

that we are all facing back in our district.

And I think really when you get right down to it, it's not that complicated in one sense to take a look at the various policies or ideas out there. It's easy, I think, one way to tell whether a good—whether a policy is a good energy policy or not. All you have to do is look at three things: supplies, cost, and security.

A good energy policy is a policy that will do what? It will give you more energy. More supply. A bad energy policy will give us less supply. A good energy policy is one that will lower costs for Americans. A bad energy policy is one that is going to continue to raise or escalate costs, meaning that American families are going to have to have less money for their food, housing, education, and so on. And thirdly and finally, a good energy policy is one that will make us a stronger, more secure America. A bad energy policy is going to be one that makes us less secure, less independent of foreign, unstable regimes like Venezuela and overseas and Saudi Arabia and places like Russia and the like.

So why don't we take a minute to see what has, quite honestly, the other side of the aisle proposed for us. I have in my hand right here, the Democrat plan to lower gas prices. You may recall that when Democrats were campaigning for the 110th Congress, they said that they had a commonsense solution to lower the price of gasoline and energy for the American public. And we are now 18 months, I think, into the 110th Congress. And, well, there is absolutely nothing in the Democrat's plan.

Their commonsense solution, and that's why we're so eagerly awaiting it, and that's why we, on this side of the aisle, come to the floor every night to hammer home the point that something must be done. But we can look to see what has occurred over the last 17 months, 18 months of the 110th Congress now that the Democrats have been in charge of dealing with energy. On these three points: on supply, on cost, on security.

On supply. As I stand here tonight, as was already indicated from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 85 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf where our energy supply comes from, natural gas principally, but oil as well, it's basically locked up off limits to us for further exploration even determining what is actually out there. There was legislation to do that just to say what's out there. Let's find out the information. Off limits to us.

Deep sea exploration. Over 100 or 200—200 miles off sea totally off limits right now. Eighty-six billion barrels of oil, 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas could be at our disposal to give us greater supply, but it's not.

Oil shales in the Midwestern part of this country. Oil shales were reported in the paper just today as it was going through committee and will be coming

to the floor later on, proposals to keep that off-limits as far as greater supply for the country.

Let me give you some quick little number here. U.S. has two trillion, that's with a "T," two trillion barrels of oil that effectively are involved here. And to put that in perspective, from 1859 from the first days that oil was pulled out of the ground to today, one trillion barrels of oil has been used. And we have basically two trillion barrels over there that we could basically be getting in economically viable ways.

Supply has not been addressed, unfortunately, during the 110th Congress by the Democrats.

Costs. Well, when they were campaigning for office, I know in my district you could buy gasoline for \$1.80. Now, of course, it's up to \$4, doubling the price, and that's hurting the American family.

What else has occurred during these last 17 months? Four times legislation has come through this House that would raise taxes on energy costs. And who actually pays those taxes at the end of the day? You and I do at the pump or any other ways where we buy our energy.

And finally, there are still proposals, believe it or not, from the other side of the aisle that want to put more taxes on us like 50 cents-a-gallon gasoline taxes has been proposed by Chairman DINGELL. So the next time you go to the pump and you're paying around \$4 bucks per a gallon of oil, just remember the other side wants to add another 50 cents; and there is another proposal for a nickel as well by Chairman OBERSTAR. So 55 cents more if they have their way in taxes.

Finally on security. Well, right now this country imports around 63 percent or is dependent upon foreign oil. Places like Saudi Arabia, places like Venezuela, places like Nigeria where they have so many problems, Down south in South America as well; and that number continues to grow for the reasons I have just stated.

Gasoline. We have not built refineries in this country so now we are like many countries across the globe. We have to import gasoline, 10 percent of our consumption of gasoline is coming into this country, which makes us a less secure Nation because we do not have our own supply of refineries right here at home.

Let me move off of what we're doing here on the floor to an outside source to look at this. And the Investors Business Daily has taken a look at this issue. And what they said is this. They said just going back a couple of years, under the eight Clinton years alone, U.S. oil production declined 1.3 million barrels per day, or 19 percent, while our foreign imports increased 3.5 million barrels a day, or 45 percent.

During President Clinton's time, he vetoed legislation that would have increased legislation that would have increased production of our own vitally needed oil supply, not only for Ameri-

cans but for our national defense emergencies as well.

The article goes on to say—it poses this question. So were the Democrats and Members of Congress together merely short-sighted with only a few having any real business experience, or were they just ignorant about economics, the fact that the law of supply and demand determines the price of oil commodities such as oil, steel, copper, and lumber? Or were they utterly irresponsible and incompetent in their actions that led us to become dangerously dependent on increasing oil imports from foreign companies? We think, it says, we think it was all of the above.

The unintended consequences of the Congress Members' poor judgment and meddling micromanagement of U.S. energy policy is that they actually hurt most of the people that they profess to help: the average American consumer, lower-income workers, and those in the inner cities who can't afford an extra \$100 a month to drive to and from work.

So that, ladies and gentlemen, is the dilemma we face here in the 110th Congress on a proposal, on plans that do not address supplies, costs, and energy. And that is why I so commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the solutions that he's offered over the years as well and his legislation that goes to the issue of supply to increase the amount of energy that the American consumer can attain, to lower the cost of energy for the American family so that they have more disposable income for other needs, and to increase national security to strengthen America to make us more independent of these volatile countries.

And with that, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his fine comments, and we yield back the balance of our time.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for giving us the indulgence of once again allowing the Speaker's 30-Something Working Group to come down to the House floor. We are hopeful tonight that we're going to have a full House here on the House floor, that we will be joined tonight by our master of ceremonies, on most nights Representative MEEK and his original partner in crime, Mr. RYAN, as well as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

It's appropriate that we're going to have hopefully four or five of us here by the time the hour is up because we have a lot to talk about. Because as our Republican colleagues have noted

over the last hour, the one thing that they are probably right on the mark about is that people are hurting out there. People have a level of anger and anxiety over what is happening in this economy that many of us haven't seen in a very, very long time.

I don't know technically whether we're in a recession, whether we're on our way into one. All I know is that people are having to do more with much less; that that salary increase that people thought they were getting isn't happening; that those overtime hours that my constituents in New Britain relied upon aren't there this year. And yet on the other side of their family's ledger, the prices to heat their home are going up, obviously the prices to fuel their car are going up, the college expenses, the health care expenses are going in only one direction and by and large far outpacing the rate of wage inflation that they're seeing as well.

□ 2130

And the New Direction Congress is trying to do something about it. There's no secret as to why we've gotten into this situation that we're in today, why our people are making money at the very upper echelon of the income scale, why do we have GDP continuing to expand, while we have wages remaining relatively stagnant.

It's because for a very long time on the floor of this House of Representatives before the New Direction Congress was installed last January, the voices that really mattered down here were the folks that were doing pretty well off in this economy: the drug industry, the health insurers, and at the top of the list, the oil industry.

The dichotomy right now that exists today between the success of the oil industry and the distress of the people who buy their product is absolutely unconscionable. And it is hard for us to understand, with our slim majority that we hold on the Democratic side, why we can't get more consensus here between Republicans and Democrats to take on those gross and unjustifiable profits that are being made by the oil industry.

Last quarter's profits from American and multinational oil companies set records, not for the history of the American oil industry, but for the history of American capitalism, and it's no secret where they're making those profits. They're making it off of all of us.

Now, we heard a couple of days ago that the average price across this country hit \$4 a gallon. Well, that was old news to us in Connecticut. We hit \$4 weeks, if not a month, ago. We are well on our way in Connecticut to \$5 a gallon, and in Connecticut it hurts us a little bit more because we have more congested highways. We don't have mass transit alternatives like other parts of the country. People are driving.

In my district, we still have some jobs growing in Danbury, Connecticut,

but nobody can live there because we don't have enough affordable housing. So people live in Waterbury, Connecticut, and they drive 30 miles to work every day. They'd live in Danbury if they could. They can't afford to do it. They'd live in Stamford if they could, but they can't. They live where they have to. They work where they have to. And it necessitates a commute which puts them out now record amounts, all the while, while the oil industry are making profits, they are setting records in the history of American capitalism.

So, to us, it seems pretty obvious where we should lay the blame, on an oil industry which has continued to take profits out of American consumers and at the feet of an administration run by two oil men. I mean, it doesn't get much more simple than that.

I mean, I understand people's frustrations. I understand the frustrations of the folks on the Republican side and the Democratic side, but it doesn't take too much imagination to figure out why we got where we got. We elected to the White House a President and a Vice President who made their fortunes in the oil industry, and they have created a legacy that they will leave behind in the White House of doing even more favors for that industry, of setting an energy policy that guarantees massive profits for the friends that they left behind in that industry.

And so, to us, the solution seemed pretty simple. The Senate tried just a few days ago to pass a windfall profits tax to suggest that maybe they're making a little bit too much in the oil industry; we should turn a little bit of that back around to hardworking consumers. Couldn't get the votes it needed to without Republican support.

Here in the House, we looked at the \$18 billion in tax breaks and giveaways that have been given to the oil industry. We watched a recent report come out from GAO, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, about a week ago which told us that we have given away over \$50 billion in annual unclaimed royalties that we should be collecting against the oil industry for their drilling across this country and off our shores. And we see an opportunity, we see an opportunity to take those unclaimed royalties that are making the oil industry rich, we see an opportunity to take those tax breaks, \$16- and \$18-billion, however you want to estimate it that the 2005 energy bill passed before the New Direction Congress got here and gave to the oil industry, and we see a chance to take that money out of the pockets of the oil industry and turn it around to hardworking consumers, hardworking commuters that need a break right now.

It's not like the money isn't out there. It's out there. It's lying in the hands of oil industry and gas industry CEOs and their top executives, their shareholders who are reaping the benefit of the misery that people in this

country are witnessing at the pump. Four dollars may be the national number, but in Connecticut that's history. We're on our way to \$5.

So, to us on the Democratic side, on the majority side, we don't want this to be a partisan issue. I appreciate the comments of our Republican friends who spoke before the 30 Something Working Group here tonight, but this, to us, isn't about Republicans or Democrats, because you're paying \$4.50 at the pump in Connecticut whether you're a registered R or you're a registered D. And those oil company executives are making record profits, whether they are a registered Republican or whether they are a registered Democrat. Affiliation ideology does not mean anything here. The stats are the stats and the numbers are the numbers, and it shows us that there are people making a lot of money who don't deserve to make it, and there are people enduring a lot of misery who don't have to.

And one of the most respected Members of the other side of the aisle sat at the well just a few moments ago and told us that words are one thing, but votes matter. I don't think that there would be a voice of disagreement in this House. Absolutely, you can go out there and say one thing about how you're trying to take on the oil industry, but what you do here matters.

And so I would encourage people out there, my friends in the Fifth District of Connecticut, and all those in other parts of the country that are struggling to understand what's happening with energy prices out there to check the record, to go back and look at what Congress has done and has attempted to do to fix this problem and see where the votes are and where the votes aren't.

You see, we've tried to pass legislation to punish price gougers, to give the Federal Trade Commission the authority to press Federal charges against those individuals, retailers and wholesalers, who have tried to take advantage of this situation to unjustifiably run up the price, and we've been alone over here on the Democratic side of the aisle. We've passed legislation to repeal the anti-trust exemption that the big, multinational oil companies have so that we can go after folks that are price colluding against American consumers, and we haven't had much cooperation on this side of the aisle.

And we have put actions behind words when it comes to conservation. I hope that Representative WAMP is right. I hope that we are on the verge of a new era in transportation technology. I hope that we are going to see electric cars be the predominant force in our automotive world. I hope that we are near that moment, and I think he's also right, frankly, that if we are going to get to that moment we're going to have to be honest about the electricity capacity that we do not have in this country.

I hope that we can set, Republicans and Democrats, a strategy to get there, to both encourage the development of electric car technology, of the recharging stations that we will need to make that a robust technology and a commercialized opportunity, an alternative for commuters, and that we will also do the right things in terms of electricity production and grid capacity to make it a realistic option.

But until we get there, until we get to a moment where we can plug in our car and go, we have an opportunity today to stand behind an effort to make the cars that we buy right now more fuel efficient. Thirty years went by until this House of Representatives stood up under a Democratic leadership and passed a new law requiring that every car in this country, the average fuel efficiency of a fleet, be 35 miles a gallon. Thirty years went by, 12 years of Republican rule, and not a single bill passed in this Congress to promote conservation with real policy directives behind it.

Now, we did get a lot of Republican sponsors on that legislation, the energy bill passed at the end of last year, but we needed more. We needed more, and on that case, votes did matter. On that case, votes did matter. We have had bipartisan cooperation, but led by a new Democratic majority, this House stood up and passed legislation requiring cars in this country to hit 35 miles a gallon, which will save the average consumer \$1,000 over the course of the year at the pump. That's real dollars. That's real dollars for the average consumer. In fact, that number was from the end of last year. It's probably much more than \$1,000 now that the price at the pump has gone up.

And the alternatives that the Republicans offer, as we try to say, listen, the solution here is to make the cars we drive now more fuel efficient, the solution is to go after those that would collude to set prices, those who would take advantage of this moment to price gouge at the pumps, when we sit here and say that we can also look at legislation promoted by Representative STUPAK and Representative LARSON, legislation being worked on now by the Energy and Commerce Committee to start to regulate the energy commodity trading markets that are skimming millions, if not billions, of dollars off of the product that people are paying for at the pump, we can do something to take money out of the hands of speculators who have done far too well off of the rising price of oil and put that money back in the hands of those hardworking, middle class Americans who are paying the bills for those speculators on Wall Street.

We're going to move forward legislation to do that as well. We're going to set a long-term strategy while we're at it because we can do things in the short-term with price colluding, with price gougers. We can take pride in legislation that Mr. WELCH and Mr. COURTNEY and others moved through

the House to stop the President from putting more oil into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and, instead, put that oil on the market. That's another 10, 15, 20 cents on the gallon. We can do all those short-term things necessary to get the price of oil down.

We can take a long-term view to try to get to a moment in 5 or 10 years where we're no longer relying on a foreign-produced and foreign-priced product that oil is. We can have that long-term view to have a renewable domestically produced energy source here.

We can do all those things, and we can do them together. It's not mutually exclusive to try to take some steps right now, going against the speculators, going against the price gougers, stopping putting oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That's not mutually exclusive from doing the long-term things necessary to wean ourselves off of this product that we do not price, that for the most part we do not produce.

The solution, though, is not to just say that we're going to get a little bit more from here in the United States. We have a chart here that maybe we can take a look at with regard to some of the claims of our friends on the other side of the aisle with regard to the great salvation of the American energy crisis which is going to be the drilling for oil in Alaska.

We are talking about a project that, first of all, is going to take 20 years to get to peak oil production. It's going to take 10 years, Mr. Speaker, just to get to a point where anything is coming out of the ground. Even in a moment right now, where big oil companies have license to drill right here onshore, on about 42 million acres, 42 million acres that they could take oil from onshore. You know how much that they're taking oil off of right now? Twelve million. There's 30 million acres with permitted potential here domestically that isn't being used today.

□ 2145

So this talk of drilling more, these oil companies have the ability to drill for more oil right now, 30 million acres permitted and not drilled for.

Let's talk about offshore as well. And I want to talk about what happens in ANWR, in the Alaskan Wildlife Refuge, but let's talk about offshore. Thirty-eight million acres ready to go, permitted for drilling by the big domestic and multinational oil companies. You know how much of that 38 million is being used today? Eight million acres. 30.6—let's be exact here—30.6 million acres of offshore territory permitted for use not being drilled upon today.

This effort to take a small parcel of land, admittedly no bigger than Dulles National Airport, and use this crisis moment in American energy history to open up a sensitive wildlife refuge for drilling is nothing more than a power and money grab by an industry that already today, by facts and figures that don't come from me, but come from the

industry themselves, suggests that there are 60 million acres of onshore and offshore territory today that are not being drilled upon that could be used right now if they wanted to. Record numbers of new permits being handed out for drilling on available lands and available offshore territory today.

It is not that we don't have the capacity for new drilling. We have it, it's ready to go; the oil industry has decided not to use it. The oil industry has decided, for whatever reason—I can't get into their heads to try to figure out exactly what their motivation is, but you can certainly impute a motivation which would suggest that a holdback on supply isn't such a bad thing, that by keeping supply, by holding back on drilling, by keeping that 60 million acres that they could drill on right now tomorrow from going into production, they're going to make some profit off of that.

Our focus has to be on how on Earth we have allowed for more tax breaks, for more royalty breaks to an oil industry making record profits in the history of capitalism that sits today on 60 million acres that they're not drilling on.

But let's talk about what would happen if we did get beyond that, if we did sort of forgive the fact that they just simply aren't using the territory that's available to them today and we gave them the ability to drill in ANWR. You're not going to be even able to really see this chart. In fact, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it looks like a blank chart. It's titled, "How Much Would We Save by Drilling in ANWR?" And the statistics used to make this chart don't come from congressional Democrats or congressional Republicans, they come from the administration, they come from the administration's own energy agency.

And you can't see anything on this chart. It looks blank to you because it is blank. How much would you save by drilling in ANWR? By 2030, Mr. Speaker—I'm going to have my first child this summer, and my child will be on his way to college by the time 2030 rolls around. So by 2030, my child will be driving a car. And in 2030, he's going to have saved 1.8 cents per gallon if we drilled in ANWR.

So even if you got over the fact that there are millions of acres out there permitted today, ready to go for exploration today that the oil industry has not used, even if you get over the very legitimate environmental concerns that confront ANWR, you're getting 1.8 cents in savings per gallon in 2030. Why 2030? Because it takes 20 years to get to peak production. It takes 10 years to get one drop out of the ground.

And while we sit here and argue over whether we drill in ANWR or not, we're wasting valuable time that could go into making changes today, like the success we had just weeks ago in stopping the deposit of new petroleum into the Strategic Reserve. That's not 1.8

cents per gallon, that is potentially 15 or 20 cents per gallon. Stopping putting oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve isn't 2030, Mr. Speaker, it's today, it's next week—maybe not next week, maybe it's next month, maybe it's next year. It's not 2030, it's immediate.

And more to the point, by spending our time this year and next year talking about how we take this country back from this oil industry, how we create sources of energy that are produced here in the United States that we control and we price, we're doing something not just for energy prices, but we're doing something for national security. Because every day that we continue to go on, every day that we fight about what little bit more we can get out of the ground, we're empowering a global energy industry that is a threat to this Nation in the end.

Every day that we continue to fill up our gas tanks with a product that sends money overseas to countries that use that money to fuel the educational and recruitment initiatives of those who would do harm to us—because that's what's happening here, we're sending oil overseas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, to countries that maybe aren't directly using that money to send straight to terrorists, but they're using that money to fund the schools that train the kids that eventually turn into those terrorists. They're using that money to create societies that marginalize individuals in Saudi Arabia and other places so that they have no choice but to flee to those extremist movements.

Every day that we sit here and argue over whether we drill in ANWR, whether we drill offshore, whether we give more power to the international oil industry that already is making these record profits in the history of capitalism, we are endangering the safety of this country.

I want to do the right short-term and long-term things because I go home every weekend and I feel the hurt, as you do, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, as you do, Mr. Speaker, of all of our constituents that don't deserve to pay \$4, \$5 at the pump while the oil industry is making record profits. But I also want to make the right decisions now on the future of our energy policy because it's how my future kids and grand kids live in a safe country and in a safe world.

And so I'm proud to be part of a "new direction" Congress that is finally, for the first time in a decade, taking on this oil industry. I'm proud to be part of a Congress that is both doing things in the short run—even if we don't get Republican votes to do it—and trying to set a long-term strategy. It's a lot to ask. It's a lot to ask, but this is a big moment right now. This is a big moment. Four or five dollar prices at the pumps cannot sustain. Families cannot pay that. And the question is, are we going to allow the oil industry to co-opt this moment, to take advantage of it, to get a little bit bigger piece of the pie in order to make even

bigger profits? Or are we going to use this money, the \$4 and \$5 prices at the pump, to finally stand up to these guys, to finally say enough it enough, and to set a long-term plan to get this country off of this product that we can't control, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ?

I think I know the answer to that. I think I know where this Congress wants to go. I think I know that the American public are ready to follow. But it frustrates me—you just joined us here—it frustrates me to listen to some of our colleagues standing on the floor and basically asking for the same old, same old that we've seen for the last 8 years, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes, they seem to believe that the President's drill more and veto policy is the right way to go when it comes to our energy policy. And I'll tell you, as I often call myself, Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN, a minivan mom because I have three young kids, I spend most of my time, when I'm home, driving them from diving practice to baseball games to gymnastics, and it consumes quite a bit of gas. So when I'm home and have to go and fill up that gas tank, which I did just last week before I came back to Washington, it cost me \$76, Mr. RYAN.

And we've done 30-something in the last few weeks, and I think the last time I was here it cost me \$62 to fill up my gas tank, the last time we talked about this. And we've gone from \$62, I'm at \$76. The week before last I was at \$72. The week before that, I was at \$68 to fill up the tank. I mean, so now we're talking about real money. Seventy-six dollars is what a very small amount of groceries cost. And that's money that is the difference between someone being able to buy the groceries in the supermarket or put gasoline in the tank or make sure that they can take their kids to the doctor and make that copayment for the doctor's appointment. I mean, we have record gas prices now that are hurting, cutting people to the quick. And the Republicans, our good friends on the other side of the aisle, what is their solution?

First of all, before we became the majority and began to even put this issue on the front burner, it wasn't an issue for them. The last action that they took, when they were in charge, was to give \$14 billion in subsidies to the oil industry, which is the most profitable industry in America. Now, what does that mean? We've heard a lot of us talk about those \$14 billion in subsidies. What it means is that the Federal Government gives the oil industry permission, they are allowed to drill for oil on Federal lands and in exchange they are supposed pay royalties to the Federal Government to do that. We forgive those royalties, that's what the \$14 billion is. And what we have proposed is, because we want to truly wean ourselves off of our addiction to oil—and not just foreign oil, we need to

wean ourselves off of our addiction to oil period because oil is a finite resource. We need to really invest in renewable energy sources, in biofuels.

And what we would like to do is repeal that \$14 billion in subsidies, require the oil industry to pay the royalties—because they're pulling oil out of the ground on land that they don't own, on land that is owned by the Federal Government, they're profiting from that and paying nothing for the privilege—we want to take that \$14 billion in subsidies and invest it in alternative energy research. Because, you know, growing up, Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN, I remember during the Carter administration, I remember the energy crisis. I remember sitting in the back seat of my parents' car on gas lines. And I remember in elementary school seeing all the conservation efforts that they started doing all the way down to, you know, to the public school and elementary school level. We had signs next to the light switches that suddenly were put on there that said, you know, "turn the lights off." There was a big national energy conservation effort that just fizzled once Ronald Reagan became President. And we never invested in alternative research like we should have. The conservation efforts went by the wayside, and we went back to the same old story, oil, oil, oil.

And look, right now, the Republicans are talking about needing to drill for more oil in ANWR, pulling oil out of shale, this 68 million acres available now that they are not drilling on, 68 million; I mean, it's absolutely ridiculous. They need to be utilizing the turf that they've got now, and they're not.

So we need to make sure that it's clear to the American people—and that's why we come out here every night—who's for solving this energy crisis and who's all talk. And I think the Republicans have clearly proven that through their actions and their lack of stewardship when they were in charge. And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What's funny here, Mr. Speaker, is that this is another pattern, as these issues continue to come up, where the Republicans continue to offer solutions that have absolutely nothing to do with the problem that we're trying to deal with. You know, they lack ideas. They are a party that's void of ideas.

We cannot drill our way out of this problem. That's the issue here. Drilling has increased in the last 7 years by 66 percent, and there has been no decrease in the price of gas, there has been a tremendous increase. And on Friday, there was an increase in the per barrel cost of oil that was larger than a barrel cost 10 years ago. So the increase this year was more than a whole barrel cost 10 years ago. We've been drilling more than we've ever been drilling, 66 percent more in the last 10 years, and it's still not reducing the price.

The key here is we need to move off of our dependency on foreign oil. So if

you look at what the policies have been up to this point—and everyone says, you know, they come down to the floor, “if we could only drill in ANWR,” if you started drilling in ANWR today, you wouldn’t get a drop of oil for 10 years. And in 20 years, you would only reduce the cost of a gallon of gas by one penny. That is the energy plan of the Republican minority in Congress and President George Bush: Go drill, and in 20 years we’ll save you one penny per gallon of gas.

□ 2200

What we’re trying to do is to make a very mature decision, which is unusual for Washington, that if we take the \$15 billion or \$18 billion in subsidies that we’re giving to the oil companies under the Bush administration, we can move that into alternative energy research and development and have a long-term plan to solve this problem. We do not want to be here. Hopefully, God willing, our constituents will continue to elect us.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield for just 1 minute for a correction?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I just want to point out that it’s not actually a penny, Mr. RYAN. We have a chart here. It’s 1.8 cents.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I’m sorry.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. It’s actually 1.8 cents.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I reserve the right to revise and extend my remarks. So I’d like to take this opportunity to say 1.8 cents per gallon of gas 20 years from now.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Right.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What we’re trying to say is we don’t want to be in the same position 20 years from now or 10 years from now that we’re in today, so that means that we need to make some long-term decisions. It’s easy to come down to the floor: Drill, drill, drill. Drilling will not solve this problem.

If you look at what President Bush’s policies have been, if you look at what the Republican Congress’ policies have been—drill, increase by 66 percent—gas still goes up through the roof. The war in Iraq has totally destabilized the region that has more oil than anywhere else, and it has totally helped to drive up costs.

What we’re trying to do is to have these mature discussions, not drill and veto, drill and veto, drill and veto. Let’s stop the manipulation of the commodities market. Let’s stop the manipulation of the futures and everything else where it’s just continuing to drive up the cost of gasoline for average people. That is basically what is going on.

I think Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ made a great point. There are 68 million acres of land, Federal land, that the oil companies could tap into if they wanted. They have not. As for the refining capacity in the United States,

everyone says, “Build more refineries. Build more refineries.” The refineries we have now are only working at 85 percent. So there are a lot of smoke and mirrors coming from the other side.

What we are trying to say is we need long-term, responsible policies that are going to stop providing corporate welfare for the oil companies, and we need to invest that money into long-term biodiesel, nuclear, wind, solar, and all of these other issues.

With that, I’d like to yield to our good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio.

I do hope those who are interested in this topic—and everybody in this country, I think, is interested in the issue of gas prices and is certainly interested in alternative sources of energy—have heard what the gentleman has just said.

There was a poll taken which somebody talked to me about today. Fifty-four percent of the American people think that we should drill for more oil domestically. Well, I don’t think there is anybody in this Congress who disagrees with that statement. What does that mean?

As the gentleman said, there are 68 million acres. That is not a typographical error. I’m not misspeaking. The gentleman was not misspeaking. There are 68 million acres of Federal lands that are currently available and permitted to drill for oil. Well, why aren’t the oil companies drilling for oil there? There are a variety of reasons.

Some of it is the construction. The permitting, the geological, the surveying work that needs to be done takes a long time. That’s the issue with ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. If we said today we were going to allow the oil companies to drill for oil in ANWR, it would be 10 years before the first drop of oil came, and it would be 20 years before ANWR was at peak capacity. I’ll return to that momentarily.

Part of that 68 million acres that isn’t being utilized is going to be developed at some point, but they’re not there yet. Part of it is that the oil companies buy up these leases and stockpile them because that looks good on their assets, and they file their financial reports, and it helps their bottom line because they hold the futures on stockpiled assets that are leased acreage for oil drilling. But we have in the Outer Continental Shelf already identified where 80 percent of the known oil is. It is within the area where the oil companies are already permitted to drill and where 8,000 leases already exist. So 80 percent of the known oil in the Outer Continental Shelf is already within an area in which we’re able to drill for more oil.

So those watching tonight might say, “Well, how much of that 80 percent are we drilling on?” Well, we’re drilling on about a quarter of it. About 75 percent of the leases that are held in that area

where we know that there is oil is not being used for oil drilling right now. It’s the same situation. Some of it is being surveyed, and the geological work is being done, and they’re going to do some construction, and they’ll get there. Some of it is just being held by the oil companies.

Then you have the coast of Florida, where the gentlewoman is from, and you have the coast of California, and you’re getting into those issues. It’s the same thing. We have identified places in this country where it’s already available to drill for oil.

You might say, “All right. What are we talking about? How much oil are we talking about?” How about 4.2 million barrels of oil per day that we could get from those 68 million acres if we were drilling right now where the leases are already held. 4.2 million barrels.

By comparison is ANWR, which we’re talking about. The first drop of oil arrives in the pipeline in ANWR 10 years from the time that we say you’re allowed to drill there. 40,000 barrels of oil per day that first year from ANWR. 40,000 barrels per day. Currently, the worldwide oil market is about 80 million barrels per day. So we’re talking infinitesimal on the worldwide market.

When ANWR is at peak capacity, according to the experts, it’s going to be approximately 800,000 barrels a day. It’s going to be 800,000 barrels of oil a day in a market that’s 80 million barrels a day, a worldwide market. Let’s think about that 4.2 million barrels that we could get from the 68 million acres, and I know we’re talking about a lot of numbers right now.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. We’re standing here, and we’re incredibly impressed, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. The point is this: We already know where there is oil to drill in this country. The oil companies already own the leases where they could drill for that oil. They’re making a conscious decision, for a variety of reasons, not to drill for oil in places where they’re already permitted to do so.

Lastly, on refineries, people will say, “Well, let’s build more refineries.” Well, we have half the number of refineries today that we had 30 years ago because the companies have shut them down, and the refineries that we do still have are operating, as the gentleman said, at 85 percent capacity.

So what is the point of spending the time and the effort to build more refineries, and what is the point of spending the money if the refineries that we have aren’t even operating at near full capacity? There are other ways we could spend our time. There are other ways we could spend our resources. There are other ways we could spend our money.

So what, I think, every Member of our side of the aisle agrees on is we have a crisis regarding gas prices in this country right now. I don’t think anybody would disagree with that. We’re paying over \$4 a gallon. It’s

going to continue to go up in the foreseeable future. We have to make a decision. We've arrived at a crisis point. We have a decision to make. There are no short-term solutions.

Now, we can put a Band-Aid on it and do the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which we did, which is going to have some impact. It's not a long-term solution. We're going to talk about manipulation in the market and about the speculation that goes on, and that drives the price per barrel up. We can do some short-term things there, but in the long term, we have to make a decision.

There are one of two ways we can go. We could either continue our dependence on oil—and yes, we're talking about domestic sources of oil when we talk about ANWR and the Outer Continental Shelf and the coasts of Florida and California. That's domestic oil. But there is not nearly enough oil there to produce that would bring down the percentage that we get from foreign nations. So, even if we were done and if we were pumping all of the oil from those 68 million acres and from the new land in ANWR and from the other locations, we still would get more oil from foreign nations than we would produce in this country. There's no way to get around that.

So the question is: If it's a 20-year process until we get to peak capacity at ANWR and in the Outer Continental Shelf, isn't there a better way that we could spend the next 20 years if we're going to pour money into it and have a national commitment to say we're going to find an alternative source of energy?

What I advocate and what I'm sure my colleagues would agree with is we need to put our best and brightest on the job and give them all of the resources that they need. We need to take everybody from our eighth grade science students on up to our Nobel Prize winners and say, figuratively, "You go in the same room. We're going to give you all of the money that you need, all of the resources and all of the support this Nation can provide. This is our number 1 priority. Figure out a way to make a car run affordably on something other than gasoline."

We can do that, but we can't do both because every dollar we spend drilling for more oil or that we spend building more refineries is a dollar we could have spent getting us off oil and getting us off our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. When most of us here are back home, I know that people say, "Just stop the politics. Solve the problem." That entails our making some tough decisions long term, and this is kind of the general theme of what we're talking about here.

It is that we're trying to provide, yes, some short-term relief but also some long-term planning and long-term in-

vestments so that we're not here 10 years from now. If you're running a corporation or a business, you have a long-term business plan. This is our long-term business plan for the United States of America.

Do you want billions of dollars going to the oil companies that are, supposedly, supposed to help them increase refining capacity and help make it easier to drill but where they're not doing it for whatever reason? Public tax dollars. So the average taxpayer is getting hit at the pump, and their tax dollars are going to the oil companies, and still the price is not going down.

What we're trying to say is this money can be better spent. We are making a decision here to invest this into the long-term alternative energies which will prevent us, as a country, from being in the same position that we're in today 10 years from now.

I yield to my friend.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you.

By the way, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that was a very impressive top-of-mind overview, and your command of the facts is truly incredible. So thank you very much for that very articulate overview.

We also want to stress that, in addition to laying out the problem and the shock that we have in reaction to the solution of our good friends on the other side of the aisle to drill and veto, we have not stood idly by and just said, "Well, unless we repeal these \$14 billion in subsidies, then we're not going to be able to do anything." We have a series of bills that we have passed, and I think it would be helpful for us to go through those and to tell people the efforts that we're making—some short-term, some long-term.

This is a difficult problem to solve in the short term. It is very difficult to dramatically bring down gas prices through legislation in a short-term way, but one of the things that we did was to pass the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Protection Act.

What that does is it says to the President that he is not to fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and that was something that the President had previously opposed. He was threatening to veto it until he realized that the increase in gas prices was so politically painful for both his administration and for his Members of Congress that he had no other choice but to finally relent and agree to sign it. There were still 25 Republicans who voted against that bill.

What the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Act is designed to do is to bring gas prices down in the short term. During the rest of this year, we expect that bill to affect gas prices in the short term.

We have the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act. That is a bill that will extend and expand tax incentives for renewable energy, the type of energy that we would like to go in the di-

rection of, instead of the finite sources that the Republicans always talk about.

What that bill would do is generate hundreds of thousands of green jobs, spur American innovation and business investment, and cut taxes for millions of Americans. What the provisions of that bill will do is preserve hundreds of thousands of good-paying, green-collar American jobs.

A recent study showed that allowing the renewable energy incentives to expire would lead to about 116,000 jobs being lost in the wind and solar industries alone through the end of next year. Yet 159 Republicans voted against that legislation. That's how latched to the oil industry they are.

How about the OPEC and Big Oil companies accountability bill? We passed a bill that would combat record gas prices by authorizing lawsuits against oil cartel members for oil price-fixing as well as created an anti-trust task force to crack down on oil companies that are engaged in anti-competitive behavior and market manipulation.

□ 2215

You still had 84 Republicans vote against that bill.

We also passed legislation, historic legislation, Mr. MURPHY, for the first time in 35 years we have passed legislation that will require the automobile manufacturing industry to increase fuel efficiency standards to 35 miles per gallon by 2020. That is the first congressional increase in more than three decades. Ninety-six Republicans voted against that legislation. It was signed into law on December 19, 2007, so we will over the long term see fuel efficiency standards improve, which, of course the automobile industry could have done years and years ago on their own. But, unfortunately, we had to cajole them along a little bit.

There are two more bills I want to highlight, simply because of the shockingly large number of Republicans that voted against those as well.

You have the Renewable Energy and Conservation Tax Act. That is the bill that included the repeal of this \$14 billion in subsidies. It also would invest in clean and renewable energy and energy efficiency and also address a reduction in global warming. It included provisions that would generate, again, hundreds of thousands of green jobs by investing in solar energy and biodiesel jobs and protect an additional 75,000 wind industry jobs. And 174 Republicans voted against that bill.

Lastly, one of the things that we wanted to make sure we protected against when it came to our energy policy was price gouging, so we passed the Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act, because it is a little bit suspect that all of these retail establishments and all of the entire oil industry suddenly and dramatically all increase prices at the same time. What a coincidence.

So we thought it was important in order to provide immediate relief to consumers to give the Federal Trade Commission the authority to investigate and punish people and entities that artificially inflate the price of energy, and we wanted to ensure that the Federal Government had the tools it needed to adequately respond to energy emergencies and prohibit price gouging, particularly like, for example, when you have natural disasters like my State faces which we often struggle with. And 140 Republicans voted against that bill.

So it is just really important that we highlight these stark differences in our policy versus the Republicans, what we support and the actions that we have taken and what the other side supports. The other side is married to the oil industry, and we would like to move, again, in a new direction, so we can invest in renewable energy.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, just to put it in real stark terms here, 2002 to 2008, the oil industry we are talking about here, goes from \$6.5 billion in profit, that is pretty good, you are going to take that, that is a good year, to 2008, \$36.9 billion in profit.

We still haven't figured out why that is. Why is it that the oil industry and the drug industry are two of the most profitable industries in the world? Because they cornered the market, right? You have got to take that drug. You have got nowhere else to go. If that drug keeps you alive and nobody else makes that drug, you have got to buy that drug. If the only thing that gets you from point A to point B is the product that Exxon and Chevron and BP make, then they can charge whatever they want.

So we can talk about the margins here. We can talk about producing a little more. But, in the end, the reason why they get to just basically decide whatever they want, they can make \$6.5 billion one year and \$36.9 billion the next year, it is up to them, because they know whatever they charge, we will pay, because we have no alternative. That minivan mom, that soccer mom, guess what? Nothing else fuels that car right now, except for the products that these guys produce.

If I made a really good apple pie and I went out and everybody else that tried to grow some apple trees in their backyard, I whacked them down, I could charge whatever I wanted for that because nobody else could make that pie. That is what the Republicans are basically doing. Everybody else that tries to go out and plant some apple trees in their backyard to give an alternative to the big oil companies, they whack those trees down. Guess what? That apple pie is now about \$5 a gallon, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If you look on every issue, right, it is like we get hit on 9/11, the Taliban is housing them in Afghanistan, somehow we end up in Iraq. We have an energy problem. Drill-

ing is up 67 percent. We have all this land and everything else, all these other areas. We got to keep drilling. That is the answer, when we know that it is these other things going on in the commodities market.

We look at trying to reduce the cost of college education. It is like we will put the banks in charge of loaning the money to the kids. Or if we want to provide prescription drugs, I got an idea. We will have the taxpayer pay for it, and we won't do any negotiations with the drug companies at all.

It is like they have a solution that doesn't address the current problem that we have at hand, Mr. Speaker. And what we are trying to say is we have solutions that will last more than a decade or two, and if they are wrong, we will switch them. But to come down and say drill, drill, drill, drill, drill. In ANWR, for example, it will reduce the cost of a gallon of gas by 1.8 cents per gallon of gas 20 years from now if we start drilling today. Totally off the mark.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I think it is instructive, the gentleman talks about mistakes having been made on other issues. It is instructive when you think about the people who are making the arguments for how to solve the problems that we face today, let's take a look at what the track record is and how we got to where we are today. Who made the decisions that have led us to where we are today?

I know I don't want to be partisan about this, but the facts are the facts. There are three reasons that gas prices have gone up, two of which we can control and one we can't. We can't control the increased demand in China and India and other countries in the world. It is a huge driving force. It is going to continue to get worse over time. It is going to continue to drive an increase.

The other two factors, increased speculation in the market and manipulation of the price in the worldwide oil market. The gentlewoman from Florida talks about what this Congress is doing on that issue in regulating that market and moving towards a more fair system that is going to decrease the price per barrel upwards of \$30. We are taking action. That is a second cause.

But perhaps the biggest cause is the weak U.S. dollar. So let's take a look at why the dollar is so weak. Oil is traded in the worldwide market based on the dollar. We are paying more in this country. Obviously our currency is the U.S. dollar and we are paying more because of the weakness of the dollar which is at an all-time low, an historic low.

Well, it is because of the economic policies of the past 8 years that have driven our economy and driven the price of the dollar nearly to the ground. And I would invite anyone to compare where the dollar was based on other worldwide currencies 8 years ago versus today.

We have an enormous trade deficit which the gentleman and I deal with

every day in our districts with the jobs that have been lost, and the trade deficit is at almost historic proportions. That has led to a decrease in the dollar.

But mostly the runaway spending of this Congress and the \$3.5 trillion in debt that this administration and the previous three Congresses rolled up on the American people have led to the economic conditions that drove the price of the dollar down, that have resulted in sky-high gas prices.

So the exact same people who made the decisions that led to the crisis that we are in today now have their own recommended solutions. And I don't dispute their motives. I think they are in it for the same reason we are. They want to do the right thing. I just think they are wrong. I think that their course of action that they propose is not going to solve the problem, and in fact is going to lead to a worsening of the problem by furthering our dependence on oil, as we talked about.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. MURPHY, I might need a little help with this so I can be bipartisan. Let's spread this out here. It is always better in the 30-Something Working Group when we give visual examples of what we are talking about.

We walked through the agenda of the New Democratic Congress on our initiatives to try to affect the cost of energy in the short-term and the long-term.

Here is a visible example. Next to here are the names of the entire Republican leadership, and here are the four major pieces of legislation that we have moved through the Congress. Not allowing OPEC to price fix, making sure that our constituents are not gouged by prices, ensuring that we invest in renewable energy and repealing those \$14 billion in subsidies, and ensuring that we have energy security going into the future.

There are no yeses on this entire grid, the entire Republican leadership. What is objectionable about making sure that we don't have price gouging when it comes to gasoline? Should we allow OPEC to fix prices? Is that okay? I am just not sure which of these bills was objectionable.

It is one thing for them to say that we should do some other things as well, but if we are going to try work in a bipartisan spirit and approach this problem and find a solution together, voting no on anything that doesn't prop up the oil industry is just insensitive and callous and doesn't recognize that this is a real problem that is affecting Americans in a significant way.

Thank you, Mr. MURPHY. I would be happy to yield back to Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. You know, before I was joined by my illustrious colleagues here this evening, one of actually our more helpful colleagues on the other side was talking about words are one thing and actions are another. Words are one thing and votes are something else.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, you are pointing out when this comes down to it, when we had the chance to gather together and link arms and be one as Republicans and Democrats, our friends on the other side of the aisle didn't join us. There have been plenty of opportunities for that to happen, for us, as Mr. RYAN says, to do what our constituents want and put politics aside.

As I said at the outset, the pumps don't care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. The pumps don't care if you voted for CHRIS MURPHY or not. They are going to charge you the same thing one way or another.

I think Mr. ALTMIRE is right. Maybe they have the best intentions at heart. But it is a pretty simplistic solution to a pretty complex problem: Drill more, drill more. Again, you are just feeding the beast. You are continuing to perpetuate a monopoly on energy that offers no real competition.

What you need is not competition between Exxon and Mobil. You need competition between oil and electric, between biodiesel and gasoline. That is what you need competition among. That is how you are going to solve this thing in the end.

But so long as the solution to high oil prices is just more oil and nothing else, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN, you are not getting anywhere.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important, the American people are onto this. They have been dealing with this problem now for like 35 years.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Pretty much our whole lives.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Before we were even born. But they have been dealing with this issue of oil and gas and the Middle East and dictators and how do we do this and prop up this one and try to figure it out.

In this whole scheme, I was watching a thing on Darfur last night. The only reason we couldn't get things done in Darfur is because China has oil in Sudan and we couldn't go in there because they were blocking things at the UN. Oil has become a major, major geopolitical and domestic problem in the United States of America. It has come to a head, and it is NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID and the Democrats who are trying to move us off the dime and say long-term alternative energy is the investment. If we drilled in ANWR today, in 20 years you would save 1.8 pennies per gallon of gas. We can't drill our way out of this thing.

So if we don't start getting innovative and having a NASA-shoot-the-moon project for alternative energy, we are going to be in the same spot a decade from now, two decades from now. Our constituents did not elect us to come down here and play politics with this.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ALTMIRE, I thank the Speaker again for allowing the 30-Something Working Group to come down to the floor again

and share with our colleagues the "New Direction" mentality that we continue to preach, talk about, and vote for here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 2230

DEVELOP ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for half the time before midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate greatly the privilege to address you tonight on floor of the United States Congress, and as I listen to my colleagues talk about the energy situation that we have here in America, it's quite interesting to me that my colleagues would say well, we can't drill in ANWR because in 10 years we are going to still have some other energy issue.

Are they looking for the silver bullet, I wonder? Do they insist that we can't do anything with regard to energy? We can sit here and deal with \$4 gas? Unless we can fix \$4 gas and make it \$1 gas, we shouldn't do anything? I wonder what is the problem with the realistic approach to this that seems to be a barrier for my colleagues from the other side of the aisle?

We know this, that there is a little over 10 billion barrels of oil in U.S. reserves, and we know that the United States Department of Energy produced a number about three days ago that showed there is about 10.4 billion barrels of oil in ANWR. If we open up ANWR, we will essentially and virtually double the oil reserve supplies for the United States of America if we tap into ANWR.

Now, what kind of thinking person would say I would rather pay \$4 for gas, or \$5 for gas, or \$6 or more dollars for gas before I would tap into 10.4 billion barrels of oil in a neighborhood up there that I would remind you, and I would remind the body, that in 1970, we were scheduled to go up to Alaska and drill for oil in the North Slope. I remember that very clearly, 1970.

The idea was, we will build a pipeline from the North Slope, Mile Post Zero up there at Dead Horse access on the Arctic Ocean, and that pipeline will run from there all the way down there through the Port of Valdez in Alaska where they will then tanker that oil down to refineries along the coast of California and other points. That was 1970.

The same philosophical environmentalists that are blocking drilling in ANWR today, the ones that took the floor just a few moments ago that said—where we shared—we dare not drill in ANWR because it's not going to solve all our problems are the ones that brought the lawsuit that brought the drilling that blocked the North Slope of Alaska in 1970.

In those days, there was a long and intense court battle that finally got the environmental extremists out of the way. In 1972, they said, all right, there isn't any logical or rational or legal reason why you can't drill the North Slope of Alaska.

So we went up and we started to punch holes in the North Slope of Alaska in 1972. In 1972 we started building a pipeline from the Arctic Ocean all the way down to the Port of Valdez. I don't actually know how far that is, but I know that there was a right-of-way for alongside the pipeline that went from Fairbanks 600 miles north. It's more miles than that from Dead Horse access on the Arctic Ocean on down to the Port of Valdez.

Even though the environmentalists in court blocked drilling in ANWR for that period of time for 2 years, even though we look back on that—well first, at the time, I thought how can the environmentalists be so effective as to shut down access to the American energy supply for two full years without a logical, rational or legal argument?

Well they did so, and now I look back on that, and I think how in the world did we resolve issue in two short years by going to court between 1970 and will 1972 to clear the environmental extremists out of the way and go in and drill in ANWR where all these extremists ideas were that if we punch our drill in the North Slope, if we punch holes in the North Slope, there will be oil flooding all over the permafrost, the tundra will be destroyed. They will be driving bulldozers through the tundra, and you can never put that environment back again.

It's a careful balance that Mother Nature has, and the caribou will all drown in crude oil. There won't be any wolves left, and it will just be a terrible economic or terrible environmental catastrophe. That was what they predicted in 1970.

In 1972 we started building the pipeline and building the right-of-way and drilling the wells on the North Slope of Alaska, identical in the environmental component that's there, to ANWR today. In 3 years we built the pipeline, we built the right-of-way road along the pipeline. We punched the wells in. We got the wells up and got them running. We hooked them in and began to transfer that crude oil down through that long pipeline down to Valdez and into other parts of the United States where it was refined. That got accomplished in 3 years.

And now, Mr. Speaker, the very people that sit over on this side of the aisle tonight that have blocked the drilling on the North Slope back 30-some years ago, and are blocking the drilling in ANWR today say, well, gee in 10 years, we still will have a problem with enough oil for the United States of America, and you will not solve this problem, the whole problem. You will not solve it in perpetuity so, therefore, you ought not do anything in Alaska to fix it.