

you have an opportunity to vote? They don't understand, they think that back in the fourth grade and the sixth grade when they learned about how Congress works, and they thought that votes just happen on the floor of the House whenever there was a bill that was introduced. Well, the challenge that we have is that the majority party, the Speaker, determines whether or not a bill gets a vote on floor of the House, and the Speaker will not allow a vote on this.

That's all we are asking. We are not asking to game the system, to tell us what the result is going to be. We will let every Member vote, all 435 Members, let them vote. That's all we are asking. Let's vote for the utilization of deep sea exploration for oil, on-shore exploration for oil, use of oil shale, clean coal technology, increasing refining capacity, increasing energy for Americans.

That's what we would like to see a vote on the floor of this House, and I know that's what the American people want to see. I am so pleased to be able to join my colleague from Georgia tonight and the leadership that he has shown on this issue.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend for that.

You are right. What the Republican message has been is all of the above. You know, we believe in conservation. We believe in renewable energy. We believe in wind and solar, but we also believe in the new technology that's environmentally safe that we can use to drill in these deep-water areas of the Outer Continental Shelf that we can use to get shale oil out of the ground in the western States, which this Congress, in May of 2007—and I don't have the chart up here with me tonight—but in May of 2007 is when the speculation market shot sky high on the price of oil because they saw that night in May when Mr. UDALL's amendment was passed that said we could no longer drill or mine for the shale oil in the western States where there are 2 trillion, 2 trillion with a T, barrels of oil.

It is off limits, and I want to say that H.R. 6, which was passed by this body, under a closed rule, which means there was no amendments, no amendments allowed whatsoever from the minority, that they passed it. We called it the no-energy bill. At the time it was passed, gas was about \$2.25 a gallon.

I want to read one comment that was made, this is on January 18 of 2007, H.R. 6. "It is sad to see the Republicans come to this. Now they are laughably saying that this will lead to higher prices." That was Mr. DEFazio from Oregon, and this was on the Democrat energy bill.

We said then that it will lead to higher gas prices, and we were right. What we are saying now is let's look at all the measures, all the measures. We heard my friend from Texas say, in a 2-year period they were getting natural gas out of the wells at the Dallas airport. This can happen, but in order to

happen, we have to get out of the fetal position. We have to get out of that political correctness mode and do what's right.

In order to do what's right, we need to have an open-rule bill come to this floor so all 435 Members of this body can have some input and all Americans can be represented in this body and it not just be a closed place. Let me say this, when the process is broken, the product is flawed.

This process is broken. We ask the majority—we ask the American people to help us create an open process so all views can be put out. Then all of the above that uses all the tools in our tool chest can be used to lower the price of gas and energy for the American people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENERGY PRODUCTION

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. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized this evening to address you here on the floor of the United States Representatives, the world's most deliberative body and the one that's supposed to be the most representative of people.

We are here tonight, a lot of Americans, yourself included and myself included, also, have heard from this group of gentlemen who have spent the last hour talking about energy. We are looking at gas prices that are \$4.08, \$4.10, \$4.11.

We are looking at gas prices by my data that shows that the gas was \$2.33 a gallon when Speaker PELOSI took the gavel here about the 3rd day in January of last year. We have watched gas go from \$2.33 to \$4.10 or \$4.11.

That chart that I saw earlier that showed the gas prices and what they were when the Republicans took control of Congress and how we held that increase in gas prices down, but when the Speaker of the House took the position that we were going to have lower gas prices and an effective energy policy, we are still waiting. We are still wondering what that was.

I do know that there has been a lot of noise from this side of the aisle about windfall profit taxes. I do know there has been a lot of noise about looking into the speculators on the hedge funds, on the futures markets. There has been a lot of noise about alleging that oil and gas-generating producing companies, are dishonestly or deceptively making unjust profits, that Exxon has made \$10 billion a quarter totaling \$40 billion a year. People on your side of the aisle seem to they think that we should go back and slap an after-the-fact tax on companies that are pouring energy into this marketplace.

I remember, one of the more senior United States senators making a public

statement here a couple of months ago, that 85 percent of the oil on our market actually comes from countries that are sovereign countries that have nationalized their oil industries. So the oil belongs to countries like Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Iran, countries where it's not private companies, but it's countries that own 85 percent of the oil that is imported into this country.

It's not the fault of Exxon, it's no fault of Chevron, it's not the fault of a lot of our good American companies that we have. It's a number of circumstances all put together, but the sovereign nations that have nationalized their oil industries, that are marketing it to us, have a lot bigger share of this. They can control and get together and do control, under OPEC, the supply of the oil. The demand is going to be in proportion to that that is necessary and in proportion to the price. Supply and demand is going to control the price of this oil.

Another component that is not discussed very much—and I don't know that it was mentioned in the previous hour—is our weak dollar. Our dollar has declined significantly in value, especially since about the 2003, 2004 era. The more the dollar declines, the more dollars it takes to buy oil from foreign countries. So if 85 percent of the oil that's available in this marketplace come from foreign countries, owned by foreign countries, and we have to send U.S. currency there in order to purchase that oil, and we get this imbalance of trade, this imbalance that is someplace in the neighborhood of \$700 billion a year—not all of it oil by any means—the weak dollar contributes to the cost of our gas.

I don't want the public to lose sight that the weak dollar contributes to the high cost of all of our commodities here in this country. For example, if you do the calculation on what it would take to dial the value of our dollar back to what it was to shore up the value of the dollar to those values of 2003, 2004 era, that's about 35 percent of the purchasing power that has drifted away as the value of dollar declines.

We bring it back to that level in proportion to the commodities that we are looking at today. We would see about 35 percent come out of the price of gasoline.

Let me just say off the top of my head, my calculus would be been this, that if you have \$4.10 gas and 35 percent of that is a weaker dollar, if we could shore up the value of the dollar, gas will get dialed back down to around maybe \$2.65 to \$2.70 in that area. I am for doing that, but in the meantime, while we are doing that, we also understand that the demand for fuel worldwide has gone up.

It stayed fairly flat here in the United States, hardly increased at all. But in China it has increased by a third, 32 percent increase in the demand for gasoline in China, for example.

It has gone up as well in India. We lose sight of the fact that the increase

in the imported gasoline for China, for this year, has gone up 2,000 percent this year if you annualize the numbers up to the last reporting date, which I think was maybe the end of May of this year. You set it up and annualize as running at a 2,000 percent increase in the amount of gas that the Chinese are importing. When they do that, that puts a lot of demand on our availability of gas to come into the United States.

We burn about 142 billions gallons of gasoline in this country. We produced last year about 9 billion gallons of ethanol to go in and supplement that overall gas consumption that we have. That has helped keep the price of gas down.

□ 2200

There has been a powerful argument. I should say it this way: It's an argument that has been made by powerful people, and it seems to be compelling to folks who aren't critical thinkers or who aren't willing to go back and gather some information themselves to analyze the situation. This argument is that using corn for ethanol has made food prices higher.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the world doesn't seem to have access to the balance of information. They go places like to the University of California-Berkeley or to Cornell University to get their information on ethanol. I would submit that, if you wanted to learn something about ethanol, if you wanted to learn something about corn-based ethanol, you ought to go to corn country where we actually make the stuff. We know a lot about it there. We've invested our capital in it for a number of years. We've come a long way, and we know a lot more about the cost of producing ethanol and what it takes to do that than does a scientist or a professor or someone with an agenda at the University of California-Berkeley.

It works like this: The study that was released by Berkeley and Cornell University made the statement that it takes more energy to produce ethanol than you get out of it. The gentleman from Maryland has been on the floor of this Congress a number of times to make his argument in agreement with them, and I consistently disagree.

I disagree for this reason, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the calculation of Berkeley and of Cornell University goes back and calculates all of the energy it takes, not just to raise the crop of corn—first, if it takes more energy to produce the ethanol than the energy you get out of it, you would think they'd be talking about how much energy it takes to convert corn into ethanol. They are not talking about how much energy it takes to convert corn into ethanol. When they say it takes more energy to produce ethanol than you get out of it, they're taking the energy that it takes to turn corn into ethanol and the energy it takes to go to the field to raise a crop of corn that gets converted into ethanol and the energy it takes to manufacture the trac-

tor and the combine and the planter and the disc and the cultivator if you use it and the sprayer and, I presume, the truck to haul it to town.

I read through this 62- or 63-page report that analyzed and that added up all of the components of the energy that's required to produce a gallon of ethanol. When you get to the point where they're hauling iron ore out of the mine in Hibbing, Minnesota—they didn't specifically say that, but this gets stretched out to those limits, Mr. Speaker—and when you think that your imagination has gone as far as it possibly can and when the scientists who claim that their study proves that it takes more energy to produce ethanol than you get out of it, then I see in their study that they charge 4,000 calories, which represent X number of Btus, for each farmworker per day, that being, presumably, a reasonable diet to keep the farmworker with enough energy to be able to go out there and raise that crop of corn, which gets converted into energy.

Now, when they go so far as to add up the calories that the farmworker eats, I think we ought to know what kind of a study this is. When they go so far as to add up the energy that it takes to mine the ore and to sail it across Lake Superior and to turn it into cast-iron and steel, enough to convert all of the energy that it takes to paint the tractor and to haul it out to the farm and the energy it takes to put in the tank, I think you know that we're going to make those tractors anyway and that we're going to farm those fields anyway.

We've done that for a long time, and no one has gone back and charged the energy and has gotten the energy you got for the food you ate or has charged that against what it took to manufacture the tractor or the farm machine or the truck that it took to haul the grain. That is not a balanced proposal.

In arguing that it takes more energy to produce ethanol because it takes energy to produce the tractor that goes to the field and that it takes energy to feed the farmworker, if that's the logic that we're using, Mr. Speaker, then I'll submit this: The same logic needs to apply to crude oil and to turning crude oil into gasoline in the fashion that we have for decades.

It works like this: If you're going to charge the energy that it takes to make the tractor against the corn we converted into ethanol, then you also have to calculate the energy that it takes to manufacture the drill rig, to power the drill rig. You've got to charge the roughnecks on that oil rig 4,000 calories a day just like you do the farmworkers.

By the way, we're defending a lot of oil fields around the world because we have to have that oil for our national interests, and so we've got to have also all of the energy that it takes to cast the iron that is used in the anchor for the battleship and for the carrier and for the Humvees and for the bulletproof

vests and for the M-16s, the F-4s and the F-16s and for all of the components that are necessary to keep our military in play in places in the world that are a long way from home.

By the way, if it takes 4,000 calories to pay a farmworker to sit on a tractor and ride in air conditioning through the field—and we've gotten to that technology, and I'm grateful for that—we ought to be able to provide at least 4,000 calories to the marine who has to go in and root out terrorists in Fallujah.

So, if you add all of that up, Mr. Speaker, I will submit that it takes a lot more energy to convert crude oil into gasoline than it does to convert corn into ethanol. Btu for Btu. That proposal, that approach, is not a logical one. It's not a rational approach. It is a specious and facetious report that seeks to undermine the credibility of ethanol.

So here is the real number. This is Argonne National Laboratory of Chicago. We'll start like this:

You have a barrel of crude oil sitting at the gates of the refinery in Texas, and you run that crude oil in, and you convert out of that a Btu of crude oil into gasoline—one British Thermal Unit. We'll be measuring our energy in Btus here tonight, Mr. Speaker.

When you take crude oil and convert it into energy and a Btu in the form of gasoline, that 1 Btu has already consumed 1.3 Btus just in converting the crude oil into gas. It takes a lot of energy to crack gas out of crude oil and to convert it into gasoline that we can use in our vehicles.

Now, with a barrel of crude oil at the refinery in Texas, to produce 1 Btu of energy, it has already consumed more than it is. It consumes 1.3 Btus for every Btu of energy in gasoline than it produces.

If you go to, let's just say, Iowa and you set a bushel of corn at the gates of the ethanol plant in Iowa and if you convert that corn into ethanol to get 1 Btu in the form of corn-based ethanol, it takes .67 Btus of energy. These are numbers that come from Argonne Lab in Chicago.

You can boil it down to this: It takes .67 Btus of energy to get 1 Btu out when you have corn at the ethanol plant, and it comes out in the form of ethanol. It takes 1.3 Btus to get gasoline out of crude oil, to get 1 Btu of gasoline out of crude oil. So equivalent: Btu to Btu, it takes just a shade less than twice as much energy to convert crude oil into gasoline as it does to convert corn into ethanol. That's the laboratory fact, and we're getting better at it. Perhaps the honest answer today is that it's all the way up 2 to 1—twice as much energy to convert crude oil into gas as it takes to convert corn into ethanol.

So the energy component of this is the false argument for those people who side with Berkeley and with Cornell University. They cannot sustain that kind of argument in the laboratory with corn matched up against

crude oil. They can only make the argument if they add this thing up all the way to the iron ore, and that is a false comparison, but if they're going to make a false comparison, they need to make a corresponding false comparison and add up the energy that it takes to make the battleship, the carrier, the F-16, and all of that that it takes to defend the oil fields that send oil to us.

Now, with that being part of the logic, part of the argument is also that which comes out of Wall Street and out of The Wall Street Journal and out of the New York Times. It's funny. You know, the further away you get from a cornfield and the further away you get from an ethanol plant, the further away they get from the truth. Here are the things that we know in the heart of the renewable fuels country.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that, as to the renewable fuels country that I represent, the western third of Iowa, 5, 6, 7 years ago, we didn't have a lot going on for a renewable fuels industry. Today in the 5th District of Iowa, in the western third of the State, when you add up the ethanol from corn and the biodiesel that comes from, let me say, animal fats and soybean oil mostly and when you add also to that the wind energy—those are all renewable energies—we produce more renewable energy than any other congressional district in America. We rank in ethanol production, in biodiesel production and in the wind generation of electricity. Those three items outstrip any other congressional district in America. So we know a little bit about renewable energy where I come from.

The concern, the argument, that comes from The Wall Street Journal and from the New York Times and from the east coast people who are as far away as you can get from the cornfields but who have no lack of self-confidence when it comes to this argument—and I'm happy to debate it with them, Mr. Speaker. In any form and at any time we can make this work, I'd happily stand up and take on all of the smartest people they can generate, but we're going to go back to facts when they debate with me.

It works like this: This corn that we've raised for years and years, this gift of the new world, actually, is hybrid corn that has been designed in the laboratories by good companies that help get us through droughts to increase the yield, having good seed corn companies that will go on record, that will say their design, their improved hybrids, will be increasing yields 3 to 4 percent per year as far out as one can predict.

When I was a kid, our corn was 80 bushel per acre. Now a pretty good crop is 200 bushel per acre. They think that we're going to see a 3 to 4 percent increase per year until corn goes to 300 bushel per acre. So think of that difference, Mr. Speaker. From the time I was a little guy, growing up, 80-bushel corn was an okay crop. 100 bushel corn

was a bin buster crop. We've gone past 200 bushel today and are looking on our way to 300 bushel per acre.

That's because we're getting a lot better at the things we're doing. We've got better hybrids to work with. We're placing our fertilizer more precisely. We've got better wheat control. We've got some GMOs. We have roundup-ready corn and roundup-ready soybeans. A lot of design and engineering has gone into these crops that has increased their yield and has provided for the genetic resistance to pests and also to the resistance of certain herbicides so that we can kill the weeds, so that we can grow the crops and so that we can do so in an environmentally friendly fashion. It's better for our water. It's better for our air. It just isn't so good for bugs, and it isn't so good for weeds.

We do those things with increased corn production and with increased soybean production in our part of the country. Yet we're faced with this argument that comes out of a long ways distance from the cornfield, which is Wall Street, which says, well, food versus fuel is really the argument, that we're taking food and we're converting it to fuel, and for that reason, food prices are going up.

Well, first of all, we have for millennia—for thousands and thousands of years—since the first real farmer planted a crop—and I'll suggest that that probably was a cavewoman and not a caveman. A caveman was likely out, doing hunting and gathering. A cavewoman must have recognized that some of those seeds that got dumped outside the cave predicted what was going to grow there. So she said why don't I just save some of these seeds and plant them in the ground. Then maybe I'll be able to actually put my own crop in.

When they started to do that, that was the beginning of agriculture, and from there on out, it has always been about food and fiber. From the beginning of production agriculture or of subsistence agriculture, it has been about food and fiber. You raised the food up out of the crops, and the fiber that came from that was used for rope, for clothing, for bedding, for things of that nature. So that has gone on for thousands of years. We raised crops for food. We raised crops for fiber. Of course, one of those fiber crops would be cotton.

Yet, today, we've taken it to another level. We've got food, fiber and fuel. The three F's of agriculture today are food, fiber and fuel. Food versus fuel is not the argument they would have you believe is coming out of Wall Street, and it works like this: For the 2007 crop, during that period of time, food inflated—appreciated in cost—by 4.9 percent. Energy prices went up 18 percent. As to the 4.9 percent of that food, much of the cost of the food's going up is the energy that it takes to deliver it and to process it. Inflation comes because we know that high energy costs go into everything that we have and

into every part of our economy. It takes energy to do everything. It takes energy to produce. It takes energy to deliver. It takes energy to process. So, as those costs go up, so does the cost of food go up 18 percent.

So the wizards of Wall Street say, well, food went up, so therefore, the cost of that is because, if we'd had those 3.2 billion bushels of corn into the food market, that would have been a lot of corn on somebody's plate to eat, and it would have kept the food prices down.

Well, the first thing is that's all field corn, and I don't know anybody who sits down to a plateful and loves it; although, if you catch it just right, you can eat it on the cob, and it's not so bad. After that, it's livestock feed, and yes, we process that corn into 300 different products or so. That's pretty specialized processing for some of the things. Corn oil, sweetener, things like that, and corn starch are some of the things we do. As to those forks and knives, if you put them in your coffee down in the Longworth cafeteria and they melt and go rubbery on you, I believe those are also made out of corn, they tell me, and we can do them better than that by the way. Those are some of the things we do with corn.

One of the things we don't do with corn is set an ear of field corn on one's plate and eat it. In fact, you don't make cornflakes out of it, and you don't make corn chips out of it.

□ 2215

Most of that corn is livestock feed. And it has a component in it that's starch, and it has a component in it that's oil and has a component in it that's protein. And the value of this corn as we break it down, it works out like this. Some of the oil has a high value to it, but poultry and hogs can't digest that higher oil product so well. Cattle seem to do okay. And yet the world has an over supply of starch, and it has a shortage of protein.

And so we take the corn, and we grind the corn up and process it into ethanol and we process the starch into ethanol, and we bring the protein back; and the protein comes back in the form of DDGs, or dried distillers grains is what that stands for, and we have wet mash in a number of different varieties and some high-protein varieties. We have a series of higher quality byproducts of ethanol production.

But to keep it simple, there is dried distillers grain. And the dried distillers grain is the protein. The starch has been converted into ethanol. Much of that starch would have passed through the animal and have been wasted had we fed it. But most of the protein is retained in the process. We feed it back to livestock.

And however pessimistic you want to be, Mr. Speaker, when you take a bushel of corn and convert it into three bushels of ethanol, or excuse me, three gallons of ethanol, that bushel of corn will have at least half of its value of

feed left over in the form of protein that goes back to livestock and the value of it is actually a little higher.

So a bushel of corn weighs about 56 pounds, and you can split that into thirds. About a third of it goes off in the starches that are converted into ethanol, about a third of it goes off in the form of CO₂, carbon dioxide—and a lot of that is wasted if you feed the corn anyway—and about a third of that is retained in dried distillers grain which goes back on the truck and back out to the feed lot and fed to livestock which converts it into protein that we can use, Mr. Speaker.

So if you go to an ethanol plant and stand there and watch what is happening, there will be trucks coming in that are dumping off corn. And they will come in and unload that corn; some of them will turn right back around, pull back underneath in the next bay and load themselves completely up with dried distillers grain and go out to the feed lot and dump that load off out there, and that goes out to feed cattle. We don't lose that grain in the fashion that Wall Street thinks we do.

So however you cut it, you have to add back in half, at least, and that's a conservative number, Mr. Speaker.

So here is how it works for the 2007 crop. Food prices went up 4.9 percent. Fuel prices went up 18 percent. They would have gone up more if we hadn't have put 9 billion gallons of ethanol on the market. So if the fuel prices had gone up, I believe they would have driven food prices up even higher. And to think that because we took corn off the market to make ethanol, that that deprives someone of a meal, it didn't happen. It didn't happen in a single instance in America or across the world for that matter, Mr. Speaker.

Additionally, last year, 2007, we raised more corn than ever before, 13.1 billion bushels of corn. That's a lot of corn, Mr. Speaker. And we export more corn than ever before, 2.5 billion bushels of corn. Not only do we export more than ever before, but we converted more into ethanol than ever before. We used 3.2 bushels of corn for that.

So if you have got your calculator out, and you are thinking how this works—and a lot of us can figure this in our head or do so with a pencil and a cardboard box—13.1 billion bushels of corn, minus 2.5 billion was exported, more than ever before I would remind you again, minus 3.2 billion bushels that went into ethanol production, and then but about half of that gets added back in because we didn't lose the feed value of all of that corn. So that's 1.6. Do a plus on 1.6 billion bushels of corn, that it goes back as a feed value. And now you should be at, Mr. Speaker, if you're wide awake and alert and paying attention, that you're at 9.0 billion bushels of corn available for the domestic consumption in the United States.

Now, what does that mean? Well, the answer, to put it in proportion, is that

if you average the rest of the years in the decade, the average bushels that were available for domestic consumption in the United States, and that's the same math I have done, total production minus export, minus conversion to ethanol, to get you to that number the average bushels that are available for domestic consumption in the United States, that comes out to be 7.4 billion bushels. That's an average year. That's an average year in the last decade and the most representative we have, Mr. Speaker. But we had available to the domestic supply 9.0 billion bushels.

So that's 1.6 billion bushels more than we normally have for domestic supply of corn. And that says to me that high corn prices in this country aren't solely attributable to ethanol, and it says to me that it isn't really a food-versus-fuel argument. It says to me there are other factors out there such as the increase in world demand of gasoline, diesel fuel, and other hydrocarbons that come from petroleum products. It also says to me the weak dollar has made a difference, that the Chinese and their demand has gone up by 32 percent, and the Indian demand has gone up dramatically, and the Chinese import has increased 2,000 percent this year.

We also should understand that there are countries in the world that subsidize the gas purchases, China being one of them. There are multiple countries in the world that subsidize gas for people. So they're buying the value of that gas down. If they can do that, because they hold a lot of dollars maybe, maybe their currency buys a lot, whatever is their motivation, we're not subsidizing gas here in the United States. We're taxing it. We're taxing gas in the United States for a number of reasons.

But in my State, the gas tax is over 20 cents a gallon. It's been that way for a long time. The Federal gas tax is 18.4 cents a gallon. And I look at this floor and the people on it and those who hold the gavels to chair the committees, and it's astonishing to the people in my part of the country that there wouldn't be enough pressure coming from your constituents to get you to finally crack and allow us to drill to get access to places like ANWR, the Outer Continental Shelf, the BLM lands in the United States.

Why does not that pressure come from your constituents, let us just say Mr. RANGEL in New York. Mr. RANGEL, why don't your constituents rise up and demand cheaper gas? I ask that question. And you can tell me, but let me try to answer, and I will be happy to yield to you if you like. But I think the answer is this. Your constituents ride the subway. Your subway is mass transit. Your mass transit is subsidized by the gas tax that my constituents pay. So when they're paying \$4.10 a gallon for tax, 20-some cents for state tax on that, 18.4 cents for Federal tax, 17 percent of the Federal gas tax dollar goes to subsidized mass transit which

subsidizes your subway riders, those people who are riding around in the subterranean tunnels in New York City. They get a cheap ride, my constituents pay the price.

My constituents are mad. They're tired of \$4.10 gas. Your constituents are riding on the backs of mine. That's why you're not hearing from them.

You can go right down here to South Capitol, Mr. Speaker, and climb on the Metro, and for \$1.25 you can get a ride out to Falls Church. But 17 percent of the gas tax dollar that's paid for by my constituents and the people that don't have a subway and don't of a Metro and don't have an L and don't have a San Francisco cable car, 17 percent of that, their money, their gas tax money, goes to subsidize the cable car in San Francisco, the subway in New York, the L in Chicago, and the Metro here in Washington, D.C.

That's why you're not hearing the pressure, Mr. RANGEL. I'm hearing it. I have been hearing it for a long time. I have been feeling the pressure when I write the checks. I don't have to wait for my constituents to tell me.

It's about time your constituents rose up and said, Let's solve this problem because the economy in the United States will ultimately collapse if we're going to be sending our money overseas and let them hold us hostage for the oil that they have. And yet the answer that the majority party has is don't drill now, don't drill anywhere, don't allow any of this energy to come up out from underneath our very feet.

The natural gas in this country is massive. I have many times come to the floor and said there are 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas out there, much of it on the Outer Continental Shelf, much of it we've not been not able to explore, and we don't know how much is there. But known reserves. I said 406 trillion cubic feet, and I saw a chart today that took us up to 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas still with massive areas uncharted, unknown. That's just the known reserves.

Natural gas is a big chunk of the energy that we burn in America, Mr. Speaker. And here is an example of the percentage.

This is our energy production. All of the different kinds of energy that we produce and consume here in the United States, there's the natural gas component. Now this is the 365-degree pie chart that's all the Btus, Mr. Speaker, that we use. It includes electricity, gasoline, diesel fuel, coal, all of the sources of British thermal units. And of the energy we produce in America, the natural gas component is right here, 27.46 percent, a big old chunk of the energy we use.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, JOHN PETERSON has come down here on this floor and repeatedly said natural gas is the mother's milk of manufacturing in America. It's the mother's milk of fertilizer. Ninety percent of the cost of producing nitrogen fertilizer, which is essential to grow everything, is right

here in the cost of natural gas. Yet because we refuse to develop our natural gas, prices have soared here in the United States and we've essentially lost our fertilizer industry; and they go to places like Trinidad, Tobago, where they have cheap, cheap natural gas. And that is driving the industry.

But also it allows for people like Hugo Chavez to hold us hostage. And a lot of that fertilizer comes from Russia.

But here in the United States, we've got the natural gas to do this, but the pressure on this natural gas is getting great because the Greens—and that means the “green people” that come up with some of these partial formulas; they can't think the whole thing through or refuse to, Mr. Speaker—but their idea is that the carbon, the greenhouse gas emissions, the carbon emissions from burning natural gas are less than they are from burning coal.

Here is our measure on coal: 32.54 percent of the energy produced in America is coal, 27.46 percent is natural gas.

So to give you a sense on how the Greens think, Mr. Speaker, it would be this: There is a coal-fired generating plant that provides the electricity for our Capitol complex here in the center of Washington D.C. Seems as though the Speaker of the House somehow has control or authority over how they manage that generating plant. I would think it would be the experts that do that, but obviously it's not. And I come to find out a month or so ago that the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, Democrat from San Francisco, San Francisco attitudes and ideas and ideals, issued some kind of an order that converted the power-generating plant that was fired by coal and operated effectively and efficiently, over to natural gas under the belief that there are fewer greenhouse gasses emitted by natural gas.

Now that may be true, but natural gas is a lot more expensive to generate electricity out of than coal.

So she converted from an economic-generating system to an uneconomic-generating system, and she tapped into the supply for my fertilizer. When you use natural gas to create, to produce more generating plants, you're taking that natural gas away from fertilizer. You're taking your natural gas away from manufacturing. You have tapped in to and you have siphoned off the mother's milk for the economy in this country to convert it to producing electricity.

The State of Florida—and I'm happy to see that a good number of the Florida delegation has decided that they think a little differently about drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf today. But a couple of years ago, the report I saw was that there were 33 generating plants planned for construction in Florida and that 28 of those 33 were to be natural gas fired; natural gas fired in a State that has all of that natural gas surrounding the Peninsula but is

not willing to allow us to go down and tap into that natural gas.

Some of them are changing their position because they understand the security of this country is tied up in energy and the cost of energy, and if we keep shipping our wealth out, it won't matter pretty soon. We will be unable to function as an economy and the rest of the world will catch up and sweep us up.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the natural gas here, which I think is an inappropriate use to be increasing the use of natural gas to generate electricity, instead, the Speaker converted the coal-fired plant here, which was at least economical, to a natural gas fired plant, and then insisted that the Capitol complex be carbon neutral.

□ 2230

And so in order to get carbon neutral, the idea is you're supposed to, if you can't get neutral on your own, then provide incentives so others can contribute. And so the order was to the management and administration of the Capitol complex here to go buy some carbon credits on the board of trade in Chicago.

Now, I've forgotten what they call these carbon credits. There's a certain trading mechanism there on the board in Chicago that will allow people to go in and buy and sell carbon credits. And so the taxpayers of the United States spent \$89,000 buying up some carbon credits on the board in Chicago.

Some of those carbon credits—the number would be about \$14,500—went to a coal-fired generating plant in Chillicothe, Iowa, and that coal-fired generating plant was to experiment with burning switchgrass to generate electricity, as opposed to burning coal. The idea is that, when you burn switchgrass, you use the plant to sequester the carbon, pulls the carbon dioxide out of the air, turns it into cellulose in the form of carbon. You harvest the switchgrass, haul it into the coal-fired generating plant, dump it into an incinerator, heat it up and use that heat to generate the steam that it takes to spin the turbine that generates the electricity. That's the deal with switchgrass.

Well, the \$14,500 check off that board apparently, according to the news at least, went to the plant in Chillicothe, Iowa, and they had already scrapped their plan to burn switchgrass. So it didn't change anybody's behavior in the positive, but it did help a little bit I suppose minimize the pain of experimenting with that.

\$14,500 of that \$89,000 also went to one of the Dakotas, and it's easy to mix them up, but I'm going to say I believe it was South Dakota. In any case, it was Farmers Union, and they distributed that money to no-till farmers. And the report is that they didn't change anybody's behavior, that some of them were to going to no-till farm anyway. Some of them had already no-till farming, but it helped out a little bit on the bottom line.

Now, this idea that we can trade carbon credits and not have any way to go back and audit and be able to measure, first, whether it changed anybody's behavior or whether you rewarded somebody for behavior that they had already adopted for some other reason, now I've got neighbors that are no-till farmers. About a third of the land around me is no-tilled. I wish it were more, and those that have been no-tilling for years are good leaders, and they will sequester some carbon in the soils, and I think that's a scientific fact, Mr. Speaker.

But it's also a fact that if they change their mind on no-till, and they want to go out and open that field up and farm it in a more conventional fashion, in a very short while, a few years at the maximum, all the carbon that's been sequestered is released into the atmosphere anyway. And so what was the point in paying them to sequester the carbon if you couldn't be sure that you could retain it there?

This has gotten pretty silly in America, Mr. Speaker. It's gotten so silly that when I pick up my chain saw and go out and trim the trees, we call that harvesting sequestered carbon where I live. And when I climb on the lawn mower and go out and cut the grass, we call that harvesting sequestered carbon. And so if I'm going to harvest that sequestered carbon, I wonder if I shouldn't get a credit for it here, and I would be willing to take that credit, if the Speaker would want to send me a check for it, and I'd contribute that back to the taxpayers that paid for it.

This is a silly, silly thing going on, and I can tell you that none of this thinking would have originated in the Midwest of the United States of America. It's got to come from the left coast and sometimes it comes from the east coast, but this is the kind of thinking that you run into in places like San Francisco and Berkeley and Boston. This is this kind of myopic thinking that can't think it through, can't get to the end, can't paint the picture of what America would look like if we gave them all their way.

So I'm not thrilled to see the direction that this is going, Mr. Speaker, but before I lose track, I want to make this point real well for everyone who is paying attention.

These are the components of our energy production. I call this is the energy pie, Mr. Speaker. Natural gas, 27.46 percent; coal, 32.54 percent. This is our nuclear, nuclear energy at 11.66 percent of the overall production. I wish that were a lot higher. Here's your hydroelectric power, 3.41 percent. Now, these tiny little slivers, things that we think actually matter and one day hopefully some of them grow so that they do, geothermal, little less than a half percent, .49 percent, not much; wind, .44 percent. Got a lot of that around me, and I'm happy that we have it. It's not a very big piece of our production pie, however. Solar power, .11 percent and can't even see that

there. It's just a line. Fuel from ethanol, .76 percent. As much as we produce, 9 billion gallons of ethanol is still only three-quarters of a percent of the overall production pie chart.

Biodiesel, .09 percent, tiny little sliver. Biomass growing, 4.12 percent. Some of that biomass is growing because we're palletizing waste and because we're palletizing wood products, for example. So we have people that have biomass furnaces. Well, I don't know how good that is from a greenhouse gas standpoint, Mr. Speaker, but biomass is a larger piece than one would think it is, 4.12 percent.

Motor gasoline, this is the gasoline that's produced in the United States of America. That's 8.29 percent of the overall production chart that we have.

Diesel fuel and heating oil together is the red piece, that's 4.2 percent. Kerosene and jet fuel together, 1.57 percent. You'd think that would be a little more, too.

And then the other petroleum products, that would be things like our real heavy oils like asphalt and products like that, that's 4.86 percent, a bigger piece than you might think.

This is what we produce, Mr. Speaker, in the form of energy, and now if it were also what we consumed, that would be a good picture. But here's a picture of what we consume, and the outside circle is the piece of our energy consumption. The inside circle is our energy production, Mr. Speaker. It's set up like this so that we can take a look at this and quickly see the difference between production and consumption.

The outside picture, the energy consumption, works out to be that, of all the energy we consume, natural gas is 23.3 percent of that. Coal is 22.4 percent. You can see that some of these things like coal we produce a big chunk of what we consume, in fact probably all of it. Nuclear, we produce what we consume, but it's 8.29 percent of the overall energy consumption. Compare it to the lower chart, where our production is 11.66 percent, and shows you just almost proportionally what happens when you go from the production chart to the consumption chart.

You can go all the way on around, and rather than pound that all in, the situation is this. We're producing 8.29 percent of the gasoline. 8.29 percent is the percentage of the overall production, but of our overall consumption, gas is 17.44 percent.

Bottom line works out to be this. Energy production, Mr. Speaker, is 72.1 quadrillion Btus of energy, 72.1. Now, quadrillion, that's 15 zeros behind there. It's a big number. But in proportion to this other number, we all understand it. We're consuming 101.4 quadrillion Btus.

The energy consumption pie is bigger than the energy production pie, Mr. Speaker, and that is the issue that we're dealing with, and we need to grow every one of these components. We need more domestically produced

natural gas. We need more petroleum so that we can produce more gasoline, more diesel fuel, more kerosene and jet fuel, more other petroleum products that we have, and we need to produce more coal, clean-burning coal. Coal's cheap, we have a lot of it, and nuclear, I mentioned.

The French and their electrical generation production, 78 percent is nuclear. Now, you can look across the world for all time and measure up the safest forms of energy of electrical production, and it's going to come down to nuclear is just about safer than anything else. We think that it's dangerous because of Chernobyl. We don't generate electricity with plants designed like Chernobyl. We do it the opposite. It is much, much safer in this country than it was there. Three Mile Island, turns out that it actually wasn't the kind of a situation that they had us thinking it was.

And so right now, electrical generation production on nuclear is the safest we can do. It's the most environmentally friendly that we can do, and there is no reason that we can't be in production, building more and more nuclear-generating plants. There is one that's under construction in South Carolina, and hopefully, they will be able to streamline the regulatory process.

But we've been tied up for more than a generation by people that are opposed to nuclear-generating plants. Even though they didn't have the science behind them, they still tied it up. They still filed lawsuits. They created movements, and these movements are movements that aren't based sometimes on fact but based on emotion.

And we've seen Europe do some things that we thought was pretty silly because it's tied up in emotion. One of those is to oppose genetically modified organisms, GMOs. So the corn and the beans that we produce here, the round-up ready I talked about, the beans going up and the weeds dying out, that's not a product that they want to take on over there. So their production has not kept up as ours has, but yet somehow they figured out that if they needed electricity and they need to be able to run their air conditioners and their heaters and turn on their lights and do all of those other things that electricity does, in order to do so they've had to generate their electricity with nuclear. They're ahead of us in that capacity. We need to grow the nuclear power here.

I would grow the hydroelectric power. In fact, I could find some places to store up some of that power and reservoirs that would protect some parts of Iowa from flooding in the future. And yet, we haven't built big dams in this country in a long time because environmentalists, Mr. Speaker, stand in the way. Environmentalists stand in the way of building more nuclear plants.

Environmentalists stand in the way of producing more coal-fired gener-

ating plants. Some people think we'll never build another new coal-fired generating plant because environmentalists stand in the way.

When it comes to natural gas, environmentalists stand in the way, not in the way of burning the gas but in the way of drilling for it and in the way of distributing it and laying out pipelines so we can get it collected. And you look around at kerosene jet fuel, other petroleum products, environmentalists stand in the way.

What are they willing to allow us to do? Well, take nuclear off the table, take coal off the table, take development of natural gas off the table. All these petroleum products here, they're all off the table. Motor gasoline is off the table. What's left? Biomass, and if they caught you burning wood in your furnace they would think that added too much to greenhouse gas, Mr. Speaker, so they would take your wood-burning fireplace off the table.

So what's left? Well, let's see, fuel from ethanol? Oh, no, that's food versus fuel, we can't do that. That goes off the table.

Solar, well, solar, .08 percent, maybe just maybe. It's a real thin line there. You can't even see the wedge. Maybe they'd let us put up some more solar panels. That makes me feel all warm and fuzzy, Mr. Speaker, if they'd let us do that.

Biodiesel, no, I know that's food versus fuel. Either soybean oil or animal fat, so somebody can eat or drink it or do something else with it.

Wind, oh, yeah, they'd let us build more wind. Of course, it takes a lot of energy to produce those generators, and maybe if we would let them use the same formula that they used to add up the energy that it takes to produce ethanol, it might turn out that it takes more energy for a wind charger than to get out of the wind.

□ 2245

But I don't think those folks at Berkeley and Cornell have actually dug into that to figure out how much energy that is at this point. So maybe, just maybe, we can tap a little energy from wind, a little energy from solar, and it looks to me like we're pretty much out, except for maybe geothermal, but, you know, it takes a little energy to produce that, too.

So if I just take the things that are off the table out of here and add up the consumption on those that may still be on the table, we have solar at .08, we have wind at .31, so that's .39 geothermal at .35, so you end up with .74—I think that will be the number—.74 of a percent. Not quite three-quarters of 1 percent of all of the energy that we consume in America is the only that would be acceptable to the environmentalists that stand in the way. .74 percent of our energy that we consume is not objectionable to them, Mr. Speaker.

And the number probably changes a little bit down here out of our production, but the point remains, it wouldn't

change more than—you get down to about 1 percent of the max. The point remains. These are people that think that our people can get along without energy.

Now, how can that be? What kind of a world would you be looking at? I mean, are these folks that live down next to the equator maybe? I remember Jimmy Carter sitting there saying, well, this Nation isn't going to be able to cut it anymore. Our future is minimized dramatically. We aren't going to be able to have gasoline to put in our cars. And we're going to have to be willing to accept a lower quality of life and a lower standard of living. But what you need to do if you're a patriot American is to buy yourself a cardigan sweater and put that on and button it up and sit in the chair and turn your thermostat down to 60. Now, that might work in Georgia—I don't actually think it works all the time in Georgia. It will work most of the time in southern Florida—maybe even all the time in southern Florida. It doesn't work much of the time in northern Iowa or Minnesota or Montana. It doesn't work most of the time in the northern half of the United States. But it worked for Jimmy Carter, put on a sweater, turn your thermostat down to 60.

So what's the future for this country if we can't find the will to expand all of these sources of energy as opposed to making a dinky little argument about less than 1 percent of the energy production we have as if somehow that's going to solve our problem.

And we saw T. Boone Pickens come on television in the last few days and say, "I've been an oil man all my life, but this is one problem we can't drill our way out of." Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be true, but this is one problem that we can't get out of without drilling either, and T. Boone Pickens needs to hear that.

Part of the solution is, develop the energy that we have, expand the size of this overall energy production pie. And let's be realistic. If you're only supporting three-quarters of 1 percent of the overall sources of energy that we have, what are you going to do with the people until you can get to the point where you can—you think you can really expand that three-quarters of 1 percent into 101.4 quadrillion Btus? Do the math on that. Do the math on that and tell me how you come back with that, you brainiacs that are believing that this country can get along without energy.

So what does energy do? It lights our homes; it heats our homes. It fuels our vehicles. It powers the cable car in San Francisco. It provides our manufacturing energy. It keeps the wheels of this economy moving. And without energy, turn out the lights, pull the keys out of the car, pull the keys out of the boat and the camper, lock up our factories, lock up our offices, go back, and you can't even light the candle because that would put greenhouse gases up

into the air and then you would have to buy a carbon credit from maybe somebody that's going to burn switch grass or do no-till farming in the Dakotas somewhere, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not going to be willing to accept the idea that we can't have a comprehensive energy plan. And I'm not going to be willing to accept the idea that the people that produce that energy are somehow capitalizing on the people here in the United States. It is supply and demand. I'm not going to be willing to accept the idea that there is a lot of margin in the futures markets and that somehow the traders have driven this up and it's an inflated price. Because when you buy in the futures, every time you go long somebody has to go short. That's the way it works, Mr. Speaker.

And last week we had witnesses before the Ag Committee that testified that they thought that a pretty respectable percentage of the high cost in gasoline comes from the people that are trading in the futures market—now, I'm not one of them. And we heard from Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland who said, when asked the question, how much margin is in there? He said, Well, I don't know. I don't know how much is there, but I know we've got to squeeze it out drop by drop. And you go to his left, and there was Ms. DELAURO, who I asked if she believed in the free enterprise system. And she convinced me that we have two different concepts of what the supply and demand is and the free market system is.

And then you move to her left and you have the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) who, breathtakingly, wrote in his written testimony and repeated it in his oral testimony that supply and demand doesn't affect the price of gold. If gold is a commodity, the value of it is a speculators' commodity, so it's no longer affected by supply and demand and that we don't use it industrially. So over the weekend I looked over there at that gold dome, that's the Iowa Capitol, and it looks to me like that's an industrial use. And I looked down at my wedding ring, and maybe that's a jewelry/commercial industrial use. This gold is not coming back on the market. Supply and demand affects the price of gold as much today as it did when Adam Smith wrote about the Spanish galleons going down to Central America and hauling back those galleons loads of gold. They dumped that on the market in Europe and the price of gold plummeted because they took the price of labor out of it by actually stealing it from the Central Americans, Native Americans.

Breathtakingly argued that supply and demand doesn't affect the price of gold, and that oil is now a commodity like gold and it's not affected by supply and demand either. I simply can't argue with that way of thinking, I'll just say that supply and demand affects the price of everything. It's our free market system. If it doesn't, then

it's government controlled, and then its volume will be rationed, Mr. Speaker.

And so of all the things we need to do, we need to grow the size of the energy pie, grow our production—this is our production—grow it out to the limits of our consumption, grow a little more if we can. Let's export a little energy and take some cash back. Let's shore up the dollar. Let's fix our balance of trade. Let's continue to close this deal; we've won the war in Iraq, and now let's finish the deal there. We've chased al Qaeda back through into Pakistan and Afghanistan. We're going to have to go there and mop it up, that's right. Casualties in Afghanistan have, of a matter, exceeded that of Iraq, and the troops in Afghanistan are far less than they are in Iraq. So proportionally it's more risky to serve in Afghanistan today than it is in Iraq.

Let's do all that. Let's seal the border. Let's end birthright citizenship. Let's shut off the jobs magnet. Let's get this country moving again. Let's improve the average annual productivity of our citizens, and let's improve their quality of life at the same time. And let's, Mr. Speaker, go back and anchor ourselves in those timeless values that are the pillars of American exceptionalism, they're in the Bill of Rights, they're in our history, they're in the Federalist Papers, and the central pillar is the rule of law.

We are a Nation that is the leader and the readout for western civilization. And one of our core values is we came from the Age of Reason in Greece, let's make sure we maintain our reason here. Let's make sure that we can maintain our ability to deductively reason, think our way through, and ask the American people to be critical thinkers. And let them be critical of us when they are logical, and let's respond to them with facts and logic, not political campaign rhetoric. Let's fix this energy problem and move forward together.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARROW (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for July 14, today, and until 12:30 p.m. on July 16.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 5 p.m.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 5 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 5 p.m. on account of an announcement of Volkswagen selecting Chattanooga, Tennessee for its new U.S. auto manufacturing plant bringing \$1 billion in investments and 2,000 jobs to the Tennessee Valley Corridor.