

The good Lord has given us the resources we need. Americans need to demand it of the Democratic leadership in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HALL of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELLER of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICAN ENERGY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I thank my colleagues on the Republican side and our leadership for giving me the opportunity to be on the floor tonight to talk to all of our colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, about one of the most pressing issues facing this country in a long, long time. And of course the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) just spent her 5-minute discussion talking about the very same thing. But we are blessed to have an hour worth of time tonight, as we have done on several nights for the last I would say 3 or 4 weeks talking about this one huge problem, Mr. Speaker.

And I have a number of my colleagues who have joined me tonight to help in this discussion of this energy crisis which is so important that the Nation is now facing. We have a Member who I will yield to subsequently who wants to talk about something very unique, a new bill, something that he has thought of that I think is very, very interesting, intriguing, and I want my colleagues to hear about that.

But let me start the hour, Mr. Speaker, by giving our colleagues a little quiz. This is not a pop quiz. Well, maybe in a way it is, but it is not a difficult pop quiz. In fact, it is the easiest type question, the kind I always enjoyed when in school, it is multiple choice. It is a multiple-choice question. So I want to ask the cameras to sort of hone in on this first slide that I have to my left. This is the question. It is simple. It is straightforward.

How do we bring down the price of oil?

Now I have listed about six possible answers. I could have listed eight or ten. Let's start with A, open up oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the Outer Continental Shelf.

Now that oil and natural gas has been closed to us, has been locked up since the mid-seventies when a moratorium was placed. Thank goodness President Bush just recently, in the last 2 weeks, lifted the executive order and now Congress certainly could pass a law and allow us to do that.

So, A, I am sure for many of our colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle, A, would be their choice as the best answer.

The second answer, B, build new oil refineries. Well, you mean we haven't? No. No, my colleagues, we have not built a new oil refinery in this country probably in 25 years. We have expanded a bit along the gulf coast where most of the refineries currently exist. And, of course, they are right in hurricane alley, and we know what happened during Hurricane Katrina when a lot of refineries were shut down and we had a real crisis because of that.

So darn right, B would be a good answer, build new oil refineries.

And C, commercially develop renewable energy resources. What do we mean by renewable energy resources? Well, I think the main two that come right to mind are wind and solar. Wind and solar. Wind and sun.

There are some parts of the energy where there is a lot of energy produced by wind and sun. The North Sea, the northern part of Germany, Hamburg; in the Netherlands. I have been to both of those countries and seen these huge turbines, wind farms, and some are out in the ocean. You can't see them, they are a long way from shore, but this constant wind source in the North Sea is a good source of renewable energy.

Solar panels, I would say, work real good in the equator in the temperate zones, but they may not work so well in certain parts of our country. But without question, C is a good response to how do we bring down the price of oil, commercially develop renewable energy resources. We are doing that. In fact, we have tax credits to incentivize that. I have recently supported a bill by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), to renew those tax credits for renewable to stimulate that industry. These tax credits expire, I think, in about a month, so it is very important that we do renew that.

Right now only 1 to 2 percent of the energy, the electricity in this country is generated from these renewable sources. It ought to be 6 to 8, maybe 10 percent; and hopefully eventually it will. So C is a pretty darn good answer.

The fourth choice, D, commission new nuclear power plants. Well, you know, some of our colleagues may say you mean we haven't? We don't? We have got over 100 nuclear power plants in this country, some in the southeast. The gentleman from Tennessee is with us tonight, and there are some in Tennessee. And there certainly are some in my home State of Georgia. I worked at a nuclear power plant in South Carolina when I was a co-op student at Georgia Tech. But we have not licensed, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has not licensed a nuclear plant in about 30 years.

The Three Mile Island scare, there was no loss of life, maybe that had something to do with it. But nuclear power today is safe. It is efficient. It is clean; and yes, it is expensive. And maybe that is part of the reason why we haven't gone nuclear in a more meaningful way. Right now I think probably 12 percent of our power in this country is generated by nuclear power.

But when you are paying \$140 a barrel for oil, petroleum products, all of a sudden nuclear power would be a bargain. And we have a couple of power plants in the State of Georgia. Plant Vogtle has two and is asking to bring online two more. We need to streamline that.

There are countries, France in particular, 85 percent of their electric power, their electricity, is generated by nuclear power. In fact, they even have to sell some of that to their

neighbor Germany who doesn't allow nuclear power.

The Scandinavian countries, Sweden, they have nuclear power generation almost exclusively, and they have a good way of getting rid of the nuclear waste, of burying it deep in bedrock. We have the same capability right here in the United States out in Nevada where we have spent billions of dollars developing Yucca Mountain, but yet politicians, very powerful politicians from the State of Nevada, I won't mention names, but they are blocking that.

So without question, D, commission new nuclear power plants, would be a darn good answer.

The next choice is E, promote conservation.

Now look, who could disagree with that answer? There are 85 million barrels of oil, petroleum, produced in this world every day; 85 million barrels. The United States of America utilizes 22 million barrels a day. We are about 5 percent of the world's population, and we are utilizing about 25 percent of the world production of crude oil. So there is something wrong with that math, no question about it. That calculus just doesn't add up. So we certainly need to conserve. We need to ride in high-occupancy vehicle lanes on our interstates. We need to probably, slowly but surely, go to smaller automobiles that are more fuel efficient.

□ 2130

We need to go to these fluorescent-type light bulbs. I mean there are so many things that we can do. Yes, we need to tighten our belt; so that answer is not a bad answer.

And I said that we could have put some other things in there. "Sue OPEC," I don't think that would be a very good answer, but I have heard people say that. "Sue OPEC and Venezuela" I have heard. And the Democratic majority, Mr. Speaker, has legislation and they want to say, well, we need to stop all the speculating and the hedging and unless you are actually taking possession of the oil, that contract, and you really are buying it for the oil company or for the airlines or for the Air Force, you shouldn't play in that market. I don't know if that's a problem. It may be a little small part of the problem. I could have added that as a possible answer.

But the last choice is choice F, and that choice is "all of the above." And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I think F is the right answer. And I believe that the 5,000 or so people that were chatting with me last night from Harris, Polk, and Carroll Counties of the 11th Congressional District in Georgia told me very clearly that that's the choice that they would take. And I believe that a fifth grade geography class would make the choice, that they would say just what the Republican minority has been saying to our brothers and sisters across the aisle for the last month or 6 weeks, that we need to do all of these things. There is not one

silver bullet. You can't solve this problem with the snap of your fingers and sue Big Oil and windfall profit taxes and releasing a few million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. You might affect the price for a few days, but it would go right back up. No, we need to look at this not only in the short term but in the long term. If we had done this back in the 1970s, we wouldn't be in this crisis that we are in today. But we went back to sleep is what we did. Shame on us for that, and doubly shame on us if we do it today.

People are suffering, Mr. Speaker. People are suffering severely. And we are about to leave this body. Ms. FOXX was talking about 9 days. Well, really we're talking about 4 or 5 legislative days and we are out of here for recess or vacation or whatever you want to call it. Every August, that's traditional. But in a situation like this, I tell you what, I would be proud to sit right here on this floor Friday and Saturday and Sunday waiting for this body to act and not adjourn until we get something done. Because if we are away from here for a month and nothing is done, when we come back, the kids are back in school, and you know how they're going to get there? They're going to walk or they're going to be riding their bicycles out on these busy highways because those yellow buses are not going to be on the road because these school systems are not going to be able to afford the diesel fuel to put in those buses.

So this is serious stuff, Mr. Speaker, and I think my colleagues understand that. I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand it. And what they don't understand and what my constituents don't understand is why the leadership, the people that bring the bills to the floor, those that have the control that say which bills are voted on and when, why they can't understand it.

Well, in this hour we will get into all of that, but I have got a couple of my colleagues on the floor with me, and I want to give them an opportunity because they have got some very interesting things to say. But I have got one more chart, Mr. Speaker, that I want to show before I yield to my colleagues.

This chart, and of course I have already given the answer away, the answer F, "all of the above." And, of course, it shows this big huge oil rig way out, 150 miles in the Gulf of Mexico. We ought to be doing that off the East Coast and off the West Coast, of course with the States' consent and with their ability to share in the revenue. And the Federal part of that revenue could be used to continue to push and promote alternative energy sources like that wind and solar we were talking about earlier, coal liquefaction, mining shale, doing a lot of things that will make us energy independent and will increase our domestic production.

And, of course, there are some other pictures on this slide as I refer back to

it. These are some of the wind farms. That's exactly what they look like in the Netherlands and in other places that I've seen them. This, of course, is a nuclear power plant.

The drilling in ANWR, I put that there just to point out what a small area it is, Mr. Speaker. The light green on the darker green is 2,000 acres in an area of 19 million, and 2,000 acres in an area of 19 million is like a postage stamp on a football field. And it's Coastal Plain, tundra, frozen most of the year. It's 70 miles from the Alaskan pipeline. It's 10 billion barrels of oil, and if you're pumping it, it's probably 1.5 million barrels a day. That increases our domestic production 15 to 20 percent, just that one site. So, obviously, we need to do all of these things if we are going to solve the problem.

And before I go any further, though, as I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, one of our Members had a very interesting thought. He wants to spend a little time discussing it and making sure our colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand it. He's a long-term Member. He knows about oil. He knows about energy. He's a great Texan. He is the ranking member of the Science Committee. I am proud at this time to yield to my good friend and colleague from Texas, the Honorable Ralph Hall.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Dr. GINGREY, I thank you very much.

I rise today to talk about a bill that I introduced just today, this very day. And, yes, Dr. GINGREY is, I think, the fourth cosponsor on the bill. I have 40 or 45, somewhere in that area. Only four have failed to cosponsor it. They simply want copies of it, and they will cosponsor it. I didn't ask one single member of the Democratic Party to endorse it or to cosponsor it because I want to give them time to look at it, to talk to their Speaker, to see what she thinks about it. I don't want to put them in a bad situation with their Speaker. I hope she is going to accept this bill because I think all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, want to solve the problem of high prices at the pump that are putting people out of business, that are costing jobs, that are causing airlines to fly full and losing money. And, yes, you have heard this before, a hundred and one times, that my bill's different. But this bill is different.

It's H.R. 6579. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about this bill just a little bit. It was just this day introduced toward affordable energy independence, and that's a word we have heard. Dr. GINGREY has been going over it here this evening. We hear it day in and day out. I hear it all the time when I go back to the Fourth District of Texas.

My bill is totally different from the multiple attempts to drill on ANWR. And just stay with me. I offer something different. I offer something that should appeal to anyone who believes in States' rights. This bill came to mind last week when I said to myself if we can't drill on ANWR, let's give it

back to those who can. So stay with me. This is a little bit different. It's called the New Resources for Domestic Consumption Act. It transfers the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, called ANWR, to the State of Alaska. Give it back to them for their environmentally responsible work and exploration and development of oil that's to be explicitly used for domestic purposes or consumption only. By that I mean none of this is going outside the United States, and that's embodied in this bill.

According to the United States Geological Survey, there is an estimated 10.4 billion barrels of oil in ANWR, which equates to 25 years of Middle East imports that we have to rely on today. This would be one of the largest oil fields ever developed in the United States. This is the answer now and not 10 years from now. You hear it said, oh, we can't drill on ANWR and people are against drilling on ANWR. Many environmentalists who don't want us to drill on pristine ANWR say, oh, it would be 10 years before you would get any energy from them. That's just not true. That's not true at all. Let me just talk a little bit about it.

In addition to producing much-needed oil under this bill, the Federal Government will receive much-needed royalties if we give it back to Alaska. I'm saying transfer this by deed, transfer it back to Alaska, and let them make their own decisions about ANWR.

We have not been able to get a bill through, and there have been many bills tried. None of them have reached the President's desk except one. It reached Bill Clinton's desk 10, 11, or 12 years ago. He vetoed it or we might have some \$2 gasoline today.

The Congressional Research Service has predicted that with oil at \$145 a barrel, ANWR's 10.4 billion barrels would deliver \$221.7 billion in corporate income taxes, not just wages, in corporate income taxes and royalty revenue to Uncle Sam.

So what's important about that? Well, I will tell you. This bill would mean more American dollars staying in the United States, not going to OPEC countries, and would result in more jobs for the entire country. A study from the National Defense Council Foundation says the figure could be as high as 1 million new jobs for Americans in all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

A principal argument against it, let me talk about that for a minute. A principal argument against using oil from the Coastal Plain of ANWR to help bring down gasoline prices is that "it will take 10 years to produce oil because it is on Federal Government land."

Well, the State of Alaska has a lot better track record than almost anyone else I know about. In 10 years America's largest oil field at Prudhoe Bay, adjacent to ANWR, was discovered and developed, in 10 years. And the building of the 800-mile Trans-Alas-

ka Pipeline that crosses two mountain ranges and many rivers was designed and constructed. The infrastructure is in place for expeditious and environmentally friendly development and production of oil, and the people of Alaska stand ready and willing to help, as they have helped in previous crises in American history.

The attack on Pearl Harbor spawned the construction of the Alaska Highway, a 1,522-mile-long highway stretch that was built in just 6 months in 1942. In the 1970s our Nation faced an energy crisis as a result of the Arab oil embargo, and in a close vote in the U.S. Senate, Congress finally approved construction of the Alaska Pipeline. Both times the people of Alaska stepped up to the plate on behalf of all Americans, and today we need their help once more. As a Texan in one of the producing States—ten States produce energy for this country and Texas is one of them—and as an American, I say let's not hold Alaskans hostage to congressional gridlock. Let's give it back to them.

Now, who's for giving it back to them? According to a Dittman Research Poll, more than 75 percent of the Alaskans support exploration and production, and these are people there on the ground in Alaska, on the Coastal Plain of ANWR.

As well, the Governor of Alaska, Sarah Palin, sent a letter to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid on June 23 of 2008, just several days ago, asking Congress to authorize development of oil and gas on the Coastal Plain of ANWR. More recently, Governor Palin issued this following statement:

"I strongly support environmentally responsible oil and gas development in the Coastal Plain of ANWR because production there would promote the economic and national security interests of the United States."

She would know better than anybody, and she would have more say over who produced there and how they produced it and how environmentally perfect they were because she's there. She lives there. This is where they are.

"The decision on how best to accomplish this objective rests with Congress," she says. "However," she says, "I would support any reasonable approach, even including the possibility of State ownership of the Coastal Plain, to facilitate production."

Governor Palin continued:

"The important thing is that Congress expeditiously authorize exploration and development in the most promising unexplored petroleum province in North America. If Congress elects to transfer the Coastal Plain of ANWR to the State, I promise, on an expedited basis, to initiate a program to explore and develop the petroleum resources located there—we have never had that promise before from anybody else—"subject to the safeguards," the safeguards that she is going to put in, "designed to protect and preserve the natural resources of

the Coastal Plain, including the fish and the wildlife."

Now, who else is for this? Don Young was the second person to cosponsor this. He's the Congressman for all of Alaska. The two Senators are for it. I don't think there is any question that they will protect their own State.

Mr. Speaker, since the 96th Congress, there have been 19 votes on the House floor that pertained to allowing drilling in ANWR.

□ 2145

19 times on this floor this body has said yes, we want to drill on ANWR. And all of those times, except one time, when President Clinton vetoed it, it failed in the other body.

Votes in the House of Representatives on energy development within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge are as follows, and these aren't all of them. I am just going to touch a few of them to let you know that we have been doing it a long, long time.

In 1979, in section 152, on a voice roll call, Udall-Anderson substitute for H.R. 39 adopted by the House, including provisions designating all of ANWR as a wilderness. H.R. 39 passed the House, 360-65.

Then on 11/12/1980 it was voice voted, a unanimous vote, Congress, of H.R. 39 passed the House.

In the 104th, in 1995, the House agreed 237-189, the conference report to H.R. 2491, reconciliation of a large bill that included the 1002 area development provisions. That is the ANWR development.

In 2001, the House passed the Sununu amendment to H.R. 4, to limit specified surface development of that same area in ANWR to a total of 2,000 acres, which we agreed, to which the Governor has indicated that all is the only amount she will take.

And yes, Dr. GINGREY told you a moment ago how really ridiculous it is to say that if you drill on 2,000 acres in 19 million acres, that that would ruin the beautiful pristine part of Alaska. That is outrageous. As he said, it is like putting a dollar bill in the end zone of Texas Stadium or in the Yankee baseball field, putting one in any part of the field and saying it ruins the whole baseball stadium or ruins the football field. It is just outrageous, it is not true, and it is almost silly.

In 2001, article 317, the House rejected the Markey-Johnson amendment to H.R. 4, to strike this 1002 area. That is the area we are wanting to develop. It was passed. They rejected Mr. MARKEY.

On 8/2 2002, H.R. 4, an omnibus energy bill, passed the House. Title V of Division F contained the 1002 area development provisions.

And again, in 2003, the House passed the Wilson amendment to H.R. 6, to limit certain features, but still to drill on the 1002 area.

Again, in 2003, again in November of 2003, the House passed a comprehensive energy bill.

And again, in 2005, the House adopted 218-214 the concurrent budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 95, which included

spending targets that would be difficult to achieve unless ANWR development legislation was passed.

In 2005 the House rejected, again, the Markey amendments to strike the ANWR provision in its omnibus energy bill, again, saying we need to drill in ANWR.

Again, in 2005, the House passed an omnibus energy bill, and in 2005, in section 669, the House adopted the conference report on the defense appropriations bill which would have allowed oil and gas leasing in ANWR.

I could go on and on, but on 8/4/2007, the House rejected a motion to recommit H.R. 3221 to the Energy and Committee with instructions to report back with language authorizing ANWR development.

And then 5/14/2008, the House rejected a motion to instruct conferees for S. Con. Res. 70 to adjust budget levels to assure increased revenues from opening ANWR to development. That is 19 times I think that has happened. Not one of these votes has led to us letting an overwhelming number of Alaskans do what we have been asking them to do. Let's give it back to them.

I understand and agree with the desire and the need to maintain pristine environments in our great and vast country. But it is impossible for opposition groups to mislead, and it is irresponsible for them to mislead the public into thinking that the Coastal Plain is the wild and scenic area they would like to point to in photographs.

Let me show you, here is the wild and scenic area. Let me just show you this for a moment. This is the area that they are talking about, and it all looks just exactly like that. The truth is the Coastal Plain is just exactly what it says; it is plain. There are no trees or snow-capped mountains with streams running through them. This is what the Coastal Plain looks like right here. That is what they are talking about wanting to save. How many of you have ever seen it?

I doubt if there is anybody within the sound of my voice or reaching here that have seen that, have even been up there to see it. I have never been there. I bet there haven't been 10 people out of this Congress have ever seen ANWR.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is 19.2 million acres. The Coastal Plain is 1.5 million acres of that. And point to poster 2, right here it is. This is the wilderness right here. This is the little area that they have set out to send back to Alaska, and this is the area that there are no trees or no snow-covered mountains with streams running through them. The Coastal Plain, allowing the Alaskans to drill responsibly on the Coastal Plain in not going to ruin ANWR, nor will it ruin the experience of the average of 1,200 visitors a year to the refuge.

So I would just say to you, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. This is a different bill. There has never been a bill like this involving ANWR. And it will allow them

to move through the legislative process and come to the House floor for a vote.

Actually, I tried to speak today to the Speaker. I have asked only Republicans to sign on to my bill. I have not asked a single Democrat to because I am not asking them to sign something that I think that their leader may object to.

I don't think she is going to object to it. Here is what I intend to do. I tried to see her today, but logically she had appointments. I went over and waited a while, but we were in session. I just missed her. She would have been courteous enough to give me a hearing if I could have waited for her. But I am going to talk to her again tomorrow. I want to impress upon her that this bill is different, that this is a different situation.

The President didn't set ANWR up for drilling when he encouraged us to do some drilling on some other areas. Neither of the aspirants for President have set up ANWR up.

Madam Speaker, you could be alone on this. You could be alone in giving back to the people of Alaska the right to protect themselves. They may not drill. You are not directing them to drill. You are authorizing them to drill.

I just hope very much that procrastination has cost Americans dearly at the gas pump. We can't afford to wait any longer. We have an emergency, we have a crisis, Americans need our help.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas. He did not disappoint. I think that his explanation was exactly what I anticipated.

And I want to, before I yield to my good friend and colleague from Tennessee, I wanted to point out, reference back to Representative HALL's poster in regard to the map. And he pointed out, of course, that this whole area, the refuge area, 9 million acres, refuge area, no development allowed. That is this orange area.

And then also, in the yellow area, wilderness area, another 8 million acres, no development allowed.

And then this Coastal Plain area on the very top, the north slope, that area was reserved by our own President Jimmy Carter, from my State of Georgia, who fully intended that, eventually, that oil exploration could be allowed in that area that Representative HALL was talking about, and not the whole area, but this small, I mean, it is about 1.5 million acres and we are talking about 2,000 acres. So clearly that was the intent, as he pointed out, back in 1980.

So I love this slide and I love his idea. I think it is intriguing.

And with that I want to yield now to my good friend from Chattanooga, the Honorable ZACH WAMP.

Mr. WAMP. Well, I thank Dr. GINGREY, and I thank Mr. HALL for his unique insight.

It is a privilege to come tonight. I think Mr. HALL is right. There are a lot

of people of good will in this body that really want to do something about this. As a matter of fact, the heat is on.

I had a Democratic colleague tell me recently that he was on an airplane and a guy came up to him and said bring down gas prices. And the guy was pretty upset, as we see often now at home. And the Democratic Member said, don't you think if we could do something quickly we would? And that really is the response that a lot of Members give.

And politics sometimes gets in the way of progress. But I have got to tell you that it is important the votes you cast, and it is important when you try to push a legislative initiative, and when things are vetoed and do not go forward, there are consequences. And we find ourselves in that mess today.

I don't come to the floor to blame anybody. Frankly, I come to the floor to offer solutions. And I think the blame game has got a lot of people really dissatisfied with the Congress to begin with. But these solutions really need to be debated and voted on. That is what we are really trying to press is for more legislative activity around new energy sources for Americans.

Now, for the last 8 years, I have had the privilege of co-chairing a large bipartisan group in the Congress called the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus. It is well over half the House. I know both these men, I think, are on the caucus. But it is about 60 percent Democratic Members, 40 percent Republican Members.

And I have to tell you, from our perspective, conservation is kind of job one. I say conservation is not for wimps; it is for warriors. Not everybody is going to put the uniform of our Armed Forces on, but everybody can help our country in a mighty way by increasing efficiency and conserving as they can. They can weatherize their home and save electricity. They can cut back, and they can go to a more efficient vehicle, and they can be smart about how they consume energy. And as we reduce demand prices will come down, and every American has a patriotic obligation to push for efficiencies and conservation, and that really ought to be job one. And we all need to say more about that because it is real.

The number one energy source over the last generation in this country, is conservation, if you just calculate all of the energy and how much we have saved since the 1970s when we conserve and create efficiencies. That is important.

Now, there is an irony here, and that is the Energy Policy Act that was signed into law almost 3 years ago this week, EPAct, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, was a Republican bill with a Republican Congress signed by a Republican president.

And everybody trashes the President and the Vice President for knowing a lot about the oil and gas industry. But the truth is, and I was there and wrote what was called the Energy Efficiency

Cornerstone Act with some industry groups for the renewable and energy efficiency organizations. That was rolled in. And if you were in the wind, solar, biomass, geothermal or renewable energy sector, you loved that bill, and you said, this is the best bill that has been signed into law for us in a long, long time.

But as Dr. GINGREY said, those tax credits to incentivize the investments in those new technologies have expired. Some of them may still be going on, but most of them have already expired. They were 2 years.

Now, if you are in the majority in the Congress today, you have a majority in the House and the Senate, and you believe in those things, why in the world have you not not only extended them for another 2 years, but extended them for 5 years or 10 years?

There is an article today that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is frustrated that he can't get the votes in the Senate to bring this up.

You talked about Congressman BARTLETT from Maryland. I am the original cosponsor with him of the extenders for these tax incentives for renewables and efficiencies without any tax increases. Just extend them. If you believe in them, extend them. Don't worry about the budget consequences because it will stimulate. And right now the cost of energy is so heavy we can't afford not to. As a matter of fact, we can't afford to do a lot of things now because of the cost of energy. We really can't afford any more time delays, any more recesses, as Dr. GINGREY says. And these investment tax credits are important.

The industry groups will tell you give us a 5-year investment tax credit and you will see major investments. If you really believe in those things, to the new majority, and I am not blaming, I am just saying, let's get on with it. Bring it up now. Time is of the essence.

The gentleman talked about nuclear. And yes, Yucca Mountain is out there, and yes, you can take the spent fuel from nuclear and you can bury it, but that is a long now protracted process that is involved in a legal dispute.

What does France do? Because they get 81 percent of their electricity from nuclear they reprocess the spent fuel. They are not as afraid of it as we are. Now, listen, the French have not been accused of being overly courageous here of late. Yet, here, they have more courage than we do. Actually they are smarter than we are on energy utilization. They go 81 percent nuclear, and they reprocess the spent fuel and turn most of it back into energy. And they have half as many nuclear reactors as we do. We are at about 105 reactors. They are at about 53 reactors. They have one reprocessing facility, therefore, we would need two. We have the technology to do it. I represent the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. We can demonstrate for the country right now, and TVA is prepared to show we

can reprocess the spent fuel and stand up nuclear.

And the gentleman is right. It is 8-12 percent right now, reactors on-line of our total electricity capacity. It needs to be at least ¼ nuclear.

□ 2200

Now they're going to come up, the Democrats, in a few minutes and talk about Boone Pickens. Okay. He's an oilman who now says 25 percent wind. Great. He shows us where they can be put. Great. What they're not going to tell you, as he also says, is go after all of the oil and gas capacity in this country that you can because we have to have new energy, okay? We can go in all of these renewable and efficiency areas, but it's still not enough given the demand. The demand is way up.

We've had a robust economy for 15 years in this country. I know it has sputtered of late, but because of that dynamic economy and because of the demand in India and in China and in other parts of the world, the demand exceeds the supply globally, and the price points are now unacceptable and unsustainable. We have got to have some new capacity as well. The Outer Continental Shelf, way out in the ocean where you cannot see it, should be a no-brainer for people if the State says "okay."

So that's what Senator MCCAIN has proposed is let the States decide. That's a good idea. If South Carolina wants to do it, let them do it. If Florida doesn't want to do it, don't let them do it, but get out of the way with the global moratorium.

The President released the executive moratorium on Outer Continental Shelf exploration. Now the Congress should do it. That's another thing that the Speaker ought to bring to the floor. Let's lift the moratorium. Things have changed.

When President Clinton vetoed ANWR in 1996, 70 percent of the American people thought that we should preserve all of that Alaska wilderness and not drill. Today, it's the other way around. Seventy percent of Americans say let's get on with it because we can't afford gas. We need help.

Senator OBAMA says it's going to be 7 years before you can pull any of it out. How much worse off are we going to be in 7 years if we don't get started now? We need all of the above.

Let me tell you that I know a lot of Democrats want to go ahead and start drilling. They want the votes, but they won't let us have the votes. Today, here at the Capitol, in Washington, there were dozens of protesters who were holding up signs, saying, "Do not drill. Protect our coastlines. Protect our wildlife area regions." I've got to tell you that they are now in the minority in this country. The American people don't want them up here protesting our going after American energy for American citizens. We have to do all of the above.

I just want to close on a couple of new technologies that have great po-

tential out of the Silicon Valley, which has, frankly, led the world now for a long time on things like information technology and which has really helped the U.S. economy and our exports.

There is a company called Bloom Energy, and they've developed a solid-oxide stationary fuel cell. It looks like the HVAC system in your home, and without a transmission system at all, it creates electricity. Now, it obviously has to have some feedstock going in, but it can run off a host of feedstocks. It can run off natural gas. It can run off of ethanol. It can run off of solar in some applications. This is a unique, new technology.

We're trying to demonstrate that solid-oxide stationary fuel cell here at the Capitol because all of these lights are on today as a result of a fossil-fired, dirty powerhouse here in Washington where we actually pollute in Washington about as bad as anywhere in the country. There's not much efficiency here. The lights stay on all the time. It's really ridiculous. The Democrats have a greening initiative for the Capitol, but it mostly involves light bulbs. We really need to get serious about it and take some of these buildings off that fossil powerhouse and move into solid-oxide stationary fuel cell-type technology.

Plug-in hybrids, we need them. Get them to the marketplace. Biodiesel, ethanol, new fuel mixes, get on with it. Wind technologies have tremendous potential in the Northern and Central United States.

As the gentleman from Georgia says, the right approach is everything. Don't pick winners and losers. Don't leave anything off the table. They did that in California with electricity, and the lights went out. You can't regulate yourself into a solution here. You can't tax your way into a solution here. We have to have a robust agenda, and it is time for Democrats and Republicans to come together and get this done.

I thank the gentleman for coming again tonight, for giving us the opportunity to talk about what the solutions are, and then let's get on with it. The American people are tired of waiting.

I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He is always very, very thoughtful, and his presentation is so clear. Hopefully, all of my colleagues can understand the message that we are presenting tonight. That is, really, as we go back, thinking about the initial little quiz, the little pop quiz, multiple choice, it's all of the above. It's all of the above. That is what Representative ZACH WAMP from Chattanooga, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee and who understands this issue, is explaining to our colleagues and to anybody else who might be listening tonight. This is important stuff, and it is critical. It is critical that we do something about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand—and this is awfully small, but

maybe the camera can focus in on it. This just shows you a number of bills that have been introduced by the Republican minority starting the week of June the 9th:

H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act of 2007: No action on that bill. We have a discharge petition. Almost every Republican has signed that discharge petition, but we need 218 of our colleagues. That means some of our Democrat colleagues need to sign these bills as well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, thank you. Of course.

The next bill, H.R. 2279, was introduced the week of June the 16th. This bill, the title of it, is Expand American Refining Capacity on Closed Military Installations. Mr. Speaker, as you know, there has been no action on that bill. Right over here to my right, at the desk, is a discharge petition. We've got Republican votes. We're awfully close, Mr. Speaker. We need 218, but so far, no action.

Basically, this bill just says in the BRAC process, where we have a number of closed military installations, we have that government land, and if that community wants to have a refinery placed there, then we can do it. It's a very simple bill. As I said at the outset, we desperately need to expand existing refineries and bring more online.

Now, in the week of June the 23rd, H.R. 5656: Repeal the Ban on Acquiring Alternative Fuels. It reduces the price of gasoline by allowing the Federal Government to procure advanced alternative fuels derived from diverse sources like oil shale, tar sands and coal-to-liquid technology.

I want to spend an extra amount of time, my colleagues and Mr. Speaker, discussing that particular bill because that was a provision—section 526, I believe—in the Democrats' energy bill of 2007. The energy bill, I think, is called the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Now, this section 526 basically says that no agency of the Federal Government can enter into a contract to purchase any nontraditional fuel if the result of processing that fuel or of burning that fuel is an increase of one scintilla—a scintilla, my colleagues, is a very small amount, indeed, a nanogram, an infinitesimal increase—in the carbon dioxide footprint.

So that means that domestic sources that are not traditional bubble-up petroleum that are easily obtained cannot be utilized, and that is a tragedy. That is a tragedy for this country when the Department of Defense, one agency of the Federal Government, is spending in the year 2008 an extra \$9 billion on fuel. Now, this is not the total amount they're spending. This is just the delta because of \$145 a barrel on petroleum and what it costs eventually to produce jet fuel.

Yet we have in this country, in the Rocky Mountain States, in three or four States out in the Rocky Mountain area, a product called shale. It's a rock, and it's embedded with petroleum, and it can be mined on the surface. People get concerned, I guess, sometimes about the environmental effects of mining, but if we didn't mine in this world, there would be no highways; there would be no aggregate to produce concrete and asphalt. Indeed, there would be no diamonds, no copper.

Mining shale has the potential in this country of producing 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum, 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it's a little more difficult to get it, and possibly, it does yield a scintilla increase in the carbon dioxide footprint, but when we're in a crisis like we are in today in this country and when people are suffering, I'll guarantee you the citizens of the 11th District of Georgia—of northwest Georgia in the nine counties that I represent—and probably my 434 colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle and their constituents will tell you the same thing:

We're worried about the carbon footprint; we want a clean environment, and we know that that's important to our future, and we're going to work toward that.

Guess what the number one priority is today. That is bringing down the price of gasoline because we can't eat and because we can't get our kids to school. We can't get to work. This is something that you would think, Mr. Speaker, the leadership of this body could clearly see when everybody else in this country can see it.

I could give you some statistics about polling. We all look at polls particularly in this big election year. According to a CNN poll, 73 percent of Americans favor more exploration of deep ocean energy resources far off of American shores. In a Reuters-Zogby poll just this past June, 75 percent of Americans support drilling for oil off the shores of the United States while 59 percent support drilling in ANWR.

We have heard this. This is an undeniable fact. I mean I know people can have their own opinions, but they cannot have their own facts. The fact is we're the only developed country in the world that has not taken advantage of exploring for oil and natural gas off of our Continental Shelf. It makes no sense. In fact, right now, Cuba and China are talking about exploring for oil and natural gas off of the coast of Cuba, 45 miles from our coast, and it's perfectly legal; they can do that. Yet we're sitting on our hands. It doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

Well, I've got a number of other bills, Mr. Speaker, that are sitting over there with those discharge petitions that are just waiting for a few Democratic signatures. I wonder of the conservative members, particularly of the Democratic Conference and of the Blue Dogs, where their signatures are. It's amazing to me that they don't go to

their leadership and say, "You know, you're killing us. We're on the verge of committing political suicide. We've got to do something."

If I cared only about the politics of it, I probably wouldn't say a word. I would let them continue this folly of their leadership and hope that the political consequences in November would be advantageous to my Republican Party, and we'd regain the majority, and we'd elect President McCain. I hope that happens.

What's more important right now is that we come together in a bipartisan way and that we do the right thing for the American people and then let the politics take care of themselves and let the chips fall where they may, and they will.

As we get toward the close of the hour, in the remaining few minutes, I want to talk about a bill that was introduced just yesterday by the leader of my party, by the minority leader, JOHN BOEHNER, the gentleman from Ohio. What Mr. BOEHNER did is he took all of these bills that our colleagues have introduced over the last 6 or 8 weeks, and he put them together into one bill, the American Energy Act.

□ 2215

We had a press conference today on the West steps of the Capitol, and Chairman BOEHNER, Leader BOEHNER, and our leadership and a number of Members who actually went up to—Mr. HALL said earlier he had not seen the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and wondered how many Members had. Just this past weekend, Leader BOEHNER and 10 freshman members of the Republican Conference went, and with their very own eyes, they saw this area.

They also went out to Golden, Colorado, to see where all the research that's being done on renewable fuel and coal-to-liquid. We have something like 1.5 trillion tons of coal in this country, and we use a lot of it, a lot of it to fire our electricity plants. But we could convert so much of that excess coal to petroleum, coal liquefaction, and we could do it in a clean and environmentally friendly way.

So Leader BOEHNER introduced the American Energy Act, and as I said earlier, remember the multiple choice question, an all-of-the-above approach to energy independence: increase the supply American made energy in environmentally friendly and sound ways; promote alternative and renewable energy technology; improve energy conservation and efficiency. That's the approach that Leader BOEHNER and the Republican minority is asking our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to get on board with us for the American people.

And under the bullet point of increasing the supply of American-made energy—we talked about it tonight—open the Outer Continental Shelf, provide an additional 3 million barrels of oil per day, as well as 76 trillion—yes, that's with a T—76 trillion cubic feet of natural gas; open the Arctic National

Wildlife Refuge, an additional 1.5 million barrels a day; and reduce bureaucratic red tape to construct new oil refineries; and increase the supply of gas at the pump, increase the supply of American-made energy; promote alternative and renewable energy technologies.

As I said, repeal that idiotic section 526 prohibition on government purchases of alternative energy and promote coal-to-liquid technology, shale mining, tar sand production. A lot of the oil that we get from Canada already comes from tar sand, but yet we can't get it right here in the United States of America. It's insanity.

Establish a renewable energy trust fund using the revenues generated by exploration in the OCS and ANWR. What Mr. HALL and Representative WAMP were both talking about is when these States share in the revenue, if they allow this drilling off of their coast, 25, 50, 100 miles out to sea, then the Federal Government also shares in royalties. That money could be spent on research and development for alternative fuels.

Permanently extend tax credits for alternative energy production: wind, solar, hydrogen, biomass. We talked about that earlier.

And eliminate, of course, barriers to the expansion of nuclear power production, which we also discussed.

And then the final chart, improve energy conservation and efficiency. There are a number of things on this chart. I could talk about them real quickly: provide tax incentives for businesses and families that purchase more fuel-efficient vehicles; provide a monetary prize for being the first to develop an economically feasible superfuel-efficient vehicle—JOHN MCCAIN is for that—provide tax incentives for businesses and homeowners who improve their energy efficiency.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity, as I say to be here tonight, to talk about these issues, has been a privilege. It indeed has been a privilege, and I want to say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that we Republicans care about the environment. We care about conservation. We want to reduce greenhouse gases for sure. Some of us believe that there's scientific evidence there that suggests that global warming is a real thing and it's caused by too much greenhouse gas production. But we can take care of that problem without breaking this country, if we do it in the right way.

Right now, first and foremost, it is time to lower the price of gasoline at the pump. We can do it by drilling here, drilling now, and saving money for the American people. We're sent here to represent them. We're not doing a very good job of it. No wonder our approval rating is 9 percent. That's shameful.

Let's stay here through the August recess. You know, if it's a week, if it's two weeks, whatever, let's get this job done for the American people.

AMERICAN ENERGY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the House and urge my colleagues to allow a vote on the American Energy Act, a bill that was filed today by many of my colleagues, a bill that I think is very important to bringing real solutions to this national energy crisis that our country's facing.

And if you look at what's happening across the country now, you look at the fact that gasoline is over \$4 a gallon; you look at the fact that people are starting to make decisions on whether or not they're even going to take a summer vacation; you look at the fact that this isn't only affecting people at the gasoline pump when they pay a price that's too high, a price that we should not have to afford for gasoline; but the fact that when you go to the grocery store now you're paying higher food costs because the trucking, the transportation of all of our food products are driving up the cost of food; the fact that when you go to a shopping center to buy clothes for children that are going to be going back to school, you're paying more money for those clothes; the fact that many small businesses are starting to have to lay off people or even make decisions on whether or not they're going to be able to make it because they can't pass on these cost increases, this is a crisis that's facing our entire country.

And what's really sad about it, Mr. Speaker, is that we have the ability to do something about it right here in our country. We have American solutions to this American crisis, and there is a long-term and a short-term solution to the problems we're dealing with. And that's why the American Energy Act that we filed today does not just deal with one side of the issue. It deals with all of the above. It deals with a very comprehensive approach to solving this problem that's addressing and facing our entire country.

And so what we're trying to do on the long-term solution is address the alternative fuels issue, to try to explore different methods of providing energy that it's going to take for people to do things that they do in their daily lives.

I was honored to go on the American energy tour, just got back Monday, where over the weekend Leader BOEHNER, as well as about 10 other Members of Congress went first to the National Renewable Energy Lab, and we went and looked at the future of the technologies that are being developed to try to create some alternative sources of energy. And there are some very good alternatives that we are trying to pursue, and in fact, in the American Energy Act that we filed, we support the continued development of these alternative sources of energy because that is our future.

But one of the other things we saw is that those technologies are not on the

ground today for consumers to buy. They're not things that are going to help our consumers, the people across this country, improve their way of life and address the problem of this high cost of gasoline that they're paying.

We looked at things like wind, like solar, like hydropower, like electric cars. You drive an electric car right now—and we test drove an electric car. The capacity on an electric car right now, with all the best technology, you can drive 60 miles, and at the end of those 60 miles, you will run out of electricity in the car. It will take you 6 hours to recharge that battery. Now, I sure hope that we continue to pursue this technology so that someday people can drive 300 miles on that electric car and maybe can recharge it in 15 minutes. But we're just not there today, and we're not going to be there for a few more years according to the experts. So we need to also address, in a comprehensive strategy, the short-term problem.

The short-term problem that's truly leading us to the \$4 a gallon price that we're dealing with, over \$135 a barrel gasoline, is a supply and demand issue. And on the supply and demand issue, you've got a global increase. It's not just American increases in demand; it's a global increase in demand. And yet the supply is flat. And any economist, anybody that's studied Economics 101 can tell you, if you have got demand going this way and supply staying flat, you're going to have an increase in price.

And that's what our country is facing right now, and what we're trying to do with the American Energy Act is say let's deal with the short-term problem as well.

And Mr. Speaker, all we're asking for is a vote, a straight up-or-down vote here on this House floor, on what is the most important issue to our country's economy right now, the issue that's affecting most people in our country.

One of the things we did is we went to Alaska on the American energy tour, and we talked to the people in Alaska. You know, I talked to the Governor of Alaska, and I said what do the people of Alaska think about exploring, opening up some of these moratoriums that Congress has, and exploring our own American energy to make our country more independent of Middle Eastern oil so we don't have to rely and be concerned about what OPEC's going to do. We can solve our own problem with American ingenuity, with American natural resources. And what she told me is about 80 percent of the people in Alaska want to explore for oil right there in Alaska because they understand that this can be done in an environmentally safe way.

And I think that's one of the points that many of the opponents of exploring American sources of energy don't get, the fact that the technologies have advanced so much over the last few decades that in my State in Louisiana, we have extensive drilling. Our State