

consuming. And so I will submit that each of these pieces of the pie—I will just turn this over so the coal lines up for Mr. SHIMKUS—each of these pieces of the pie needs to grow out to the limits of the diameter of this circle so that together we're producing as much energy, or more, than we're consuming. And then we can engage in this and change the size of these pieces so that we can prioritize the use of our energy.

And I would submit that this natural gas product that's here, the yellow, let's produce a lot more of it. Let's use less to generate electricity; let's use more to produce fertilizer and use it in industry where we produce plastics, et cetera.

But this is where the picture is for the solution. We need more coal, more natural gas. We need more other petroleum products. We need more diesel fuel, more motor gasoline, more biomass, solar, ethanol, biodiesel, wind, geothermal, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, might I request how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's just enough time to demonstrate what corn is.

Mr. Speaker, this may be a first on the floor of the United States Congress. In this Ziploc bag is corn. Now, there's a little bit of a misconception out there. There's an argument that we shouldn't turn this into ethanol because people will say, well, that's food. Well, I have chewed on this corn, but we grind it up and feed it to livestock. This isn't human food as we know it. We do convert some of it to syrups and 299 other products, value add. But what happens is we'll bring a bushel of this corn into an ethanol plant, we'll run it through that plant. A third of the volume that you see here will be converted into ethanol. About the same amount of it is wasted when you feed it to livestock anyway, it just isn't usable, so that turns into CO<sub>2</sub>. And that's a waste product right now with ethanol.

The other third of it turns into this; this is a fine product called dried distiller's grain. This is actually high-protein, dried distiller's grain, Mr. Speaker. This gets fed back to livestock. So I'll come down at another time and I'll demonstrate what you do with a bushel of corn. It produces three gallons of ethanol. Half of the feed value in that, at least, goes back to the livestock in the form of dried distiller's grain that I have in this hand. And this food-versus-fuel argument does not hold up right now; it may for the '08 crop, it doesn't for '07.

We've produced more corn than ever before in 2007; that was 13.1 billion bushels. We exported more corn than ever before; that was 2.5 billion bushels. We converted more corn into ethanol than ever before; that was 3.2 billion bushels. And 1.6 billion of that went back to livestock in the form of feed, so you add that back in. And the

amount of corn that was available for domestic consumption was 9.0 billion bushels of corn from the 2007 crop. That's more than ever before, Mr. Speaker. And the average amount of corn available for domestic consumption for the other years in the decade was 7.4 billion bushels.

So there was 1.6 billion more bushels available for domestic consumption, the prices somewhat higher than they ever were before; part of it is a weak dollar, part of it is global demand; part of it is we exported more meat than ever before. And our economy has been rolling and booming.

We have to figure out how to come to grips with this. Ethanol isn't the only answer, drilling is not the only answer, but \$4.08 gas surely is not the answer, Mr. Speaker. And anybody that thinks that drilling for oil is a dead end I think has a dead idea. And the American people are going to stand up and say, Drill ANWR, drill the Outer Continental Shelf, drill the non-national park public lands. Let's have all the energy and all these categories that we have. Let's drive down these prices. Let's boom our economy. And let's get on with where we need to go as a country.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention this evening.

#### THE FRESHMEN CLASS OF THE 110TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here tonight on the floor of the House of Representatives with a number of my colleagues who will be coming in and out, I imagine, as the evening goes on. And I'm also especially glad to be able to follow my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING), who's got an interesting, but obsolete, perspective on the energy future for this country and what we need to do not only in the current crisis, but for the future of our great country, for the future of our economy, for the future of our energy use.

So tonight we will be talking about what it means to go green. Because, let's face it, green is the new red, white and blue. And before I jump into the energy issues, but sticking with the theme of going green, I cannot help but stand to congratulate the Boston Celtics for winning the NBA finals. And if anybody exemplifies what it means to be green and to be champions, it certainly is the Boston Celtics. It's the kind of lesson that we all could learn in this country.

Many of us in New Hampshire are diehard Celtics fans. And some of a certain age, including myself, remember the great championship Celtic teams from the sixties, seventies and eighties. And this has been the longest stretch in the Celtics' franchise history without winning a championship.

The Boston Celtics last night beat their rival, the Los Angeles Lakers, by a whopping 39 points. It was the first NBA championship for Boston since 1986. Now, Celtics fans are especially proud today of Captain Paul Pierce, who, in the great tradition of Celtic champions like Red Auerbach and Larry Bird and Kevin McHale and Dennis Johnson and other greats, was the obvious choice for the NBA Final MVP Award. I'm proud to stand tonight to congratulate Paul Pierce for securing his place in Celtics history and the rest of the team for bringing the 17th banner back to New England. It's time to go green: Go Celtics.

Now, along with going green, what's important to note is that, as we are here tonight, in my home State of New Hampshire, New Hampshire families are paying record prices for gasoline. Today, the average is \$4.04 for regular gas and \$4.73 for diesel. Last year at about this time, New Hampshire families were paying \$2.92 for regular gas and \$2.82 for diesel.

Now, for some reason, as if to rewrite history, the President of the United States and my Republican colleagues, regrettably, would like to shift the blame for the soaring energy prices to the Democrats in Congress. They would like somehow for the American people to believe that it is simply the fact of the switch of majority in 2006 and Democrats who have been here working hard on reasonable, responsible, smart energy legislation, who are somehow the cause of the pain at the pumps. Well, tonight we'll talk a little truth, we'll talk a little truth to what are outrageous scams. It is simply not true.

The President today proposed, for example, drilling in ANWR. He proposed giving the oil companies even more access to drilling. The President's proposal today is, unfortunately, another page from the administration's energy policy that was literally written by the oil industry. I don't think anybody can forget that it was Vice President CHENEY, an oil man, who, together with President Bush, an oil man, sat in secret with the oil companies to create this country's energy policy.

The product of that energy policy is that today, after the first quarter of 2008, we've had another record year for oil company profits. Apparently Mr. CHENEY's energy policy seems to be working for the oil companies. In 2002, the profits of the oil companies were \$6.5 billion in a quarter. And today, in 2008, first quarter of 2008, the record year for oil company profits, \$36.9 billion in profits, while we pay \$4.04 at the pump.

So the plan from the President now is to give away more public resources to the very same oil companies that are raking in record profits; and all the time those oil companies are sitting on 68 million acres of Federal lands they've already leased; 68 million acres of Federal lands they've already leased

and already have done the environmental permitting on. That's 68 million acres ready to be drilled on for oil.

The President's speech, in a time of record gas prices, had no ideas for more efficient transportation or renewable American energy; no ideas for conservation and an alternative future that will actually free us from oil; no real ideas to deal with the current crisis now, as well as looking toward the future because they are inseparable. And we are now paying the price, frankly, for 30 years of not paying attention as we should, and for 8 years under the Bush administration, together with a previous 12 years, much of that with a Republican Congress in which energy policy has been designed for the oil companies, favoring the oil companies, and the American consumers have been paying the price. The President's proposal is nothing more than a continuation of addiction to fossil fuels and dependency on an oil industry earning record profits.

Now, just before I turn it over to my colleague, my good friend from the State of New York, JOHN HALL, who has been working on environmental issues his entire life, what is clear is that we will need to transition from the current addiction we have to oil that binds us to unfriendly countries, that threatens our national security, that depresses our economy, we will need to transition to a future of energy efficiency and conservation, and renewable and alternative fuels, which will explode the entrepreneurial spirit of this country, deliver real security, real jobs, and a sustainable future. But in that transition, what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like the American people to think is that somehow, by drilling in Alaska, they will see some real benefits.

We will talk more about it later. But the last thing I will say before I turn it over to Mr. HALL is, what the Department of Energy has told us about drilling in Alaska is very simple: Even if you opened ANWR to drilling it would take until about 2025 to see any of the benefits, and at that point you might reduce the price at the pump by 1.8 cents. So that is what the President of the United States proposed today to deal with our energy crisis and the future of our energy use.

□ 2145

Drill in ANWR, and by 2025, we will reduce the price by 1.8 cents.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to turn the proceedings over to my colleague from New York, John Hall.

Mr. HALL of New York. Thank you, Mr. HODES. Good evening. It is a pleasure to be here again. I want to just agree with one thing that our previous speaker from the other side of the aisle, Mr. KING, had to say regarding biofuels. I think that there are ways in which various biofuels, including corn, but especially cellulosic biofuels and nonfood crops can and should be used

to extend the liquid fuels capacity of this country. But the main reason that I'm here tonight is because I've heard in the last several days a nonstop drum beat, a chorus singing from the same choir book and the same hymn book at every committee meeting I have been at, at every press conference I have heard, at every chance I see a Republican representative on television blaming the Democrats for the high price of gasoline and claiming, erroneously, that Democrats have been stopping drilling, that Democrats are opposed to drilling, and therefore we're responsible for the price of gas. This is not only false but ridiculous on the face of it. And I challenge it as a falsehood.

Specifically, I would say that over the last 8 years, the number of drilling permits issued by the government has gone up by 361 percent. So the lands are open. The oil companies own 9,700 plus leases that they have bid on and received the leases for. And as you say, Mr. HODES, they have got done the environmental permitting on, the permits have been issued, and the way is clear for drills to go into the ground or into the offshore adjacent waters of the lower 48. But for some reason, no drilling is occurring.

Now I'm curious as to why exactly that is, if really the oil companies want to drill. And I would remind you, by the way, that our President George W. Bush said, when oil was going for \$50 a barrel, that that was all the incentive the oil companies need. They don't need any more tax breaks or incentives. Fifty dollars a barrel is enough incentive to make them drill anywhere.

As this chart will show you, the total Federal acres leased and in production in 2007 were 91.5 million acres leased but producing only 23.7 million acres. There is a huge discrepancy between land that has been leased by the oil companies and that which they are using to actually drill and produce oil. Why is this? Could it be perhaps that they expect that speculators and market forces may drive the prices up further, not to mention their restricting supply might drive them up further, and that if they hold off for a couple more years, that same land and that same oil might be more valuable? And actually when you're making profits such as the gentleman from New Hampshire just talked about, I mean, how much money can you deal with? How many profits can you possibly figure out what to do with and where to invest in? And maybe it's better leaving them in the ground.

If I'm an oil company, I'm not necessarily thinking in the national interest. I'm thinking in the interests of my shareholders for the next quarter, for the next year, for the next shareholders' meeting, and for my next bonus if I'm the CEO. We had the CEOs of the top five oil companies testifying in this House before the Select Committee on Energy Independence and

Global Warming. And when they were asked, "Now that you have made the record profits of any corporation in the history of the world, would you commit to investing in one biofuels pump at every station that you own?" And they said "no." And when they were asked, "If you would commit to advertising now that you have made the biggest profits in the history of the world for 3 years in a row, would you invest in advertising to tell people to conserve more and that it's patriotic to conserve and to drive a more fuel-efficient car and so on?" And they said, "Oh, we're already doing that." Which I frankly haven't seen. I watch enough television. I think I would have noticed if they were doing that.

And my friend, Mr. WALDEN, a minority member, a Republican member of the Select Committee from Oregon said, "I'm a capitalist." I'm paraphrasing him now. I don't remember the exact quote. "I'm a capitalist. I'm a small businessman myself. And if I made record profits for several years in a row, profits that I hadn't even dreamed of, I would start to think about whether I could lower my price to my customer. Have you at the oil companies thought about lowering the prices to the consumers?" And one by one all five of them said, "Well, we don't set the prices." And there was a chuckle through the room.

But I think there are various factors setting the prices. And one of them is collusion between the oil companies, which is why I have called for an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission on exactly that fact, the fact that when crude oil goes up on the world market, the gas and diesel price spikes immediately with it. They go up simultaneously. But when crude prices go down, gasoline prices still go up. And if they come down at all, they come done slowly. It's kind of like rockets and feathers. The price goes up like a rocket, and it comes down like a feather very slowly.

So I'm suspicious about a couple of things, one, the disconnect between crude and refined gasoline when they're coming down. They're connected when going up. They are not connected when coming down. Secondly, why so much leased acreage that is not being drilled on? And thirdly, why at this time when the prices are at a record, when America's families are being squeezed and hurt, and their budgets are being hurt, they're being forced to choose between food, medicine or gasoline, some people have given up their jobs because they can't afford to commute to those jobs, why at these times are these oil companies and our friends on the other side of the aisle choosing to put the pressure on and say drill in ANWR and drill in these environmentally sensitive areas?

By the way, two of the individuals who have been stopping offshore drilling, I haven't personally stopped any myself, but two of the people who have

are the President's brother, Jeb Bush, who is the Republican Governor of Florida who is opposed to drilling off the coast of Florida, and Governor Schwarzenegger of California, a Republican Governor who has been opposed to further drilling off the coast of California. So you can't just say this is a Democratic opposition even if we were opposing it.

But the fact is that we have seen an increase, a radical increase in leases that are made available, in leases that the oil companies bid for apparently believing there is something of value underground, 9,700 separate leases and 68 million acres of land currently available and not being used. And I suggest that our friends in the minority might think of another reason, or perhaps another policy, that would help us get out of the box we're in.

We have worked very hard in this Congress to try to develop new sources, to provide incentives and tax breaks and subsidies for renewable energies like solar, wind and geothermal and various kinds of biofuels. For the first time, we made a major investment of, I believe it was \$6 billion or so in carbon sequestration so we can use the record amounts of coal that we have and still precipitate out the carbon so we don't release that carbon dioxide that causes the global warming.

And, by the way, I would say in sympathy to the folks from Mr. KING's State and to the parents of the five Boy Scouts who were killed by a tornado there, and in sympathy to the folks in Cedar Rapids who are just now starting to pump out their basements and put their city back together, it used to be called the city "that would never flood," by the way, that was under 12 feet of water from its most recent flood, in sympathy to the poor citizens of Myanmar who were struck by the cyclone a couple of weeks ago that was as strong as Hurricane Katrina but came to shore with no warning and no FEMA, and not even Brownie to save them, and in sympathy to the people in Georgia and in Florida with record droughts, and in sympathy to people of the Rocky Mountain States and the Western States with record fire seasons, and in sympathy to folks in the 19th District of New York, which I represent which has had three 50-year floods in the last 5 years, I would say in sympathy to all those folks and to protect them, that global warming is here, it is starting to change the climate. These extreme weather patterns fit the computer models of global warming. And if we want to pump and drill more oil and burn more fossil fuels, fine. But that had better not be our only solution, or we will see more tornadoes, more floods, more extreme weather catastrophic events and more global warming. And I think that is not what the American people want. What we want are fair gas prices, fair energy prices and a green, renewable, sustainable energy future.

I yield back to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. HODES. Thank you. And what strikes me is as you recite the litany of terrible tragedies, natural disasters, or unnatural disasters, that have struck the world, my district underwater in various parts of it, as yours has been in the last 5 years, with unprecedented floods, the floods around our Nation, hurricanes, Katrina, in Burma, Indonesia, around the world, clearly, the world's climate is changing.

What strikes me as radical is to attack the notion that global warming is here. What seems radical to me is not to accept that we're going to need to make the kind of transition that seems evident that we will have to make from a fossil fuel past to a new energy future. And in the middle of all this, how convenient it is at summertime with people in pain from rising gas prices, caused by lots of things, to say, for my friends on the other side of the aisle, it's those Democrats, if only they would let us drill, if only those Democrats would let us drill, everything would be fine. If only we could drill in ANWR. If only the Democrats weren't stopping us from drilling, gas prices would come down.

Let me point out that since the 1990s, the Federal Government has consistently encouraged the development of its oil and gas resources, and the amount of drilling on Federal lands has steadily increased during that time. The amount of drilling on Federal lands has steadily increased.

Now that includes the period of time in which the Democrats have had the majority in Congress. Federal lands have been open to the oil companies. They have leases. The environmental permitting is done. As you pointed out, they haven't been drilling, although the number of permits has been going up. In fact, we would call it an explosion in Federal permits to drill for oil on Federal lands, a resource for all the people which, through the wisdom of the Federal Government, the Federal Government is allowed to be drilled on in the environmentally proper ways.

In fact, 5 years ago, there were 3,802 permits to drill, and in 2007 there were 7,561 permits issued to drill. We're not stopping drilling. We're not stopping drilling. What we are talking about, though, is truth.

And one of the questions that you have to ask is, so where is the drilling getting us? What effect will the drilling have, has the drilling had, on gas prices? Well, if the President's answer is we want to drill more, if my friends across the aisle's answer is, oh, drill more, the more you drill, the lower the gas prices will be, then let's at least first take a look at that claim that more drilling means lower gas prices.

In fact, between 1999 and 2007, when the number of drilling permits issued for development of public lands increased, as you said, by 361 percent, gasoline prices have also risen dramatically. The chart to my left shows

emphatically, categorically, with no room for argument, that more drilling, more permits, doesn't equal lower gas prices. When you look at this chart and you start down here in the corner that I'm pointing to, we have the price of gas along this side. I'm pointing to here. The years are along the bottom. We see in red, the bars are drilling permits issued. In blue, we see the number of wells drilled. And the green line is the price of gas. So we're showing all three components of the question I asked: Does more drilling lower gas prices? Because if it doesn't, then the President's argument to drill in ANWR holds no water. The complaints of the minority that we're somehow stopping progress, we are the fault for keeping gas prices high, holds no water. And we're going to have to look for other enemies to point the finger at and other solutions for our energy.

□ 2200

So let's take just a quick look. Without going through it all, what this trend clearly shows, as you can see, are the permits issued. This starts in 1994 and goes up to 2007. As you can see, in the early years, with the red bars, there are more permits issued than there is drilling because, first, you have to issue the permits before you drill on it.

Then by about 1999, after we've issued permits from 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997—here we are in 1998 and 1999—what we're seeing is that the number of wells drilled has caught up and has surpassed the number of permits issued, and it's relatively stable through there.

Then starting in the year 2000, we're going to see that the number of wells drilled is declining. As you pointed out, the oil companies are getting permits. They're buying up leases. They're holding onto the supply, but they're not drilling wells, not because there aren't the permits issued, not because they couldn't drill but because of some other reason. Now, let's remind ourselves that they're also making, in these last years here, record profits while their drilling on public lands available to them is lower than the permits issued.

Now let's take a look at the price of gas. Notice how the price of gas basically tracks these lines. So it shows more permits, more drilling, higher prices of gas. More permits, more drilling, higher prices of gas. The argument that if we simply open up ANWR to drill will somehow lower the price of gas is absolutely wrong. It just doesn't hold water.

What is so interesting to me is that this is a, theoretically, free market economy, and this country has always stood for free markets with reasonable regulation because, as Abraham Lincoln—a good Republican—said, the purpose of government is to do what the free markets cannot or will not do so well for themselves.

In our free market economy, if the oil companies tapped the 68 million

Federal acres of leased land, it could generate an estimated 4.8 million barrels of oil a day. That is what is available to them now under lease with the environmental permits done. 4.8 million barrels of oil a day is six times what ANWR would produce at its peak in the year 2025. It's available to the oil companies today. Yet, somehow, the President and our colleagues want to open ANWR, which will take 20 years to get done and will reduce the price, theoretically, by 1.8 cents. It simply doesn't hold water.

The fact is that 80 percent of the oil available on the Outer Continental Shelf is in regions that are already open to leasing, but the oil companies, in their wisdom, haven't decided it's worth their time to drill there either. They have the leases. They have the permits, but they don't want to drill there. So we have the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, a small place up there in Alaska where the caribou are wild, where wildlife flourishes, where it's tough to get the oil out of there because you've got to build a pipeline forever. We have onshore Federal lands available to the oil companies. We have offshore lands available to the oil companies. They're not drilling. They want more leases. It sounds kind of like grab and greed to me. Grab and greed.

We're a nation that has, perhaps, 2 percent of the world's supply of oil. We use 24 percent of the world's supply of oil. There is a disconnect there. We need to find new solutions because the bottom line is we cannot drill our way out of an energy situation in which foreign countries, many of them unfriendly to us and multinationals who are making record profits, control our supply of oil. It has had disastrous consequences for our foreign policy because now you read the various evidence that's coming out about the reason we went to war in Iraq.

I just finished the book of President Bush's spokesman, Scott McClellan, called "What Happened," which is on the reason we went to war. What is very interesting is that, when you read the passages of the discussions in the White House about why we went into Iraq and Vice President CHENEY's concerns about oil, many of the fears that people have seem to be clarified about the reasons we went to war in Iraq.

Now, I understand the motivation that says we need oil and that we need to secure our supplies and that we're going to use our geopolitical power and our military might to make sure we have the energy, but the bottom line is, when our energy future runs our foreign policy instead of our foreign policy and our energy future being tied together for our independence, we're at great risk. Here we are in 2008, stuck in a quagmire of a war with a huge debt. We have a deficit with China. Our gas prices are soaring. There is no way to drill our way out of the solution, and so we're going to talk about some more facts, some more truth and some of the things we're doing both to deal with

the current issues and what we're doing for the future of this country.

I'll yield back to you, Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Thank you, Mr. HODES.

As you were speaking, I was thinking about some of the things that we can do.

Westchester County, one of the counties that I have the honor to represent, has a loop of county bus service which has switched from diesel buses to biodiesel buses to hybrid biodiesel buses.

We have John Jay High School, at which I just spoke a couple of days ago, where the environmental club has a grease mobile, a diesel car they've converted to run on biodiesel that they made from cooking oil from restaurants in the area.

The Newburgh Free Academy, a public school in Orange County, New York, one of the counties I'm honored to represent, has a solar racing club that built a solar car which tied for first place in a race between Houston, Texas and Newburgh, New York. They were built without the faculty advisors' even touching the vehicle. The adults were not allowed to touch the vehicle. The kids had to build it by themselves. These students knew how to weld and fasten the car together and how to build it sturdily enough and how to make sure that the wheels rotated so that they didn't wobble and so on. The advanced placement math and science students knew how to calculate how many square inches of photovoltaic cells it took to power a certain number of batteries to drive the wheels.

They drove that car from Houston for 2,000 miles to Newburgh, New York, and tied for first place in a race that was sponsored by a corporation that put the money up for the entire educational and research experiment.

When we did a presentation in our district on this, the students came in, wearing their solar racing club hats and their solar racing club T-shirts, and they showed the video of their car rolling down the highway with nothing but solar power powering it. By the way, this was a standing-room-only crowd who came to see this at the Bedford Town Hall in New York.

Afterwards, the adults came up to me as we were leaving, and they were saying, if these kids can do this on a shoestring, with no budget to speak of, where is Detroit? Why can't GM and Ford and Chrysler, our automakers, do this?

I would say that they can and that they should have been, but they're only now starting to. In fact, as to the Chevy Volt, as advertised on their Web site—it will be out, I believe, next year—they're planning this car to be a plug-in hybrid which will have a small internal combustion engine, but it will not be connected to the drive chain. The gas engine will only be used to drive a generator to keep the Lithium-ion batteries fully powered. When you drive this car, they say, on a 100-mile commute or less, it will run as an elec-

tric vehicle and will not use any gasoline. When you run it on an intercity trip of hundreds of miles, it will average 150 miles per gallon. That's supposed to be available next year.

I was at an event last week, and I talked to somebody from Toyota. They said, oh, that's nothing. In a couple of years, we're bringing out a car that's going to get 500 miles to the gallon.

Now, my feeling is that, when I was growing up and when we were in the middle of the space race and when President John Kennedy had challenged us that we would get to the Moon in 10 years, in our country, we were used to the position of leadership, and we thought, certainly, the United States has the ingenuity and the creativity and the expertise and the intelligence to be able to devise solutions for all of these problems. I still think we can, and I think we need to, and I think that the solution here is not to drill, drill, drill, and to open up more environmentally sensitive areas to be destroyed.

By the way, it was interesting to me that the polar bear was just put on the threatened list by the Secretary of the Interior. Then just this week, with a rulemaking process that doesn't have to go before us here in Congress, Secretary Kempthorne issued a rule indemnifying the top seven oil companies against any legal action should they kill polar bears in their exploration for oil.

So it's kind of a curious environmental consciousness that this administration seems to have where they give lip service to it on one hand, but on the other hand, they want to protect their friends in the oil companies from any risk at all at the same time that they open them up to all profit imaginable.

Just turning to this chart, natural gas is, of course, another one of the things we hear about, the oil and gas for which we bad Democrats are not allowing them to drill. Currently, how much natural gas is open to leasing? 82 percent. Closed to leasing is this small piece of the pie chart. This came from the Minerals Management Service in 2006. Technically, of the recoverable reserves of natural gas, 82 percent of them are open to leasing. This corresponds with the figures that we've been talking about in terms of oil that is open to leasing and that, in fact, has been leased and that is not currently being used.

I would contrast that with the inventiveness of Listening Rock Farm in my district, which is in the town of Amenia, New York. It's, actually, just barely north of my district. It's a renewable tree farm that's making biodiesel from wood waste and is running all their farm vehicles—their tractors and other vehicles and their road vehicles—on biodiesel made from wood waste, which is wood chips, sawdust, leaves, anything that doesn't go into the furniture that they make.

I would contrast it with Taylor Biomass, which is a company in Orange

County that is a private corporation but that takes municipal solid waste currently from the Town of Montgomery on a pilot project. They separate out the batteries and the solvents and the Raid and the insecticides and other bad things that you don't want to go into the groundwater or up into the air, and those things get taken away and are dealt with in a responsible way. What is left is gasified and burned to spin a turbine and to put kilowatts out into the grid and, at the same time, to produce ethanol. These are creative solutions to our energy problems that, I think, must be explored.

One thing I would share with our friend Mr. KING is that we need to look at a wide variety of different kinds of energy around different parts of the country but, in particular, in the northeast where we have a hilly topography. There are many opportunities for small, low-head, hydroelectric power. In New York alone, the Department of Energy's Web site—the Idaho National Laboratory page—lists 4,000-some, low-head hydro sites, meaning small dams and small waterfalls, where, according to them, no lefty, environmental, tree-hugging organization—this is our DOE that we're talking about now—says that if we just put turbines where the water is already falling at these 4,000-some sites of low-head hydro potential that we could generate greater than 1,200 megawatts of power. That's about 60 percent of the output, the full output of the two Indian Point nuclear plants in my district. That's just for contrast.

Lastly, I would say that I'm interested that Texas recently passed the State of California as the State with the largest installed wind-power capacity. They have now become the leading wind generation State in the country. The reason, in part, is that Governor George W. Bush, when he was Governor of Texas, signed a renewable energy standard requiring that 10 percent of all electricity in Texas be generated by renewable sources of power.

□ 2215

Of course, once the industry knew that that was there, that was a requirement they had to meet, they more than met it, they exceeded it. They had passed California and became the top wind-power electric producer that T. Boone Pickens, one of the original oil tycoons in this country, was quoted recently as saying that he is more excited today about wind power than he ever was about any oil field he ever discovered.

The odd part of this picture is that now that George W. Bush is President of the United States, he threatened to veto our energy bill last year if it included a renewable energy standard in it. What was good for Texas, for some reason when he was President, wasn't good for the whole country.

Now, I wish that he would revisit that or explain it to us, but I believe

that the same thing that was good for Texas would be good for the whole country. It doesn't have to be wind everywhere. It just has to be renewable. Some places will be wind, some places might be low-head hydro, some places might be biofuels, some places might be tidal power or wave power, but all of these things are available.

There are test programs and pilot programs that show they are effective. The sooner we start using them, the sooner we can get off this dependence on foreign oil and start to put our economy back to work and create new jobs and the new businesses, new technologies, here at home.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, and I appreciate the kindness and decorum with which you discuss the change in apparent policies from our President, who was Governor, apparently understood the importance of a renewable electricity standard which would help industry, help consumers and help move us to the kind of energy future that is responsible, American independent energy future.

As Governor of Texas, as you said, he signed a 10 percent renewable energy standard. As technology has developed, in our bill in the House, when we tried to pass a bill with a 15 percent national renewable portfolio standard to give our utilities who generate the power and the electricity we need the certainty they are waiting for, to unleash the free market forces, to use the renewable and alternative energies with technology already existing to do it, that would come from a variety of sources around the country and start to give us the kind of power around the country that could come from renewable and alternatives, but unfortunately it didn't get past the Senate where, unfortunately, Senators from my State of New Hampshire stood in opposition to it, along with a number of their Republican colleagues. It didn't pass.

We did pass an absolutely important, precedent-setting new CAFE standard, which means that for the first time in 30 years the mileage standards for automobiles will begin to rise. We have been able to pass legislation to correct the obsolete standards we were stuck with, and now by 2020 we will be in a 35-mile per gallon standard. But as you discussed in your earlier remarks, the technology is here today for our automobile companies, which are now languishing in the doldrums. These former engines of the American economy, in which some people estimate 20 percent of the workforce of this country is in some way involved directly or indirectly in the supply chain, our car companies are taking a back seat to others which seem to have gotten on the new technology bandwagon a lot earlier. They have simply fallen behind, when if they had kept up with advanced technology, technology that's available now, think about the markets around the world, which our car

companies, thus the people who are working directly and indirectly in that supply chain would then have the benefit of, we would then be exporting advanced technology instead of being behind the rest of the world, because the technology is certainly here now.

One area that you touched on that I would like to amplify are the kinds of innovative and entrepreneurial activities that are going on at home in our districts in our State. In New Hampshire, we have a lot of wood, and in much of the Northeast and in much of the cold belt of this country we are heavily forested, have a lot of wood resources.

One of the things that I was glad to see in the farm bill, not a perfect bill by any measure, as you know, in any of these large bills, there is a lot to like, there is a lot not to like.

One of the things that's important in the new farm bill is that cellulosic ethanol will receive much more help from the Federal Government, as opposed to corn ethanol, which we now know I think to be somewhat of a problem. The subsidies were lowered for corn ethanol, raised for cellulosic ethanol.

With all due respect to my colleagues on all sides of the aisle, whose districts produce a lot of corn and have been producing corn for fuel, we now know there are some issues with corn ethanol. It takes about this much energy to produce this much corn ethanol. There may be some byproducts. Food pricing around the world has suffered, so we clearly need to find a range of solutions.

Cellulosic ethanol means ethanol that can be added to the fuel of automobiles and other vehicles that comes from wood waste, biomass, switchgrass and other organic matter other than corn. It's very important in the Northeast where we can use wood chips, and the waste from logging and forestry products.

One of the fascinating things that I had the privilege to visit in my own district was a wood pellet plant in Jaffrey, New Hampshire, New England Wood Pellet, which is one of the pioneers of wood pellets. Now, wood pellets are essentially compressed wood waste where you take sawdust. Then you are able to compress it under very high heat.

When compressed and fed into a stove, it's incredibly efficient, extraordinarily clean at the same time, and very convenient. You can put it in the hopper, and power your home and heat your home with it. The sad thing is that after wood-pellet technology was developed in the United States, the leader has become Germany.

Now, when I was visiting a closed paper plant up in my district, there were Germans who were thinking of coming to take it over and turn it into a wood pellet plant. So we have the capacity, clearly in this country, to use our entrepreneurial skills and use local resources to produce our energy.

The even more interesting thing about the wood pellet plant in my district is that they have attached an innovative system to their wood pellet plant. What they have done is they have brought in a large turbine, it kind of looks like a jet engine, that's housed in a small business, that's attached to the wood pellet plant. Now, as I said, the wood pellets are produced using extraordinary amounts of heat and sawdust to compress it into the wood pellets for use in a stove.

What these folks have done is they have attached their own heating and electricity generating system right off their own building, so they have these two buildings interconnected. The turbine, which looks like a large jet engine, is fed through a series of filters and tubes. What happens is from the wood pellet process, the waste gases and the waste, of which there is some, is fed through the filtering system, gasified, and then fed into the turbine.

The turbine spins, it provides heat first to preheat the heating system that makes the wood pellets. It provides all the power, the electrical power to run the wood pellet plant, and it provides additional electric power which they sell back to the electric grid.

So they are heating their plant, they are preheating their manufacturing process, they are providing the power for their building. They are selling electricity back to the grid all in an integrated system that is creating fuel from a locally produced product that can be used to heat homes in a renewable energy efficient and appropriate way.

Now, if that one small wood pellet plant in my home district of New Hampshire can do that, we can be doing that all over the country in different ways, whether it is geothermal, whether it is tidal, whether it is small hydro, of which there is plenty all over this country, solar, wind, biomass, we have the capacity. We have the brains. We have the entrepreneurs, we have the technology, the computer systems, and the people who are just waiting to have the entrepreneurial spirit of this country unleashed.

To hear the President, and to hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, trying to propose that we go backwards in time to a technology which clearly does not lower the price of gas for consumers and clearly threatens our planet, is surprising, to say the least. I asked my friends on the other side of the aisle, for whom I have great respect, because this is an important process, to have two different philosophies come before the American people so that they can help discern the truth.

I have asked them, and I have yet to hear a good answer, what is it, what is it that prevents you from seeing the free markets, which you say you believe in, are waiting for the signals from the Federal Government, are waiting for the standards to be set here

in Congress, are waiting to be unleashed. They know it means jobs, they know it means good products, they know it means new markets around the world, they are ready.

The utilities are ready, industry is ready, the market are ready. I just don't understand the thinkers who are stuck in the past and aren't ready, not only to address the issues we are facing today, but help move this country into the future.

I don't have an answer. I haven't heard an answer. I certainly would like to hear one, because what is being proposed by the President makes no economic sense except perhaps to the oil companies, whose record profits will go up even more if the President's plan were followed. They would get more leases, get more permits, do less drilling, let the price go up, and make more money as they have been.

That doesn't seem to be a good deal for the American people, so why the President would propose it, I have no idea. But I don't understand why he and his colleagues, his supporters, don't understand that the future is simply waiting.

If they are real free market folks, then let's go, let's unleash the free markets.

Do you have an answer for me, Mr. HALL?

Mr. HALL of New York. Well, I have a couple of comments. One is there is a bill that will be, I believe it's already been introduced, but we are going to be talking about more tomorrow called the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Lease Act of 2008 introduced by Representatives RAHALL, MARKEY, HINCHEY, EMANUEL and YARMUTH, among others, I am cosponsor as well, as are you, I believe.

Mr. HODES. I am.

Mr. HALL of New York. What this will do, it's called, the slang version is the "Use It or Lose It Act," which would compel oil and gas companies to either produce on those 9,700 leases that they have and those 68 million acres of land that they have already leased, either produce or give up those leases that they are stockpiling, and it would do this by barring the companies from obtaining any more leases unless they can demonstrate that they are producing oil and gas or diligently developing the leases they already hold during the initial term of those leases. The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to define what constitutes diligent development.

By the way, the backdrop for this, the sort of origin for it, is that back a while in history, coal went through the same kind of speculation, where Federal coal resources were being abused, potential coal exploration areas were being leased by the coal companies, and speculation was driving the price up before that coal was actually developed.

Some people think that, and this is people in the financial markets as well as the energy markets believe that a

significant portion, maybe as much as 25 percent in the increase in the cost of gasoline is actually speculation, people saying, well, that's a good place to put my money. I guess the stock market is kind of uncertain, and real estate has taken a hit lately.

Of course, I am not sure which commodities to invest in, but, oil, that looks like it's always going up. No matter what happens, I think I will put my money into oil. Of course, the more people that do buy oil futures, the more the price of oil goes up on the world market, and the more we wind up paying at the pump.

Companies which lease Federal coal resources are, already by law, required to diligently develop those leases. That's the result of this speculation in the past. The requirement has discouraged the rampant speculation that once did exist in the Federal coal leasing program. This same type of speculation now appears to be plaguing the oil and gas leasing program.

So under the Use It or Lose It bill, the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Lease Act of 2008, oil and gas companies would have to either produce on those leases or give them up. I think that this is in the national interest, I think it's fair, because certainly the application for lease of a particular plot, whether it be onshore or offshore for production of oil or natural gas, implies that that company was intending to develop that resource.

□ 2230

And the Department of the Interior has I believe the right and the duty to make sure that our country's natural resources are used for the best and higher good of the people of this country. Not the CEOs or the stockholders of those corporation, but every American citizen, every person in the United States whose future depends on this economy and on the energy choices we make.

That's all I wanted to say, but I wanted to ask my friend from New Hampshire, since you have that lovely chart next to you, I wonder if you can comment on the Republican leadership's voting record on legislation that pertains to gas prices.

Mr. HODES. I would be happy to talk about that. One of the interesting things that we have seen, unfortunately, is a do-anything-to-stop-progress mentality from our colleagues. While they have been long on accusations about the Democratic attempt to move us, to address the current issues and move us to a new future, their leadership has unfortunately been lacking.

For instance, on the issue of OPEC price fixing, the House will once again take up legislation to empower the Justice Department to take legal action against OPEC-controlled entities for participating in oil cartels that drive up oil prices globally in the United States. We are in the grip of monopolies with price fixing. It is a

basic right of American law that we deal with that in the proper way to stop price fixing. The Republicans have stood in the way without any leadership on that issue.

In terms of price gouging by the oil companies, we have passed, the Democrats have passed legislation cracking down on Big Oil that are gouging American consumers.

The Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act would give our Federal Trade Commission authority to investigate and punish companies that artificially inflate the price of energy. It sets criminal penalties for price gouging, and permits States to bring lawsuits against wholesalers or retailers who engage in such practices. The Bush administration has threatened to veto the measure and the Republican leadership has consistently voted "no, no, no" and "no" on price gouging.

On renewable energy as we discussed, we have been moving towards renewable energy provisions. The House leadership of the Republicans, every single one of them has voted "no" on renewable energy. They are voting "no" on America's future. They are voting "no" on a responsible free market. And on our energy security which we have been working on as Democrats to make sure that we are moving to real security for the United States and energy independence, they voted "no, no, no."

So in closing, and there is so much more we could say about what we have been doing, but as I close tonight I want to say to you and to the Speaker's attention I appreciate, another member of our freshman class of 2006, a distinguished member, that it is time to say yes to the future. It is time to say yes to American consumers. Our special interest must be the interest of the people of this country. It must be an answer to the pain that they are feeling at the pumps, and where they know, where the American people know the great future and destiny of this country lies.

So our job is to say yes. We understand that we need to do something now and we are. We are answering the call now. Democrats will answer, Republicans will say no, but we will be steadfast in the special interest of the people. We will be responsible in unleashing the forces of the free market to take us into the energy future that the American people need and deserve. It is time to say yes to the future. Green is the new red, white and blue. I look forward to working in the years to come on the legislation and the policies that will move us into the future in a way that the American people will be proud of, and I thank you for being with me tonight.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YARMUTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. GIFFORDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 25.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 25.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, June 19.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, for 5 minutes, June 19.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, June 19.

(The following Member (at her request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 16, 2008 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 6124. To provide for the continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 19, 2008, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7185. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees for 2008 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [AMS-CN-07-0092; CN-08-001] (RIN: 0581-AC80) received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7186. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Rules of Practice Regulations Under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA) To Increase Reparation Complaint Filing and Handling Fees [Docket Number AMS-FV-06-0217; FV07-376] (RIN: 0581-AC72) received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7187. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the

Department's final rule — Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. AMS-FV-07-0159; FV08-955-1 FR] received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7188. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees for 2008 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [AMS-CN-07-0092; CN-08-001] (RIN: 0581-AC80) received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7189. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. AMS-FV-07-0159; FV08-955-1 FR] received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7190. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Rules of Practice Regulations Under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA) To Increase Reparation Complaint Filing and Handling Fees [Docket Number AMS-FV-06-0217; FV07-376] (RIN: 0581-AC72) received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7191. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Assessment of the Livestock and Poultry Industries for FY 2007," pursuant to Public Law 106-472; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7192. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Mission-Related Investments, Rural Community Investments (RIN: 3052-AC42) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7193. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Regulation — Loss Severity Amendments (RIN: 2550-AA38) received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7194. A letter from the General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rehabilitation Training — Rehabilitation Continuing Education Program — received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7195. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — West Virginia Regulatory Program [WV-114-FOR; OSM-2008-0010] received June 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7196. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of payments to eligible governments in the State of California for Fiscal Year 2008 under the Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7197. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's report on a major rule promulgated by the Department of Defense, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, and the Environmental Protection Agency, entitled, "Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(2)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.