

I was on that board of directors for many years. And thankfully, we have it open and we're serving the inner city of Atlanta right now with that crisis pregnancy center.

But we've got to stop the killing of these children, black and white, of all colors, because God cannot continue to bless America while we're killing 4,000 babies every day and while we're funding an organization like Planned Parenthood. We have to stop the funding of that organization. And I just encourage all my colleagues of this House to understand that life begins at fertilization, and we've got to stop the killing as a Nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Dr. BROWN, thank you so much for those very strong comments and for the insights that you bring as a medical doctor.

I yield 30 seconds to my friend and colleague, MICHELE BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I just wanted to end, Madam Speaker, by saying Steve Trombly is a top executive director of Planned Parenthood in Illinois, and he said, "I would like to think of Planned Parenthood as the Lens Crafters of family planning." If you've got 882 clinics, you have \$1 billion a year in annual revenue and \$330 million of that comes from taxpayer funding, I think that shows pretty clearly they are big business. They are the Wal-Mart of big abortion. They're the big box retailer.

It is time to end their tax exempt status. It's a fraud. And it's time to stop the public financing of Planned Parenthood. It's the right thing to do.

I yield back to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, the stalwart of prolife, Representative CHRIS SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, let me conclude with just a couple of comments.

First of all, I think most people need to realize who Margaret Sanger really was. And I've read her books; I've read her writings. She wrote in a book called "The Pivot of Civilization" that "we are paying for," and I quote her, "and even submitting to the dictates of an ever-increasing, unceasingly spawning class of human beings who should never have been born at all." In chapter five, she has a chapter called the "Cruelty of Charity" and takes to task those who would provide maternal health care and outreach to those women, poor women especially, in her writings. And I will put them in the RECORD. She says that "such benevolence is not merely superficial and near-sighted, it conceals a stupid charity." To her, these babies and these mothers should have never been born.

Let me conclude, Madam Speaker, abortion mills don't nurture, they don't heal, they don't cure disease. Abortion is violence against children. Some abortion methods dismember and rip apart, the fragile bodies of children. Other methods chemically poison children. Abortion has turned children's bodies into burned corpses, a direct result of the caustic effect of poisoning.

Consider a dismemberment abortion, this is called the D&E abortion. It is used later term, at least from the 20th week or so onward. These children, Madam Speaker, feel pain.

My colleagues will remember that last Congress we brought forward a bill called the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act which would at least inform the woman that a child at this age feels excruciating pain. Sadly, the abortion lobby, including Planned Parenthood, lobbied vigorously against informing women that these children feel such excruciating pain, sometimes as much as four times that which would be felt by a newborn or a child later in his or her life.

We need to, again, Madam Speaker, respect all human life. In the life of an unborn child, birth is just part of a process. It's an event in a child's life; it is not the beginning of life. These children deserve their fundamental human rights.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is always an honor to come before the House and address the Members.

I can tell you that today, in this great country of ours, we have a lot going on. There is a lot of news on the Presidential race. There are a lot of issues that are facing our Nation with Iran testing missiles. And there are a number of issues that American families are also facing.

We're going to talk a little bit tonight about energy. We're going to talk about the Iraq factor. We're going to talk about the things that American families are going through right now. And I think it's very, very important because many people feel that there are issues that are not being addressed here in Washington, DC as it relates to the executive branch. And I think that it's important that we share with the Members that we have a number of issues that this Democratic-led House has put forth on behalf of the American people in a leadership role.

As you know, in the 30-Something Working Group, we always start our hour off—and I'm joined tonight by my very good friend, Mr. JASON ALTMIRE, and also Mr. RYAN, TIM RYAN, on this 30-Something Working Group. And you know we come to the floor, Madam Speaker, to actually speak in what you may say the arena of fact versus fiction. We know that sometimes we get a little excited and we may not have the necessary footnotes we need to back up the information that we are providing, but tonight we did come to the floor to share with the American people fact, not fiction.

I think that, when we start to reflect, Madam Speaker, on a number of issues

that are facing Americans, we have to look at the everlasting issue of fuel costs, for someone to fill up their car, for someone to do something that we may call very common, being able to put gas in their car to be able to take their children to school, to be able to make it to their jobs. And I think that as we look at this issue we need to know who is on the side of the American people. When I say "we," I'm saying Members of Congress.

I'm hoping that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, my Republican colleagues who have joined us on a number of major pieces of legislation that we passed out of this Congress that has gone to the President, I want to applaud those Members for being a part of this great democracy and this great leadership that we have here in the House, to be able to bring about the paradigm shift of bipartisanship. We have not seen bipartisanship in the 109th Congress, 108th Congress. I can attest to that because I was here for those two Congresses. The 110th Congress has brought about bipartisanship on major pieces of legislation that I will talk about a little further later on, but I just want to mention a few things.

Madam Speaker, I always start off by giving what is going on in Iraq. The \$8.5 billion war that's taking place right now in Iraq, some over \$230-something million a day war. And I had the opportunity, Madam Speaker—and I don't want to digress—to speak to some first responders from New Jersey. They are from New Jersey, and Representative RUSH HOLT asked me to speak to his first responders. As you know, Madam Speaker, I was, once upon a time, a first responder as a Florida Highway Patrol trooper. And we talked about funding, and they were talking about the grants. And there was a grant here for, you know, \$50 million or a grant there for equipment for fire fighters and State troopers and sheriffs, \$70 million.

But when I started talking to them about the \$230 plus million a day that's being spent in Iraq, you should have seen their eyes opening wide. We all believe in making sure that we give our men and women what they need in Iraq; and we do that, this Congress has done it. But I think that when you start looking at the policy, when you start looking at how this administration has not put the Iraqi Government's feet to the fire to let them know that we have homefront security and hometown security needs to be addressed, they will never see the kinds of dollars that we're spending there.

I also want to share the numbers with you. The total deaths in Iraq is 4,117 as of July 9; total number of wounded and returned to duty is 16,866; and the total number of wounded not returning to duty is 13,483. I think we have to look at that in perspective.

I want to yield to my good friend, Mr. ALTMIRE, at this time as we talk a little bit about a number of issues that

are facing the American people. Like I said, we're going to talk about fuel, we're going to talk about dining room table issues. So we're going to bounce around a little bit tonight, Madam Speaker and Members. And hopefully we will be able to share with the Members exactly what they need to know versus what some on the other side may not want to hear, because we're going to need this bipartisanship to push it through, to send the President a message that the American people have to be heard.

With that, I yield to my friend, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

And on the subject of Iraq, before we move on to some other things, I did want to discuss a little bit the fact that the Iraqi Government this week announced that they support the creation of a formal timeline, a date certain at which the American involvement in Iraq would wind to a close.

And I think that that's a monumental moment in what we're facing in Iraq because we have, for years now, going on 6 years, been engaged in this conflict in Iraq. And the military men and women, the brave service men and women who serve us over there throughout this conflict have done their job, they have done everything that has been asked of them. We could not ask any more from the men and women, they have done what they were called to do. And that's something that every American can see in the results on the ground. And now, thankfully, the Iraqi Government themselves have recognized that that is the case by announcing their intention to ask the United States for a formal date certain at which point we would wrap up our involvement.

□ 2100

So I find that to be good news. Moving forward, we need to go to the Iraqi Government and say, look, this is your country and we cannot continue to hold your hand and run your affairs for you. It's time for you to step up and administer your own government, administer the affairs of state, and take the reins of power. And I think that by the statements that we heard today, the Iraqi people and the politicians in Baghdad have seen the light on that issue, and I feel like we are moving towards resolution and agreement that it is time to wrap up our involvement in Iraq.

And I would yield to my friend from Ohio if he wants to continue on that, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate that. And it is time to wrap it up. And I think as we were home over the July 4th break and as we were meeting with our constituents and going to parades and getting out and about and reconnecting with our district, one of the issues we heard, obviously, is gas but also just the squeeze that families are feeling now. And one of the reasons we

need to get Iraq wrapped up and get our troops back home is because it is costing us \$12 billion a month in Iraq. And if we continue to go down this road with supplementals of \$180 billion and continuing to go down that road, those are investments that we can't make here in the United States.

And I think a lot of people would say, Mr. MEEK, that we have got to make investments back here in the United States of America so that we can build roads and bridges here in the United States as opposed to roads and bridges in Iraq. And that's one of the key issues here.

I know the gentleman from Connecticut wants to say a few words. But I think it's important for us to realize there is a direct connection between what we are doing in Iraq and what we are unable to do because of the budget.

One of the issues that we're talking about too is what has happened to our budget here in the United States. And just a few short years ago in 2000, January of 2001, we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus, and after President Bush got sworn in up until today, we have a \$3.2 trillion deficit. That's an \$8.8 trillion swing, and that is part of the reason we have a weak dollar, and that is part of the reason that oil is so expensive. So we've got to get our house in order here.

So we talk about the war in Iraq and about how we need to finish it and honor our troops and support our veterans and make sure we have health care and whatnot, but we have got to balance the budget here in the United States and make those investments here, put people to work here in the United States building roads, bridges, infrastructure, water lines, sewer lines, septic tanks, broadband.

I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank my friend from Ohio. And I think it's important to point out that a lot has changed here in the last 1½ years. I mean the numbers that you show are pretty startling, moving from about \$5.6 trillion on the plus side to now \$3.2 trillion in deficit. And the fact is that we got a mandate when the Democrats were elected to control this House and to control it by a slimmer margin in the Senate. We had a mandate to get our fiscal ship in order. The days of not paying for anything had to end for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the reason that you're talking about, the fact that the amount of money that we are borrowing from foreign banks has contributed to the devaluing of the dollar. And that means everything that we import into this country becomes more expensive, not the least of which are the millions of barrels of oil that come into this country.

So what do we do about it? Well, we did something. We passed a rule in this House that is a rule that most families and every business out there lives by every day. We said, listen, when legis-

lation comes before this House that spends money, we're not going to pass it unless in that legislation we account for how we're going to pay for it. When a piece of legislation that comes before this House wants to cut somebody's taxes, we're not going to pass it unless within that piece of legislation we account for how we're going to pay for that tax cut. And we call it the "pay-as-you-go" rule, which is how my family grew up, how most American families live their lives. They don't spend money that they don't have. And it's so ridiculously simple that it's mind blowing to a certain extent that it took a change in leadership in the this House to actually put that into practice, but it has changed things. We're starting to get that deficit that you talk about, Mr. RYAN, under control.

Now, it means that this Congress can't spend money as wildly as it did under the Republicans. It means that we have got to be a little bit more careful about whom we give tax cuts to and make sure that when we do it, we give it to the right people. But in the end it makes for a better policy and it starts to get that fiscal mess that you talk about under control.

And there are so many ripple effects of that good policy, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, that's not just about making sure that we don't pass along the costs of this deficit to our kids and our grandkids and their kids. This is also about restoring some balance of trade so that we are not basically asking the rest of the world to pay for our debts, and in the end, do something about the dollar that as much as anything else is responsible for the high prices we're paying at the pump, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, if you think about the amount of money that we have spent in Iraq, that we are going to go and fix the Middle East and make it different and the money that it costs, almost \$1 trillion that we have spent there already and the projection of \$3 trillion when you start talking about taking care of all the vets that are going to come back with traumatic brain injury, amputees. When you factor that cost in, Joe Stiglitz, the Nobel winning economist, says \$3 trillion it's going to cost.

And I think it's important for the American people to realize that if we had made different decisions early on in this decade that those billions and billions and billions of dollars could have been invested into alternative energy sources, could have been invested into loan guarantees for nuclear plants, could have been invested in coal to liquid or whatever. Pick your issue.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman. This is exactly what we need to talk about tonight. You have the chart there. The gentleman has the chart talking about turning a projected 10-year surplus—when President Bush put his hand on the Bible and took the oath of office, the projected surplus over the next 10 years was \$5.5 trillion.

Now we're in a presidential election year. Mr. MEEK referenced it earlier. Let's think back 8 years. Vice President Gore was running against then Governor Bush. What was the debate about? The debate was about what are we going to do with this enormous surplus? That was the whole thing. Remember Vice President Gore had his lockbox idea. Are we going to shore up Social Security? Are we going to pay down the debt? And with that \$5.6 trillion surplus, we could have nearly paid off the entire Federal debt by now, 8 years later. We would have it almost completely paid off. Instead, because of the decisions that have been made by this administration and previous Congresses, we have a \$10 trillion debt. So instead of having it paid off, it's at its highest level in history, nearly \$10 trillion.

We could have, as the gentleman suggests, invested in alternative energies and research and development on alternative sources of energy. We didn't do that. We could have done any number of things with a projected \$5.5 trillion surplus.

Well, instead, because of the economic policies of this administration, we have not had that \$5.5 trillion to the good; we've had \$3.5 trillion in debt. And I would suggest, and we have talked about this before, if you had said to any economist in America, no matter what their political persuasion, in the beginning of this administration, what would it take over the next 8 years for us to have a \$9 trillion swing in the projected surplus to the deficit that we would then encounter? What would it take? What type of economic policies would we have to put forward? Any economist you asked would have said, well, that's impossible. You can't possibly mismanage the economy to such an extent that that would be the result, a \$9 trillion swing. Well, unfortunately, this administration and the previous Congresses did the impossible, and we are faced with the situation that we are.

Now, pay-as-you-go budget scoring, as Mr. MURPHY talked about, is not the only answer, but it's definitely a step in the right direction. And it was President Bush's father, President George H. W. Bush, in 1990 that came to the agreement with Congress to put in place the pay-as-you-go budget scoring that led to the record surpluses of the 1990s following the all-time record deficits to that point of the 1980s.

So this Congress has taken a step to put our fiscal house in order. We can't dig ourselves out overnight. But all of this has led to the decrease in the value of the dollar. And the decrease in the value of the dollar, anyone would agree, is one of the major factors involved in the price of gas today, the price of petroleum in the worldwide market. And we're going to talk about that tonight.

I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much.

Florida is front and center in the solution on the Republican side of the whole oil crisis issue. And we started talking about deficit spending. We started talking about what is happening to the American family, and I think that it's very important.

I heard you, Mr. RYAN and Mr. ALTMIRE, say something earlier about the folks in Iraq taking the responsibility. They are now calling for a timeline. It's interesting that the administration is not calling for a timeline.

And I think it's important, Madam Speaker, when we look at \$8.5 billion a month, that's not anything to look away from. That's a lot of money. And I can tell you that there's a number of folks that would like to see that kind of money invested here in the United States.

Let me just mention one thing. The Speaker a few days ago wrote a letter to the President. Two months ago she asked for oil to be taken out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve that we have here. This letter is, I believe, on speaker.gov, which is on Speaker NANCY PELOSI's Web site. It asks the President to dip into the oil reserves, that we have over 90 days of reserve that's in these oil reserves.

This has been done before. This is not what you may call a new idea. This is not a radical idea. It's been done by not only the first President Bush, his father, but also by President Clinton and by this President during Katrina.

I just want to take a couple of excerpts from this letter. It says: "Two months ago, after initially opposing our proposal to suspend the government's purchase of high-priced oil from the Strategic Oil Reserve, you signed the bipartisan legislation into law."

A couple of paragraphs down, it talks about the fact that oil was \$30 per barrel when his administration took office and now has hit \$150 per barrel. And I think it's important for us to look at the \$1.47 average when he came into office and the \$4.11 per gallon.

In 1990, 1991 Desert Shield, Desert Storm, when George H. W. Bush the first drew down from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve on January 17, 1991, it actually bought oil prices down per barrel \$8. In 2000, in the face of high energy prices, the oil prices, President Clinton signed an executive order authorizing a withdrawal of 30 million barrels that were released from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve that actually brought the price per barrel down from \$30.94 to \$20.38, which is a 37 percent decrease. And this is backed up by the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming of April 24, 2008.

Then we look at Hurricane Katrina. President Bush has done this before. Hurricane Katrina in 2005, because the Gulf States were hit, the administration offered 30 million gallons from the Strategic Oil Reserve that actually brought down the price per barrel by \$5.

Why do I mention what has happened in the past, which should happen here in the present? The real issue is it's 97 percent full at this particular time, well beyond the International Energy Program as it relates to the 90-day reserve stock that should be there. When the President makes a decision, in 13 days, you will see oil prices go down. Why is this important, Madam Speaker and Members? This is very important because the American people are having to make a choice. If they're going to drive to work or they're going to drive their children to school, especially in rural America and even in urban America, they are having to make those decisions.

□ 2115

There were families that had to make the decision if they were going to see their family members or go to the family reunion this last July 4th, which is one of the most celebrated holidays in our country, which is our independence. They could not make that decision to drive because of the price of oil. We have companies that are laying off workers as we stand here today because of the issue of oil per barrel.

I talked to Chairman OBERSTAR. We took the opportunity to do it. Mr. RYAN and I were in a meeting today. Chairman OBERSTAR stated the following, the chairman of the Transportation Committee: A \$10 drop in the price per barrel of oil will result in a savings of \$420 million per year to Northwest Airlines. It also would mean a savings of \$840 million for United Airlines. It would also mean a savings of \$900 million per year for American Airlines.

What does that mean? That means that the American people will not be nickel-and-dimed as we are now as they travel throughout this country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to make the point that I was there with you, talking to the chairman of the Transportation Committee, and the point is it's not just airline fares, it's not just reducing from \$4 a gallon down because of the millions of gallons that we could just take out of the oil reserve that is just sitting here in our country, and there are several of them. Just take the oil out.

Everyone's talking about drilling. Take the oil out of where it is right now. Just turn the spigot on. Just turn that spigot on and let that oil flow.

My point is that when you do this, it's going to have an effect because the airline companies are laying people off, just today in Toledo, and all over the country.

So this is about making sure that we have jobs in the country. Airline pilots, machinists. The whole nine yards. So I wanted to put a little texture into that argument, a little context in that argument, support it even more to talk about jobs here in American.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, there's nothing wrong with texture or context.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield back.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, sir. I think it's important as we look at this, Madam Speaker, and we say small businesses are the backbone of our economy. I mean, we are just hearing about the big players here; the airlines, those that are publicly traded. What about the small business of 25 to 100 people? Do you think they are laying off people? They are laying off people because they can't afford it.

I am not a Member of Congress with a conspiracy theory, but I can't help but pay attention to this board here. So many Americans appreciate the fact when Saddam Hussein's statue was taken down and we are going to liberate the Iraqi people and all, but there are some other people who had some other interests and some other things in mind. A few companies are making record profit, just breaking records as it relates to profits.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch or back at the dining room table, folks are having to park their vehicles because they can no longer afford to be able to pay for the necessity of being able to use their own vehicle. I mean the cost of living in the United States has gone up in some households some \$200 to \$300.

What we do here, Mr. MURPHY, we are here to represent the American people. So we have to make sure that we do exactly just that.

Here's another chart. I had some of my friends come to the floor on the other side of the aisle saying, You know what we need to do? Great idea. Let's drill more. Let's make sure that we have more opportunities for oil companies to find the kind of energy that we need. That is that old school kind of Beta thinking, VHS thinking. Just the other day I was with my wife, looking around. We had to find something to turn it to DVD or whatever the case may be.

If you want to think in the old sense of things, you can. But here are the facts. Acres leased, and this is in the millions, 9.5 million acres that have been leased. When you look at the acres that are producing, 23.7. So what we have here is a full plate that the oil industry has to look for oil or whatever the case may be. They are not even taking advantage of the leases that have already been given. But, better yet, they want more.

Now, what the Speaker is talking about and the Democrats are talking about, let's go in, let's bring this price down. Let's let the oil cartels know that we mean business. And we also responded as it relates to legislation looking at alternative fuel.

The last point that I want to make and then I'm going to turn it over to my good friend here. Let's talk about what is happening out there.

If you're lucky enough to have a 2008 Pontiac Grand Prix, the cost to fill

that up is \$62.73. That is every time it ends up on E. The annual cost is \$2,927. If you're lucky enough to have a Honda Accord, the cost to fill that up is \$58.26. Annual cost, \$2,565. Not even talking about what you have to do as relates to preventive maintenance.

If you have an opportunity to have a 2008—all these numbers I am talking about here, like I said, Madam Speaker, we don't talk fiction, we don't embellish numbers, we don't leave any like gray area out there for folks to say, Well, maybe he might have meant that, or maybe the 30-Something, maybe they were making another point. We want to make sure that you're able to go on fuelconomy.gov and you can get these numbers that I am stating right here on the floor right now, right here.

If you're lucky enough to have a 2008 Chevy Impala, \$62.73; \$2,798. Chevy Suburban. Many small businesses use these vehicles. A 2008, \$124, and \$4,391 to fill it up per year. We are not even talking about preventive maintenance.

Ford Escape, \$60.88; \$2,927. You also have your Ford Escape Hybrid, which is \$55.35; \$2,096 that is being spent, plus you get your \$3,000 tax credit when you get this hybrid.

Let's just talk about what is happening in rural America, in many places in rural America, and small businesses. Ford F-10 pickup truck, \$113.83. That is to fill it up; \$4,391. It goes on and on with this Web site. This is based on the national average, which is \$4.10.

This is what is happening right now. They don't want to hear what the Republican side is talking about, Madam Speaker, as it relates to if we were to give more leases and we were to start drilling off the coast of Florida that we have never considered—well, we never really considered before. We wanted to do it, but we couldn't do it. But now folks are in a crisis now. Here's our solution.

Well, that is not a good solution because you have all of these leases that are out there. It's almost like the oil companies, back in 2001 when they had this great meeting in DICK CHENEY's office and started talking about how we are going to deal with energy policy, came up with this situation.

We have seen oil and the price of gas go from \$1-something to now \$4.10. It seems to work. The Bush administration is there. I think it's kind of like the last call for you know what to say that, Hey, let's get these leases while we can because we have Democrats here in the Congress that is talking about alternative fuel, that is talking about bringing the gas prices down now, not later, and have a real strategy as it relates to dealing with these oil cartels with penalties and allowing our regulation agencies here to regulate these folks from price gouging the American people.

Who's standing in the middle of the door? When they say stand in the schoolhouse door, who's standing

there? The administration is standing there, saying that it's not just and it's not fair.

I have got a problem with that. I don't think my constituents sent me here to Congress to sit idly by and watch this happen. I am so glad, my colleagues here, that we have acted on this. I am not so happy that the President has not acted on it. I am not so happy that there's not outrage as it relates to his inaction for not dealing with these issues.

So Members can come to the floor and start talking about fiction and carrying on and embellishing. I'm not saying that. I am just saying some folks can come and start painting big pictures with broad brush or whatever the case may be. But I think it's important that we bring these issues to the forefront.

I don't have a problem with the oil companies that are on this chart here. I am not upset with them. They are just taking advantage of the situation that they have. Use it or lose it. They are taking advantage of it. We are going to ride this thing as long as we can ride it. I tell you, the American people have a say, and come this November, there's going to be a different day.

Last point. I am just going to make a last point and have a seat. I am going to let my colleagues share a little bit with us.

I remember in the day when Mr. RYAN and I, some two Congresses ago, used to say, If we have the opportunity to lead, that we will lead in a way that the American people would like for us to lead, not as Democrats would like for us to lead, not as independents, or not as Republicans, but as the American people would like for us to lead; how future generations would like for us to lead as relates to dealing with global warming, as it relates to investing in the Midwest versus the Middle East so that we can create green jobs. To put the American people to work, not other folks to work. And we have responded to that call.

In politics, you don't see that. You don't see people. The Speaker said what we are going to do. We are doing it. The President is not doing it. The Vice President is not doing it. I can tell you right now, we need this paradigm shift to happen now.

We said that there will be Members of this House that will be watching us here on this floor at home, not because they are retired, not because they thought someone else needed a chance to lead, but because the American people no longer tolerate it. That actually happened.

So I think come this November, the American people are going to rise up and they are going to say, Listen, I did not send you to Washington, D.C. to represent the special interests and to represent big oil to make record profits. I sent to you Washington, D.C. to make life better for me and my children.

So I want to thank my colleagues here for allowing me to make that point. I know that we have some other things to share as relates to this subject, so I will yield to my good friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank you, Mr. MEEK. I appreciate the point.

You talked about record profits. Let's talk about some meat on the bones here. A 311 percent increase in profits for the oil industry from 2002 to 2007. It may just be a coincidence that that time about correlates with the moment that they started sitting in those secret meetings, Mr. MEEK, in Vice President CHENEY's office to negotiate this new energy policy into the Bush administration. But I don't think it's a coincidence.

I think you can directly correlate the moment at which the oil companies started seeing this 311 percent increase in profits begin with the moment at which they were let in the door to start writing America's energy policy. Because that is what happened.

We put two oil men in the White House, in President and the Vice President seat, and we got, as a result of it, the highest gas prices in the history of this Nation, a 300 percent increase in the profits to their friends in the oil industry, and families having to make decisions about whether they feed their kids or whether they fill up their gas tank to get to work the next day.

That is not coincidence. That is not chance. That is the result of putting two people in charge of this administration that made their fortune in the oil industry and who have friends that they have allowed into the room to write the very legislation that has led to the situation that we are in today. It's not just conjecture.

Let's take a look just in the last year and a half at what we have been doing here and who's been standing in the way. This is probably not readable to the Speaker and to our colleagues here, but can you get the picture here.

The Renewable Energy and Jobs Act that we passed just a few months ago, investing millions of dollars into renewable energy that would actually compete with the oil industry, would make us energy independent, as we talk about all the time. Veto threat in the President of the United States. The Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act that held OPEC and the oil companies accountable for price fixing; for getting together and trying to decide what the price of oil should be. The President once again threatens to veto it.

Commonsense legislation. Repealing the subsidies, the tax subsidies that that energy bill that the oil industry wrote, repealing those tax subsidies and instead, this just seems like common sense, turning those subsidies that the Republicans and the President were giving to the oil industry, instead give them to consumers and small businesses and people who want to invest in things and energy technology in

their homes to get them off of oil. Another veto threat from the President.

Cracking down on price gouging. Fifty-six Republicans joining us on that bill. Veto threat from the President. Again, a second bill, this time with 125 Republicans supporting the measure.

□ 2130

This measure was to go after the OPEC countries and oil cartels for price fixing. Another veto threat by the President. Over and over again.

This Congress in the last year-and-a-half has been doing what we were sent here to do, represent and stick up for all of those middle-class families out there that are getting it stuck to them at the pumps. The way we say that we can do that best is to go right at the people who are getting rich off of these exorbitant oil prices, those oil companies. And every time that we have done it, virtually every time we have done it, we have had a President standing in the way. It continues.

We just find out the other day, Mr. MEEK, that this administration has been helping the oil companies negotiate no-bid contracts to get their newly found oil out of the fields in Iraq.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Say it ain't so.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. It is so, Mr. MEEK. It is so. Because this is just going to go on and on and on. So long as we continue to have the same people in charge of the White House and the administration's energy policy, we are going to continue to see these record profits for the oil industry and see a neglect on behalf of the administration to come to this Congress and work with the Democrats who are trying to turn this whole thing around.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. RYAN, the real issue here is executive power, okay? We live in this democracy, but we have executive power as it relates to being able to deal with these issues. And I am so glad you are reading off the list of not only the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but congressional action on doing what we said we would do.

We had a plan, Six in 06. We have done all of that. We talked about the issue that is facing America, the American people, as it relates to energy costs. When I read off those airline issues, I am not talking about profits for those airlines. I am talking about the fact when you go to book a flight now, to even check a bag, you have to not only spend the money that you spent on booking the flight, but then now you have to pay sometimes \$15, \$30, \$100 per bag. The next thing you know, they are going to have a little card swipe on the restroom in the bathroom. I am not trying to sensationalize anything. That is just where we are now. A little bag of peanuts you used to get on the plane, folks are saying that is now \$5.50. You want something to drink?

So when you look at these issues, these are real issues. It is something,

Madam Speaker, we have to deal with. It is not only dealing with the American families, but it is also dealing with American business, the backbone, small business, the backbone of our economy. When we start dealing with our economy, we have to really look at these issues for what they are worth. I am hoping we can get more of our colleagues from the Republican side to join us.

Mr. RYAN, I know you have something to add to this.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important. Here is the history. Not just the short-term history, kind of what the gentleman from Connecticut Mr. MURPHY just went over, but that long history. We have been since we got in trying to push legislation on every single issue that is going to help middle-class families in the United States of America.

We raised the minimum wage for the first time since 1997. The new increase will go here in just a few more weeks. On July 24th there will be another minimum wage increase for those people earning the minimum wage. Some people have two minimum wage jobs, who will get another \$28 a week, which isn't a lot, but with high gas prices it is a lot more than what would have happened if the Democrats were not here.

If you look at the investments we made in biofuels already through the farm bill and the alternative energy that Mr. MURPHY already mentioned, some economists are saying this is keeping gas down 50 cents a gallon more now because of the biofuel blends that are coming in.

If you look at what just happened last week when you would take your kid or a student was going to try to take out a loan to go to school, and the interest rate was 6 percent instead of 6.8 percent, that is because the Democrats are in Congress and pushed that bill. That did not happen when the Republicans were in charge here.

Madam Speaker, we did that. Democrats did that. So when you are talking about who is on the side of the person going to the pump at \$4 gas, it is the Democrats. We are against the oil companies. We are against President Bush. And if you look at the last 8 years, who would you rather have fixing the problem? President Bush and Dick Cheney and the oil companies, or the Democrats, who increased the minimum wage, invested in alternative energy, and made the kind of commitments on student loans and education that we have made. There is a clear difference here.

And here is all the land that the oil companies have to drill on: 102 percent of Colorado, 130 percent of Kansas, twice the size of Illinois, 2½ times the State of Ohio. Go drill. Go drill now. You have the leases. You have picked out the land yourself. Go and drill it. But, no, you want to go up to ANWR and drill, a small little piece. All we are saying is you have the leases. We are talking about 20 years down the

line. Even if you started drilling here in ANWR or anywhere else, 20 years. Speaker PELOSI is saying, take it out of the oil reserve that we have right now, and the President is saying no.

So do you want to get oil into the market now, Madam Speaker, or not? It is pretty clear. There are people in our communities that are hurting, and we have a short-term plan and a medium plan and a long-range plan that is being fought tooth and nail by the oil companies.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. It is completely consistent though, because when the Bush administration came into office and they wanted an energy policy, they knew who to turn to, right? They went for answers to their friends in the oil industry. So, today, when people are hurting at the pumps and they are looking for answers, who does the Bush administration and who do the Republicans look to for answers? They ask their friends in the oil industry. And guess what their answer is? The way out of this is to give us access to the tiny little chunk of territory that we haven't gotten yet. It is going to take 20 years to get anything out of it, but our answer to your immediate problem is to give us access to territory that will get a tiny additional bit of oil in 20 years from now. And people bought it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And save 5 cents a gallon. This is about people that sent us down here to make mature, responsible decisions, not the issue de jour, what is going to rattle will public. We have got a responsibility.

We only have a couple of percent of the whole reserves in the world, and we consume 25 percent of the daily energy in the world. And for us to come here and say if we just drill, which we are saying, go ahead and drill. That is fine. Drill now. Here is all the places, 6 million acres you have. Go ahead and do what you have to do and make your money. But we are going in another direction, because we are not going to rely on imported oil from the Middle East to solve this problem. We are going to rely on the Midwest and the ingenuity in the country.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, as we close we are going to do this little lightning round here. We are going to yield back and move from there. So we will just kind of roll around in rotation.

Mr. ALTMIRE has been standing by here very patiently. It is very interesting. I guess it is just the Pittsburgh spirit.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman. I was going to comment on the fact that there is a slogan that you see rolling around these halls, and it is "drill here, drill now." You hear it everywhere we go, drill hear, drill now.

Well, how could we accomplish that goal? Because the Democrats want to drill here and they want to drill now. The way we drill here and the way we drill now is by using the 6 million acres that are already leased and permitted

and available for drilling. We need to be doing that now. They are ready to go.

Now, there is exploration that needs to take place, I understand that. But the territory that has not been leased and permitted is 10 years away before the first drop of oil comes out, and it is 20 years, 20 years, before it is fully on line at peak capacity. That is not drilling now. So I would suggest to those who want to pursue that policy, maybe they ought to change their slogan. Just to be more accurate, it should be "drill here, drill in 10 years or 20 years," because that is what they are talking about.

What we are talking about is using the land, the territory, the parts of the Outer Continental Shelf, 75 percent of which is leased and permitted, allowed to drill, and they are not drilling. The oil companies who have the land leased and ready to go on the Outer Continental Shelf are using a quarter of it, 25 percent.

So you will hear people say, well, there is no oil there. Well, that is factually incorrect. Eighty percent of the known oil in the Outer Continental Shelf is located in areas where the oil companies are already allowed to drill. It is already leased. It is already permitted. It is already ready to go. Go to it. Drill here, drill now. That is what we are talking about. Have at it. We want you to do that, big oil. Do it.

Now, if you want to talk about drilling here in 10 years and drilling here in 20 years, that is a different ball game, and we can have that discussion after they have used the land and territory already available.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One of the provisions for taking this right out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and pumping it into the market is it stays in the United States market. What they are drilling now, wherever they are drilling, doesn't necessarily mean the oil they are taking out is staying here in the United States, all of it. So there are a lot of issues here that we need to deal with.

But, Mr. MEEK, I just want to get nostalgic for 30 seconds with you, if I could, before we close up. I remember four or five years ago when the whole 30-Something Group started and we started on the issue of Social Security privatization accounts. Congressman MEEK and I started coming down here on that issue. Then-Minority Leader PELOSI asked us to come down here, and we got into the nuts and bolts of the privatization accounts. And it was 60-40 people in our generation were for it, until we got into the nuts and bolts.

We began to explain night in and night out on this floor, and throughout the country Members would go home and started to talk about Social Security privatization, putting this social insurance program in jeopardy, and we ended up killing the President's privatization account scheme that he was going to set up.

What I am saying to Members here is if we just continue to get the facts out

on this, that there is oil, 80 percent of the known reserves, the oil companies have the permits to drill it, we passed legislation that says use the permit or lose it so we can get people in there who want to drill, and we just keep talking about that, and what we are going to do with taking the oil that is already there in the reserve and put it into the market, there is no doubt that our plan in the short-term is better and we have already made the investments in the long term that I know will be better.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank you, Mr. RYAN. You referenced that short-term plan, and I think we would be remiss if we didn't talk a little bit about what is maybe our best tool between now and when this session wraps up to actually get some short-term relief to people. Because as much as we know the oil companies are a lot of the reason, the majority of the reason behind the problems that we face today, we have got to acknowledge where the price of a barrel of oil is set.

The price of a barrel of oil is not set in the boardroom of Exxon or Chevron or BP. It is not set at the gas station that you and I go to fill up at. It is set on this place called the commodities market, the other place that has done very, very well over the past several years, the traders on Wall Street who have been coming away with millions, if not billions, off of these increased prices that we see.

So if you really want some short-term relief, if you don't want to wait 10 years until you could get a drop of oil out of newly-leased territory, then let's actually go and pass some legislation to affect the very place that the price of oil is being set, and that is on the commodities market.

We have seen an explosion of almost 20-fold in the amount of money that is being invested in the oil commodities market. And, guess what? Most of that money is being invested betting in only one direction, that the price goes up. And guess what else? When you bet that the price goes up, that is what it does. It goes up.

□ 2145

Money chases money. Long bets increase the price of a barrel of oil. So we have got some pretty simple solutions in front of us that we are going to be putting forward in front of this House in the next few weeks.

Let's limit the amount of people who can go onto Wall Street with the millions that they have made and force the price of gasoline, the price of a barrel of oil artificially beyond what it really costs. Because I do not believe that the price of a gallon of gas is really \$4.20. That is not what supply and demand would have it at. That is what the commodity traders on Wall Street would have us believe.

So if you really want to get short-term relief, then just as on the issues that we were talking about before, you have got to take on the oil industry,

you have got to take on Wall Street, you have got to take on the commodity traders.

And this place just I have seen it in the last few weeks, Mr. MEEK, has all of a sudden started to crawl with those lobbyists that represent the folks that are making all this money off of oil trading. They are going to try to shut this down. They are going to do their best to go to their friends here in Congress and in the administration and try to shut down our efforts to reform the commodity market.

And this isn't a simple thing to explain to our constituents, it is not a simple thing for people to explain to us. But if you really want to talk about what is responsible, what venue can be affected immediately in terms of bringing down this price, you have got to go after Wall Street, you have got to go after the place where we can get the most obvious and quickest price relief. And it is not going to be easy, because those folks there have just as many interests and lobbyists as do the oil companies here. But, Mr. MEEK, we didn't get sent here to represent the lobbyists, we didn't get sent here to represent the special interests. We took over this House, we took control of this House because we are supposed to stick up for the people who are paying those prices.

And we are all singing the same tune. In the long run, we have got to get off of oil. We have got to find something else to run this country on, Mr. MEEK, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. RYAN. But in the short run, let's go to the place where it counts and where it can be changed and affected the most, and that is the commodities market. And I hope that we are going to do something here. I hope that we are going to get some bipartisan consensus to be able to work on that solution in the next few weeks.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, I want to thank you for sharing with the Members how we can improve and how the administration can improve as it relates to policing what is going on right now.

We passed legislation putting teeth in the Federal Trade Commission to be able to go after these price gougers, to be able to find out where there is fat and waste. This Bush administration will not get the award for being able to stomp out waste and fat within the Federal Government. The executive branch means a lot to accountability as it relates to what we are trying to seek out here in Congress.

I want to thank you, Mr. MURPHY, and I want to thank Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. RYAN for coming down here, this 30-Something Working Group hour tonight.

Madam Speaker, we come to the floor to not only bring about bipartisanship, but also challenge our colleagues in being a part of the solution versus standing idly by and holding on to party loyalty or whatever the case may be. Because we did not talk about the kind of changes that you can believe in

or the kind of change if you give us the opportunity, or the Six in '06 plan on behalf of just Democrats, on behalf of Independents and Republicans, but on behalf of the American and those yet unborn. So we are batting pretty good as it relates to the accountability of what the people want and what is good for this country. And I can tell you, there is no greater honor, there is no greater honor than serving here in this Congress and being about the solution.

We can talk about solution and we can take action on solution here. But if we have an administration that is treating it as though it is the last day of school or the last days of school, and I don't necessarily have to respond; we have oil companies that have a plate of leases that are out like this high and putting pressure on the Congress and on other entities to say, hey, let's start drilling off the coast of Florida. Well, why? Well, we want to bring gas prices down. When? Oh, maybe 10 or 15 years. But we just want it. We know we have thousands and thousands upon thousands of leases that are yet undrilled upon, unresearched or what have you, but we want more. It sounds like the oil companies are saying: We want to keep this good thing going for us.

Well, the American people are now asking for a bailout as it relates to the price of gas at the pump. I am asking the Bush administration and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to be just as excited about helping bail out the American people as though they were and have been excited about bailing out industry, special interests when they get into trouble. Why doesn't somebody save Ms. Johnson or Ms. Cravis, or Mr. Jackson who has an F-10 pickup truck and running a small business. Let's help them.

So that is what we are trying to do here and that is what we are advocating here on the floor. It is going to take more than a willing House and a willing Senate to bring about the kind of change that will affect the bottom line of the American people that are facing these prices right now. We need the administration to be able to stand up on behalf of the American people. And, guess what, we can't wait until January for that to happen.

So we thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the members that came down to the floor tonight of the 30-Something Working Group. It is always an honor to address the House of Representatives.

We yield back the balance of our time.

HOLDING THE LINE ON DEBT AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House of the United States Congress.

I have sat here through the last hour and patiently listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and one of the things that comes out clearly is the tone of the message that they deliver.

I have heard this 30-Something Group now, I think I must be into about the sixth year of listening to this, and it seemed to me that at some point they would maybe get over their bitterness about President Bush winning an election in Florida twice, and all the recounts they could come up with still came up with the same result and they still carry the same resentment that the will of the people was reflected. And the bitterness that emerges in this discussion and the implications that come that challenge the motives of the President are disturbing to me, and particularly their remarks that have to do with allegations about: You put two Big Oil people in the White House, and this is what you get, is high oil prices. A lot of us that watch the policy will say we know better than that, Madam Speaker, and I know better than that for a lot of reasons.

As I look down through this, I am going to pick up the oil in just a moment, but I think where I would like to step in here first is to deal with the issue of the national debt. Now, some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle were clearly stating that they believe that they could have managed their way into not eliminating the national debt alone but providing for a surplus. They say: We could have paid off all the national debt if you would have just allowed us to be in charge. We would have made the right decisions.

So I listened to all that, and I tried to put myself, Madam Speaker, in a position of what it would be like for a person in a living room in someplace across the United States, or maybe someone who just pulled into the motel or the hotel and turned on their C-SPAN, turned on their television, they are surfing through there and came across C-SPAN or heard something like that, that the folks on that side of the aisle, if you would have been in charge, you would have paid off the national debt, which means if it is paid off, there must be a surplus. That is by simple, easy deduction and because the allegation is the folks that were in charge were irresponsible, supposedly.

So I thought, all right, what do I remember? What is real? What are some of the facts? And I can think in this 110th Congress, this Pelosi Congress, this Congress that is characterized by San Francisco values, Massachusetts values, and budget mismanagement, these are the things that come to mind on me. And some of them, it has been the Republican minority who has fought aggressively to protect the interests of the taxpayers. These are the things that I just wrote down off the top of my head, and it is by no means a complete list. It isn't even close:

Republicans held the line and saved the taxpayers \$40 billion on the State