yesterday from one of our Senate colleagues from a northern State, a northeastern State, say that what we ought to do is buy one million barrels a day from Saudi Arabia. That would reduce the cost at the pump by about 50 cents. Well 50 cents right now would be great. But why not take that from ANWR? We can get one million barrels per day from ANWR right now, we are told, at least that, if we are to take it from there, and not have to buy it from any other foreign country, have it shipped to us from any other foreign country, and use it exactly like you said down

here to make this great country run on its own fuel as opposed to buying from someplace else.

Mr. GINGREY. If my colleague from Michigan will yield, the whole issue here is when the Democrats passed this Energy Independence and Security Act some 17 months ago, the price of regular gasoline, as all my colleagues know, was about \$2.60 a gallon. Now, if Speaker PELOSI, at that particular time, or Leader HOYER felt that the price of gasoline at the pump was going to drop \$1.50, then maybe I could understand their emphasis on protecting the environment from any iota increase in carbon dioxide footprint or greenhouse gases.

But what has happened with their "no energy plan," unfortunately the price of gasoline has gone up about \$1.55 a gallon, and here we are looking at \$4, \$4 and a nickel now, and so we have to ask ourselves, what is the crisis? Is the crisis global warming? Or is the crisis bankruptcy of our country because of the price of energy? And people can't afford to buy gasoline. They can't afford to buy food. We are losing jobs to other countries. I think it is time to say to our majority party, for goodness' sakes, at least make in order the Gingrey amendment which would allow the administrator of NASA to have a waiver of section 526 and utilize some of these sources that Mr. UPTON and Mr. BROWN and others are talking about, getting that shale oil product from Canada. It just flows right down the pipeline. It is an easy flow, easy obtaining it. There is not a lot of hard work. It is the same thing with tar sands. And let NASA continue to do their research. Share it with the Department of Defense.

And I will make this one point to the gentleman from Michigan who is controlling the time, and then I will yield back so that others can weigh in, but do you know that in the year 2008 the Department of Defense is going to spend an additional, a delta, of \$9 billion on fuel because of price of gasoline right now? And I yield back.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank you for that and the points you make so clear.

I would like to yield back for a moment to my good friend from Georgia, since we have two Michiganders here and two Georgians now speaking, Dr. PAUL BROWN, for some additional comments, I know you have a point to make, before I go on to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, my friend, Mr. WALBERG. I just wanted to ask Mr. UPTON something before he left. You were mentioning that it takes some energy to produce this energy. And the people on the other side, the leadership on the other side has been promoting these alternative sources of fuel. Ethanol has been one. And you are on the Energy Committee I think, isn't that correct?

Mr. UPTON. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Well tell me if it is true. I understand that to

produce ethanol today, particularly corn-based ethanol, it actually takes more energy to produce that corn-based ethanol than the ethanol itself produces. Is that correct?

Mr. UPTON. Well, there have been different studies showing different things in terms of what to count. One of the bills that I have cosponsored, it is actually a bipartisan bill, is to look at increasing ethanol from nonfood source, or noncorn, and there are a couple of bills to do that using switch grass and a number of different things. We are not quite there in the technology, but we are not too far away, within a couple of years. And I think we ought to be investing more on that type of technology so that we can take some of the pressure off these rising food prices. I represent Kellogg's as well, as does the gentleman in the well, Mr. WALBERG.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am talking about corn-based ethanol because I am excited about switch grass and other sources of potential, and I believe we need to investigate any source of energy anywhere.

Mr. UPTON. Now that the price of oil has gotten up to \$135 a barrel, there is a lot of things that 1 month ago weren't economical to do. And that is why by putting more alternative fuels in the mix, we can have some downward pressure on the overall price of gasoline. And obviously ethanol is part of that mix, whether it be corn-based or nonfood items, and we need to explore those and see what we can do to put downward pressure on the overall price of gasoline.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I agree with that totally. The other thing is propane is a byproduct of the refinery process of gasoline as well as natural gas. And we already know that propane is an environmentally protective agent. And we have had, in the past, fleets of cars fueled by propane. I know at my hunting camp down in rural southwest Georgia, I have fueled my house down there in my hunting camp with propane. And I know a lot of people heat their homes with it. And most propane, from what I understand, is produced here in America and sold here in America.

So tapping into our oil sources would give us an additional source of energy that we are not getting today if my understanding is correct, and so we can further protect the environment by having more propane utilized in our own energy, as well as stop the production of carbon in the atmosphere that the environmentalists are so bent that it is causing global warming. And I am not so certain about that. I don't really think that is so.

Mr. UPTON. The gentleman makes a very good point. And I know there are other Members waiting patiently to speak. So I am going yield whatever time I have left to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Congressman BROWN, you point out the fact that we have all

sorts of energy sources. And we ought to be using them and developing them.

I want to move to a good friend, colleague and leader in our conference from Oklahoma. Congressman COLE, I appreciate your joining us tonight. I know you have taken some ribbing already about Oklahoma. I know you can handle it, but certainly I know our people would like to hear what you have to say about this issue.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding. And I thank him even more for conducting what is an important and enlightening educational experience for the people of our country about the reality of high fuel prices and what is behind it. You do take a little ribbing occasionally if you're from Oklahoma. But we think that is generally jealousy, except from our friends from Texas, who have a very similar view of the world to us.

But let me talk a little if I can about what the current state of play is in energy prices. Today as you have had up on your sign, the national average price for a gallon of gasoline is \$4.04. That is something I never thought I would live to see, and frankly, no American should have ever lived to see. You can now buy a barrel of light sweet crude for July delivery at \$131.31, a nice round number, nice even alliterative number. Currently in my State, Oklahoma's price at the pump, and we are producers, in some ways we will feel it even worse because we have been producing for over 100 years much more than we consume and exporting it to the rest of the country. And we are delighted to do that. But it is pretty tough when people in Oklahoma, a producing State that sacrificed, that frankly are delighted to have exploration and production, but they are paying \$3.83 a gallon.

In January of 2007 when this majority, this Democrat majority took office, the price per gallon was \$2.08 a gallon. That is a rise of \$1.75, an increase of over 80 percent.

□ 2015

The country as a whole has experienced very much the same thing. The average price since the Democratic majority has come into power has gone up \$1.67, an increase of 71 percent.

Now, that is not what our friends on the other side of the aisle expected to happen at all. As a matter of fact, let me read you a few quotes of what they told America as they came into the majority our energy future would be.

Our distinguished Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, said on April 18, 2006, "Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down the skyrocketing gas prices." She said a few days later, "The Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices."

Our distinguished Majority Leader STENY HOYER said on the 4th of April, 2005, "Democrats believe that we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas

prices." I would love to "struggle" to pay \$2.08 a gallon. It would be a nice fight to have.

Our good friend and distinguished whip of the majority party, JIM CLYBURN, said, "House Democrats have a plan to help curb rising prices." That is on the 26th of July, 2006. If this is the plan, we want them to go back to the drawing board and reconsider where they are at.

Four times since they have taken the majority they have voted to increase energy taxes; to increase energy taxes. Now, even people that don't like the energy industry can usually say, well, gosh, if you increase the tax, won't they pass that along to us in the price? It is an incredible record.

Now, every single energy bill the majority wants to reach the floor has reached the floor. Most of them have passed this body. Some of them have gone all the way to the President and been signed. As I recall, I don't remember anybody who actually vetoed any energy legislation that has actually reached the President's desk. So what we are seeing really is the product of the majority's legislative agenda.

What haven't they let come to the floor? What commonsense solutions that most Americans support haven't come to the floor? I am just going to list a few of them, because, as my colleague knows, there are many of them.

Our colleague from Texas, MAC THORNBERRY, has a wonderful bill, the No More Excuses Energy Act, H.R. 3089, that literally covers the gambit of things we ought to be doing. Not just oil and gas, but nuclear, solar and wind. It incentivizes production. That is the lesson that our friends on the other side have forgotten, that supply is really important to cost. They simply seem to have no conception of that.

There is a wonderful bill by Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, H.R. 2279, that will expedite the construction of new refining capacity on closed military installations in the United States. These are installations that have been set aside. They are safe. They are secure. Why in the world wouldn't we want to refine the product? If we have to import it, we at least ought to get the value-added portion of refining it. It is a crime that we should ever import a refined product.

Our good friend Mr. BLUNT, H.R. 2493, has legislation that removes the fuel blend requirements and government mandates that contribute to unaffordable gas prices. We shouldn't have dozens and dozens of blends of gasoline. A few is enough.

Our good friend Mrs. MYRICK has H.R. 6108, Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, which grants coastal states the authority to grant exploration up to 100 miles from their coastlines and allows States to share in that revenue. A commonsense solution.

None of this legislation, and dozens more, have been allowed to come to the floor. My friends on the other side love to blame Republicans, President Bush

and the energy industry for these kinds of problems.

I just want to conclude quickly with a story. I do represent a district that is one of the top 20 energy producers in the United States, so we are more than doing our part. I convened about a year ago, actually before this extraordinary rise in prices, a group of independent energy people that have spent a lifetime trying to provide energy to this country.

I asked them, "Give me your suggestions. What can we do to increase the supply and stabilize and hopefully lower the price of a gallon of gasoline or heating fuel or electricity?" They thought, and they had a lot of great solutions.

They said, "Let's go drill in ANWR, in Alaska. That would be a wonderful thing." By the way, my good friend Mr. YOUNG has a superb piece of legislation on that, H.R. 6107, that would actually allow us to drill there and invest some of the severance revenue in alternative energy supplies so we could both meet an immediate need and start looking for alternatives.

But they suggested that. I said, "Well, you know, I am for that. I voted for that. The Republican majority passed it four times in the House and couldn't get it through the Senate because of Democratic obstruction, so we probably can't get it done."

Then they said, "Let's do more exploration and production offshore. We have seen Katrina. That has worked well in terms of no spillage. We know we had 25 percent of our supply in the Gulf of Mexico. We could do more." I said, "Well, I am for that, but we can't do that either."

Then they asked about additional refining capacity, and they asked about expedited permitting on non-park Federal lands. They just went through a litany of things. Alternative energy. Each one I would say yes, I am for that, but we can't get that through, particularly a Democratic Congress.

Finally at the end of this in frustration, one of my good friends said, "Well, why don't you go back and ask those other Members of Congress who are opposing these measures just how rich they want foreign countries to be? Just how much they want to pay the people overseas that we are importing this petroleum from, or this gas, when we could actually do the production here? Because they are exporting thousands of jobs, billions of dollars, and they are jeopardizing our security."

Then the guy added in fairness, he said, "By the way, we are all here giving you suggestions about how to lower the price of the product that we produce."

We have had a shameful exercise, in my opinion, in the last several days, particularly on the Senate side, where people that work to solve America's energy problems are brought in and interrogated as if they are the source of the problems, and the only frankly justification for that is the high prices.

But when those people respond, they say, "If you would just do the things we have asked you to do year after year after year, we could solve this problem."

So I am sorry I went on. You have been very generous with your time, and I appreciate that very much. But it is a frustrating problem when the solutions are sitting here waiting to be acted upon by this House and none of them are being dealt with at all.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank you for sharing that history. It is a good point to know what has been attempted and what hasn't been accomplished. But it would also give the opportunity for our constituents to voice their concerns now with factual information to say there are things you can do. Now get it done.

In the time remaining, I would like to turn a portion of that over to my good friend and colleague from Texas, bringing the southern States in now, Congressman RANDY NEUGEBAUER.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Well, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I also want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, because he makes a very good point. And when he says we are importing thousands of dollars, actually it is billions of dollars. Every day America gets up and writes a check for \$1 billion-plus to buy enough energy to run this country for 1 day.

What does that mean? That means that it takes \$365 billion currently for America to buy enough energy just to run our country on an annual basis, \$1 billion every day. And do you know what? Unfortunately, some of that money is going to some folks that aren't all that friendly to the American people. One of those people is Hugo Chavez.

I want to read you what Hugo Chavez thinks about America. He said, "What we do regarding the imperialist power of the United States, we have no choice but to unite. We use oil in our war against neo-liberalism." He also said, "We have invaded the United States, but with our oil."

So every day as the American people go to the pumps all across America, what I want them to visualize is that every day we write Hugo Chavez, who calls us imperialists, a \$170 million check. That is \$62 billion a year. What would happen if we could invest \$1 billion a day in America developing America's energy resources, creating jobs for Americans? Think about it. Instead of writing Hugo Chavez a check for \$172 million, that we write America a check for \$172 million?

I think of the people I know in the 19th Congressional District of Texas, which is a big district, 29,000 square miles, 27 counties, teachers having to drive 60, 70 miles a day to go and teach our young people, that now are looking at doubling the cost of making that commute across the district.

I think about the man last night that I was talking to in my district. He said, "Congressman," he said, "I have to

drive three times a week 30 miles each way to get dialysis so that I can be treated for diabetes." He said, "Congressman, I am down to the point now of having to choose whether I can afford dialysis, afford gasoline, or afford food."

Madam Speaker, it is time to say yes. We have heard you say no; no to new drilling, no to building additional power plants in this country; no to new refineries. America is wanting you to say yes, because America is tired of writing checks to Hugo Chavez for \$160 million every day.

I thank my friend from Michigan tonight for hosting this hour. I hope that somehow the American people realize that there is a willingness on behalf of many Members of Congress to say yes and to move forward and to do something proactive, instead of doing something that is called nothing.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank my good friend and colleague from Texas for ending it on a point that is poignant, that reminds us what this really costs. I wish we could go on and on tonight to bring out more points like this. This is critical. It is a security issue, as well as a point of life, and you made it very clear. I don't want to write a check for \$170 million to Hugo Chavez. Let's get it done.

RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the impeachment resolution noticed last evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1258

Resolved, That President George W. Bush be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against President George W. Bush for high crimes and misdemeanors.

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has committed the following abuses of power.

ARTICLE I.—CREATING A SECRET PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN TO MANUFACTURE A FALSE CASE FOR WAR AGAINST IRAQ

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution