

that the days of free-for-all feeding frenzy, unregulated financial markets in the United States are over. By extension, we will be setting an example for how business will be conducted around the world.

I thank you for being a wonderful Speaker pro tempore and for being there as we have our conversations during our CBC hour to open eyes and ears about the challenge that we will face this week. We will face it with all courage and dignity.

THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to control this hour. A lot has happened, not only this week, but in the last several weeks here in this great country of ours.

We have been talking a lot today about what's been happening on the financial markets, but we always have to worry about what's happening on the energy markets. As you know, we have all seen those commercials on television from T. Boone Pickens talking about that \$700 billion transfer of wealth out of this country in 1 year's time. When we are talking right now about what is happening in the financial markets, we are talking about maybe a bailout of \$700 billion.

Not only are those two numbers both very, very high, but they are also the same. We can't watch those American dollars flowing out of the country that should be staying right here. As we stand here today, we have about a \$9.6 trillion national debt, of which \$2.6 trillion of that is owned by foreign governments.

One of the things that I have been saying for a good long period of time is what happens when they start dictating to the United States. I think one of the most interesting stories that did not get a lot of play, but was on the front page of the Washington Times during the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac bailout, is that when the bailout was being worked out, the foreign banks out there, and creditors, had about \$1 trillion of Fannie and Freddie. They are secured, but we have a lot of American banks out there that didn't have that preferential treatment, and they are on pennies on the dollar.

But, again, as one of the things that was stated in that article, which I again found very, very interesting, it could be one of the first times since maybe the Revolutionary War when a foreign power is actually telling the United States what it is going to be doing. I think these are very, very tough times, but they are also times for action that we have to be doing in this country.

At this time, I would like to recognize the gentlelady from North Caro-

lina (Ms. FOXX) who has been a great advocate. I would like to yield to her at this time.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank you, Congressman, my colleague from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), for yielding time and for stepping in to lead this hour this evening, because we have many of our colleagues who are tied up in meetings right now dealing with the issues that we have been talking about.

I heard a little bit of the comments that were made by our colleague from New York (Ms. CLARKE) in the previous leadership hour. I have great respect and affection for her, but she made a couple of comments that I have a concern about that I thought it might be useful to make a couple of comments about. We will try to tie the issue of energy in with the issue of the financial situation that we are facing here in the same way.

She said a comment that we don't have enough regulations on the banks and that we need more regulations. I think that most Americans now understand that one of the major problems that we have in our country with jobs going overseas is the impact of too many government regulations.

We are, in many ways, regulating ourselves out of business in this country. We may have wrong regulations for banks and investment firms, may not have the right regulations for them, but I don't think it's that we don't have enough regulations for them. Again, in many ways, we have too many regulations.

I was interested in Congressman LATTA's comments about the fact that we had, we know, in talking about the energy issues, and our good friend T. Boone Pickens has done a lot to raise the awareness of the American people by talking about the fact that we transfer out of this country every year \$700 billion, the largest transfer of wealth ever in the history of any society. It is a bit ironic that the figure that has been shared with us, that is needed for this proposed bailout, various companies on Wall Street, is \$700 billion.

You know, it would be really simple if this Democratic Congress had paid attention to what Republicans have been saying for the last 20 months and, say, let us start developing more American-made energy. Let us stop transferring all of that money out of this country to foreign countries, many of which don't like us, many of which are doing everything they can to destroy us. Keep that money here and let us create jobs and wealth in this country. It would be a marvelous thing for us to be able to do.

The price of oil spiked up again today, the largest increase, I believe, in 1 day that's ever occurred. Well, we can have energy independence in this country. I am convinced of it, most people are convinced of it. Never before have we seen ourselves so dependent on other nations, and there is no reason for it.

What we have to do, though, is use the wonderful resources that the good Lord has given us in this country and use those to our advantage. Many of us have talked over and over again, in the last 2 months, particularly, about the opportunity to drill in ANWR, in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In fact, I don't think too many people have mentioned that when that refuge was set aside, there was specifically written into the bill that set it aside language that said part of that property would be used for drilling in the future.

□ 2030

That is simply being ignored by the Democratic majority in this House.

The other place that we need to be drilling is on the Outer Continental Shelf. Every other nation in the world that has oil and gas resources along their coastlines is tapping those resources for their benefit. We are the only Nation in the world where it is locked up.

Now next week the moratorium, the congressional moratorium will expire, and with that we have the opportunity to make that property available for leasing. It would result in huge amounts of money for this country, coming into this country. It is projected to be \$2.3 trillion.

Now I happen to believe that some of that should be shared with the States, but all of that money can come into this country and we would be able to change our balance of payments once we are able to use those resources and change the whole way we operate in this country.

In terms of the bill that is being worked on to be presented to us today or tomorrow, I have some grave concerns about the fact that people are saying there are no alternatives. There are lots of alternatives to simply writing a blank check to the Treasury Department. We could again be cutting the Federal budget. We could be doing lots of other things. We could arrange to bring in the private sector to help with this transition. I know many people think the situation is really dire, but part of our problem is that our colleagues who have preceded us in this Congress in the last several years, many of them have thought that the Federal Government should be doing everything, and we have gotten ourselves into a bind by trying to fund everything in the world out of Washington. If we would pay attention to the Constitution that we are sworn to uphold in this body, then we would narrow dramatically what our scope of practice is here.

Last week I spoke on the floor about a bill that we were dealing with that was funding education programs. As I have said on the floor many, many times, it doesn't say anywhere in the Constitution that funding education is a function of the Federal Government. So I believe that we could solve most of our financial crises, and I have to believe we probably are in a crisis right

now because that is what we have been told over and over again, but too many of the things that are brought up here are called crises and they are not, but I have to believe that if we would again pay attention to what the Constitution says and become fiscally responsible, we would not have to go into dire measures to deal with the problems when they come up.

And so I want to say, and much of what we are dealing with now has to do with prices having gone up and people not being able to pay their mortgages because the price of gasoline has doubled in the last 2 years. And my colleague said before we can't blame this on the Democratic Congress. I don't have a chart out here right now but I could get one in a hurry that shows that when the Democrats took control of Congress 20 months ago, the price of gasoline started going up, the unemployment rate started going up, the number of foreclosures started going up. It really is difficult to deny that those things are coincidental.

Now, I am a social scientist and I am very wary of declaring cause and effect, but the markers are simply too strong to deny the relationship of them. I think it is something that we need to continue to talk about because the bill that was passed last week by the Democrat majority did not respond to the situation that we are facing as far as energy is concerned. In fact, it did just the opposite. It made it even more difficult for us to deal with the high prices of energy in this country.

You don't have to take my word for it, the editorial pages of the major newspapers and non-major newspapers of this country agree with us. I will just quote from some of them because they have said what we have said here on the floor. We can be dismissed as being partisan, but most of these newspapers are not partisan newspapers. And, if anything, they are very liberal newspapers saying these things.

I am going to quote from the Waco Tribune editorial, September 22, 2008. It is entitled, "Energy Package Stalls Out: Hastily Passed House Bill Appears Dead in the Water."

"Which is why it was doubling disappointing to survey the energy bill passed by the U.S. House last week. Swiftly engineered by House Speaker NANCY PELOSI and Democratic allies, it's a limp-wristed approach to pressing energy problems. In seeking to appease everyone, it satisfies no one, offshore drilling enthusiasts and environmentalists included."

There is an editorial in the Buffalo News, September 22, 2008. "This way, Democrats can claim to be opening the way to offshore drilling . . . under the restrictions included in the bill, no real drilling is likely to happen."

An article from the Augusta Chronicle, an editorial, September 22, 2008. "This just in: Nothing. That's what this Congress came up with after months of high fuel costs and concern over our dependence on foreign oil, and

after a summer recess in which Senators and Representatives could have listened to the American people but did not. Congress came up with nothing—a fake energy exploration bill that would only weaken America. House Speaker NANCY PELOSI, who is devoting her career to blocking new energy for America, allowed a bill that would permit drilling for oil 100 miles offshore, which is prohibitive. Under the bill, coastal States could go 50 miles closer in—but have no incentive to, as the Democrats' bill doesn't share revenues with the States." The title is "They've Blown a Ruse; Congress Fails Yet Again."

This goes on and on with article after article saying why the bill that was passed was a sham and a joke.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD the remainder of these quotes from the newspapers from this week.

"If House Democrats were looking to give Americans relief at the gas pump in the energy legislation passed on Sept. 16, they failed. In a jarring twist, the legislation offers a solution and then negates it. If Americans were hoping for at least half a loaf from this legislation, they were disappointed." ("Energy Legislation Less Than Half a Loaf," Reading Eagle Editorial, September 20, 2008)

"Don't be fooled by House Democrats' disingenuous bill to lift the federal government's ban on offshore oil drilling. Rather than address a shortage of supply in the face of growing demand, the bill seeks to appease angry voters without harming the Democrats' mission to force America off fossil fuels * * * This isn't a bill intended to tap vast untapped reserves. It's a bill intended to give voters the impression that Democrats favor offshore drilling—while maintaining their opposition to it." ("Drilling for Political Advantage," Northwest Florida Daily News Editorial, September 20, 2008)

"Coming next week from Nancy Pelosi and the House Democrats: legislation that allows oil and gas drilling on the moon! The bill would have the same result as energy legislation passed Tuesday—no increase in domestic oil production—and it certainly wouldn't be any less cynical * * * The Democrats' intent here is so transparent it's embarrassing. Americans know the country needs to use all its resources to power the future and speed economic recovery. That includes offshore oil drilling—where the oil is." ("Let's Drill for Oil—Where There Isn't Any," Las Vegas Review Journal Editorial, September 19, 2008)

"Pelosi, who opposes new drilling for American oil, allowed the vote only because this summer Democrats were on the wrong side of offshore exploration, which seven in 10 Americans favor. Unfortunately, the House-passed bill is nothing more than a fig leaf for Democrats as they prepare to face frustrated voters in November." ("Same Old Drill: 'No-Energy' Bill Risks Voter Wrath," The Oklahoma Editorial, September 19, 2008)

"The sudden pro-drilling makeover of the Pelosi Democrats has always had an air—a gale, really—of election-year convenience, and the House proved it Tuesday by passing an energy bill that would put any bunko man to shame. This confidence trick won't expand domestic oil-and-gas supplies even a bit * * * As Congress runs down the clock for this term, the likelihood of reaching some grand pre-election energy bargain is vanishing fast. The House bill shows that the Pelosi Democrats simply aren't serious about expanding domestic energy supplies."

("Pelosi's Drilling Ruse," Wall Street Journal Editorial, September 19, 2008)

"Congress may as well close the windows, lock the doors and take a vacation. If the energy bill the House passed Tuesday night is any indication, the lower chamber is already out to lunch * * * The House this week finally responded, tweaking the drilling bans just enough to pass a bill that Republican leader John Boehner correctly calls 'a hoax.'" ("Energy Bill is a Dry Well," Bend Bulletin Editorial (OR), September 19, 2008)

"On Tuesday, House Democrats made an embarrassingly weak attempt to protect themselves * * * Therefore, House leaders produced a 'compromise bill' and quickly moved it to a vote. It passed along largely party lines, and Democratic incumbents in tight races can claim they voted for drilling. Voters should not fall for that old trick." ("Democrats Drill for Political Cover," Roanoke Times Editorial, September 18, 2008)

I want to say to my colleagues who are going to be here during this hour talking about this issue, we have many, many alternatives to giving a blank check to the Treasury. We have many, many alternatives to the bill that was passed last week by the Democrat House.

Republicans know that. Republicans have presented those in the American Energy Act which we have proposed. I want to say that I for one, and I believe my colleagues are pro-American energy, and we are waiting for our Democrat colleagues to leave their anti-American energy stance and join us in being pro-American energy.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her eloquence and steadfastness and willingness to roll up her sleeves to work for a solution on these problems that we have.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is such a strong voice on energy policy that we think this country ought to be pursuing.

I didn't hear the first few minutes of the hour, Mr. Speaker, but clearly we on this side of the aisle were most disappointed last week. We, as you know, spent a lot of time during the August recess, I think 134 of us, some several days, some one or two days, but came back from our break, if you will, to try to address the people who were here during August visiting the Nation's Capitol, the people's House. It was a most enjoyable time.

We talked to the American people. They came down and sat in these chairs that we occupy. They got to see where we voted. They weren't just up in the gallery. Because we were Members and we were not in session, we were permitted to bring, to escort people into the Chamber. And on many days the Chamber was almost full. It was almost like a day of voting on an important issue for us. I think they enjoyed it. Many of these people were Republicans, many were Democrats, some

probably Independents. We weren't overly political. We just tried to make the point that to solve this problem, we really do need a comprehensive approach.

Some may, and I have heard some on the Democrat side of the aisle say that we are Johnny one note. All we can talk about is drill, drill, drill. Drill, baby, drill. Drill here, drill now, and low prices. While that has been the cornerstone of the American Energy Act, the All-of-the-Above Act, it certainly isn't the only thing in that act. There are so many provisions, not the least of which is conservation, and to foster and pay for research and development for fuels, alternative energy sources such as the sun and the wind, to continue research and development on taking this abundant supply of coal that we have in this country, and everybody knows what coal looks like. When you mine it, it is in a solid form. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I read recently that in the United States of America there are 1.4 trillion tons of known coal resources and maybe twice that much. But if it is limited to 1.4 trillion tons, I think we burn, generating electricity mainly in this country, about 20 billion tons a year. So we may well have 150 years worth of coal to produce electricity.

So this research and development to take that coal, that rock that we all know, to convert it into gas, gasification, just methane gas, natural gas, or to liquefy it and basically turn it into petroleum and diesel fuel. So we have the capability of doing that.

We have something like 1.5 trillion barrels or at least 900 billion, but I think the closer estimate is 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum that is embedded in a rock, not coal, but in a way you can think of it as coal, in the Rocky Mountain States. There are three or four States, Colorado being one of them, and this rock can be mined just like coal or anything else, copper ore, anything that we mine, and we can extract that petroleum from this rock. You can almost think of a sponge that was fully soaked, saturated with water, and you just kind of squeeze out the water.

It is a little more complicated than that and it is going to take some more research and development, but the Democratic majority in their Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 put a provision in the bill that said you couldn't use that. That no agency of the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force which uses all of that jet fuel, they couldn't enter into a contract because the mining or production, burning of that alternative fuel would result in one little scintilla increase in carbon dioxide emission.

We hear, and I will yield back to my colleague in just a second, but I want to make this point. When this 110th Congress convened in January of 2007, the first witness we had in the Science Committee, and this was kind of un-

precedented, was none other than the Speaker of the House. We were thrilled. That was an honor. The Speaker of the House was going to be the one witness at the Science Committee talking about global warming.

And several weeks later our second witness was former Vice President Al Gore who had just gotten an Oscar for the documentary film "An Inconvenient Truth." I think was the name of it, again in regard to global warming.

□ 2045

Well, the price of gasoline at the pump at that time was maybe \$2.50 a gallon or a little less than that, \$2.33 a gallon. And it was clear that Madam Speaker's passion, and she said it later, and she said it recently, her passion was to save the Earth in regard to global warming and carbon capture and all of that. And of course Vice President Gore, the same thing. And I could understand their passion.

I didn't necessarily agree with all of the scientists, the U.N. committee that had those five different reports on global warming and what we should do about it, capping trade and whether or not these were just sort of natural cycles and phases of the sun. And you have little ice ages and warm ages and that sort of thing.

But even giving them the benefit of the doubt, and we are talking about some very bright scientists, that that is a priority maybe when gasoline is \$2, \$2.25 a gallon. But when it's \$4 a gallon, and crude oil, light sweet crude is \$140 a barrel, that cannot be the number one priority of this country, when we're on the verge of going bankrupt.

We literally, I really say, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my colleagues would agree with me, but I truly believe that what we're facing now in the financial markets, it all started with this dependency on foreign sources and being at the—they almost have a gun at our head in regard to this.

So the number one priority, at least from this side of the aisle, is to have a comprehensive energy plan, lower these prices and become totally independent. It doesn't mean that we will not continue to buy fossil fuel from foreign sources, but at least we wouldn't have to. And so that's why we're here tonight, to talk about that.

I want to thank my colleagues for letting me speak maybe a little longer than they had anticipated I would. But the gentlewoman from Minnesota is here tonight, Mrs. BACHMANN, and she's been here so much over the last 2 months talking about this issue, as has Congressman LATTA from Ohio. So at this point I yield back to my colleagues, and I thank you for letting me participate.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his eloquence also tonight and for all of his hard work on trying to get this energy issue resolved, because it really is the number 1 issue that's really facing so many Americans out there.

And I know that when I go home a lot, and I go home every weekend and

I put a lot of miles on the car, I know as well as you all do. When you're at the gas station you have a lot of people come up to you and ask you the same question, what are we going to do about this energy question.

And as we talk about it for a little bit, we talk about what we're doing down here and what we're trying to get accomplished, it's kind of interesting every so often because then some people ask you, well, how do you stand it, with all this? And I say, you know, it's not that bad. If you know what the problem is and we know what the solution is, we just have to get there. So I'm two-thirds of the way there, and I think that's the best way to go.

And as the gentleman was talking about, as where we are today and it's a real crisis, and I'd like to invite my good friend, the gentlelady from Minnesota, to the podium also to talk about not only energy but also some of the financial things going on in the country at this time.

But as has been pointed out, I know by the gentlelady from North Carolina, the big story today was that crude prices went up over \$30 a barrel in a 1-day jump. And suddenly, finally a record jump of \$16.37, and what that's spurred on by is by this financial problem that we have in this country. It's just not on the energy side, where we had all of these folks out there trying to find where's a safe haven to be right now. So they're looking at commodities for that currency hedge. And so you watch gold, silver, copper all posting strong gains today. But at the same time we saw oil that had been slowly but steadily going down, and trying to help the American people out there not have to spend so much at the pump.

And I know the gentlelady has been very, very concerned on this same issue. And at this time I'd just like to turn over to you for a little bit to chat a little bit about where we are on the financial side, and we can talk about the energy issue at the same time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you to Congressman BOB LATTA. Thank you so much for your leadership on this issue and also for the fact that you've been willing to take on interest group after interest group on this issue, because one thing that I have learned, being a freshman Member of Congress, is that there are interest groups who are speaking loud and clear, and they aren't speaking on behalf of the American people who need to get gas prices back down to \$2 a gallon or less, what they were just months ago. It wasn't that long ago that gas prices were \$2.32 cents a gallon. And I'm sure that our colleague from Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, remembers. When we took office in January of 2007, gas prices were \$2.32 a gallon. What are we being told now? That'll never happen again. We can never get gas prices back down to that level.

Well, we can't if the special interests that are now running this town stay in charge. They're exactly right. We never

can get it down. But we can get it down to \$2.32 a gallon if we do what the American people called us to do when we came here, because as Congressman LATTA knows, this is a congressionally created problem. This is not a problem of lack of energy resources in this country. This is not a problem of lack of technology for accessing these resources.

The problem is the United States Congress that has made it virtually illegal to access the answer to our problem that's contained right here underground, whether it's 27 percent of all the world's coal supplies, as I heard Congressman GINGREY state in his remarks, or whether it's the fact that we are the "Saudi Arabia of Oil" with three States, Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, that have more oil than all of Saudi Arabia contained in shale oil. Or whether the answer is in natural gas, which we have over 420 trillion cubic square feet in the Gulf Coast region, or whether it's wind or solar or conservation. We've got it all. And again, the United States Congress is the problem.

What's that led to?

That's led to the largest wealth transfer in American history. Over \$700 billion has gone out of our pockets directly overseas to people who don't like us to purchase energy. \$700 billion.

Isn't it interesting that what we are hearing right now in this financial crisis is that the American people are being asked to pony up \$700 billion to bail out private companies out of a financial mess that they've gotten themselves into. So just think about that for a moment.

Had we been drilling here in our own country, rather than going overseas to purchase foreign sources of energy, we would have had \$700 billion worth of American dollars staying here within our own borders.

Now, Congressman LATTA, I'm sure that you would agree with me that we would far prefer to see \$700 billion worth of investment stay in the United States, because that would mean \$700 billion worth of jobs that could have been created in the United States.

Mr. LATTA. You're absolutely right, because when you're talking about that \$700 billion, that translates into about 70 percent of all the oil that we use every day is imported in this country. And you're absolutely right, because when that price of oil keeps escalating up, then the question becomes what happened to the regular American person out there?

Well, the problem is this. That means a person or a family won't be able to buy a new car because they've got to worry about what oil prices are.

I have the largest washing machine plant in the world in my district. So that means of those 5 million washing machines, the problem then becomes, well, maybe people won't be able to buy washing machines.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. LATTA. Absolutely.

Mrs. BACHMANN. What that means is \$700 billion translates to one-sixth of the American economy. Eighteen percent of the American economy was transferred from your pocket at the pump overseas to people who don't like us very much. Now those countries are enriched with \$700 billion worth of American money that could have stayed here.

You mentioned that you had the largest washing machine plant in the United States. I have the largest window manufacturer in my district. Well, we all know what's happened with the mortgage industry and with the housing industry. Imagine the impact that that's made on this company in my district for manufacturing windows. This is tremendously important. This is real. This is real pain that the American people are feeling, and it is fueling this crisis that we're seeing, both on Main Street and on Wall Street.

I don't know about you, but I've gotten an earful when I'm home talking to my constituents, and they want to know that, they are incredulous that the Democrat-controlled Congress, because, again, Republicans have not controlled Congress for almost 2 years. The Democrats have controlled Congress.

And under Democrat control, in 2 years we have seen gas prices escalate 76 percent. That's right. Gas prices have escalated 76 percent, and we have seen the largest wealth transfer in American history go out of your pocket over to countries that don't like us very much.

How can we reverse that?

Congressman LATTA, what would be the solution that we can reverse that so that we could keep American money right here in the economy and start buying those American-made washing machines that are in your district and American-made windows that are in my district?

Mr. LATTA. You're absolutely right, because we need self-sufficiency on energy in this country; we keep the money in our own pockets. And you know, when it comes down to it, my district, I had the Corning International Manufacturers. You know, we have the ninth largest number of manufacturing jobs in the Fifth Congressional District in Ohio. That's a lot of jobs that are all dependent on one thing: energy.

You know, when I go into my plants, I try to go in plants every week when I'm home. If we're here Monday through Thursday, I'm usually somewhere on Friday. And the one thing that they'll do every time, they'll say, you know, what's driving us in cost here is the problem with energy. And a lot of times it's the oil. Well, it's the oil base that they have to have in their product that they make. It could be the energy that they have to consume to make that product. It could be higher electric costs. It could be, you know, you go right down the line of what it is.

And the problem that we have been having in this country is we haven't been taking care of ourselves. We have to have what we've been advocating on our side of the aisle is an all-of-the-above energy policy. And that policy, of course, is what we're talking about is having more nuclear, to have more clean coal technology, to go out and have oil, have natural gas, as you pointed out, and to have that solar, that wind, that hydrogen, that ethanol, the biodiesel.

But as our good friend from Georgia just mentioned a little bit ago when talking about coal, we have 24 percent of the world's known coal supplies in this country, and we're absolutely stymied at this time in not being allowed to get to that coal, because we could take that coal. I have an individual in my district that's invented a clean coal technology, and that's what we have to do. We have to utilize what we have here in this country so we don't transfer that wealth overseas.

You're absolutely right when you talk about that 420 trillion cubic feet of gas, 86 billion barrels offshore right now. You know, what has just been passed last week under the Democrat plan, we're not going to get to that oil. You want to know the reasons why? Well, first of all, a lot of that oil is within that 50 miles offshore, not 50 miles to 100. And the second thing is there's nothing in that bill talking about lawsuits and preventing those lawsuits from slowing these leases from being developed. Because if we can do that, we can start developing.

But it's about time that Americans take care of Americans because we're in a situation here, and you're absolutely right what you're talking about on the financial side, we're in a crisis stage here. We've watched all these dollars go overseas.

I talked a little bit earlier about what happened with that \$2.6 trillion of our national debt now being owned by foreign countries, \$1 trillion being owned when it came to Fannie and Freddie Mac by foreign creditors, that they're actually dictating to us now. They're at the table. They're bargaining, or maybe they're not even bargaining. They might be dictating. And we're in a situation that we have got to get something done in this country, and I'm sure that you are very well aware of it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And if the gentleman would yield on that point, I just wanted to mention regarding jobs once more. Both yourself and I, together with eight of our colleagues, went up to Alaska 2 months ago. And while we were up in Alaska looking at the ANWR region, which, by the way is the most perfect place on the planet to drill for oil, absolutely perfect place. It's perfectly sited. Without any environmental degradation, we could increase American energy supplies by over 50 percent if we would bring on line just oil production in ANWR alone.

But one thing we heard when we were up there from the people who were giving us tours, the Mineral Management Service, the Bureau of Land Management told us that just bringing on line oil production in Colorado and Alaska would add over 750,000 jobs.

□ 2100

Over 750,000, three-quarters of a million American jobs, and the jobs in Alaska, we were told, start out with an astounding starting-level salary of \$100,000 a year. Now, imagine that. How many Americans wouldn't be willing to go and work where they could be making \$100,000 a year? Rather than being one of the largest importers of energy, America could turn around our economy by being one of the largest exporters of energy and one of the largest job creators of energy.

One thing I wanted to add, if I could just take a moment to talk a little bit about the current economy and the current meltdown in the financial markets.

I have the privilege of sitting on the Financial Services Committee. And one thing that's important to remember, just as this energy crisis was created by the United States Congress because Congress made it illegal to access American energy and has put into law a Prohibition-era mentality on American-made energy production, so, too, Congress created this financial services mess. You ask how. Let me just briefly explain and just in a nutshell how this occurred.

Back in the 1930s, Congress created private companies to back mortgages. So when you go to buy a house from your bank, the bank doesn't keep that mortgage. The bank sells it to an organization called Freddie or Fannie. They're private companies. But the problem is, government implied, with a wink and a nod, that government would back up those mortgages from Freddie and Fannie. So these are private companies, but they can take any bloomin' risk they want because Uncle Sam said you're going to foot the bill in case those mortgages went sour.

Well, fast forward to the late 1970s. In 1977, the Credit Reinvestment Act was passed, and in the early 1990s, there were amendments made to the Credit Reinvestment Act. What did that do? It suspended, for the first time in American history, 200 years' worth of sound financial loan making.

So before when you and your wife, Congressman LATTA, if you went to get a loan to buy a house or my husband and I got a loan to buy a house, we had to show that we were credit-worthy risks. Under the Community Reinvestment Act, the banks were ordered under penalty of fine and lawsuit, "You don't make loans anymore to people who are creditworthy. Now you're forced to make loans to people who are not creditworthy." It turned the world upside down.

So the world of banking became like "Alice in Wonderland" where banking

rules were turned topsy-turvy on their heads and banks were fined or threatened with lawsuits if they did not make loans, a certain quota of loans to people who weren't creditworthy. Guess what? That's when a new product called subprime loans started to be made. And unfortunately, now we all know what subprime loans are. They were made to people who weren't creditworthy, who, in other words, had no means to pay those loans back.

So what is happening today? Today the markets have melted down, and now the American taxpayer is being told, you, Mr. Speaker, and the American people, are being told that they have to pay for what private companies agreed to in contracts. So the beleaguered taxpayer is the forgotten man in this equation.

The American taxpayer didn't ask to be a part of these subprime contracts. They didn't receive any of the benefits. They didn't receive any of the profits when profits were being made. But now that losses are on the horizon, now the American taxpayer is being asked—not asked, forced to pony up at minimum \$700 billion of new taxes; which, ironically, \$700 billion is the exact amount of money that you, in essence, Mr. Speaker, the American people, have been taxed by these artificially high prices of gasoline.

There is no reason why gas prices would be \$4 right now, no reason, if we would legalize American energy production. So had we been legalizing American energy production and we had prices low for the American people to pay, whether it's through heating oil or whether it's through natural gas that they pay or through electricity or at the pump, we wouldn't have been enriching all of these foreign countries. We would have had that much more money in our economy, and we may not have seen the meltdown because people would have had the wherewithal to pay their mortgages, to have high-paying jobs, and we may not have seen the subprime mess.

Mr. LATTA. Well, when you're talking about who's going to be footing this bill, the other things that scares me is this. The reports out right now is that China will become the number one manufacturing country in the world next year. The United States, after more than 100 years, is getting knocked off that hill as being number one.

So as we are in a situation where the taxpayers are being asked pretty much again to step up, foot these bills, who is going to pay it? Because the problem is the jobs.

When I'm out at these factories in my district, one of the things that I ask the folks that are running the companies is, "Out of curiosity, how far do your people drive in?" It's not uncommon in my district that the people are driving 50 miles one way to work.

Well, then you talk to the people out on the floor, and they're saying, "You know what? If I have to drive 500 miles

a week, with gas prices as they are, is it really worth it to me to actually have this job, or should I try to find a job some place closer to home?"

Then the manager of the companies then say, "If I lose these trained employees, where am I going to get the people to run this plant? I'm going to have to move it either across the country or out of the country."

It's almost like the dog is chasing its tail here. And we've got a real situation in this country where the people out there don't have the dollars in their pockets because they're paying more and more out.

We had that report not too long ago that said we used about 4½ percent less fuel and energy this past summer. That was almost like a good news/bad news. Good news is we have more fuel supply, but the bad news is we had companies not making product. We had people not going places. We have a lot of places in my area, the State of Ohio, especially along Lake Erie—which is a huge tourist destination area—and a lot of people said, "You know what? We can't take that summer vacation this year. We can't go there." So by them not doing that, they didn't help the local tourist trade in our area.

So it's a very tough situation. You know, when other countries are out there, they're exploring. As you pointed out as we were talking about oil shale that 2.1 trillion barrels, trillion barrels. And you're absolutely right; we are the Saudi Arabia when it comes to oil shale.

At the same time you have got the Chinese and the Indians and the French and a lot of other countries in the world right now are out there producing energy. And you have got China in the next 25 to 30 years, they're probably going to build 40 nuclear power plants. The Indians are going to be building another 25 to 30 in the next 25 years. You have the French. The French right now are at least 75 percent nuclear. They have enough power that they can export that power into Europe.

And here in this country we've got a situation where they're saying, "What are we going to do in the future? What have we done?" You know, the last nuclear power plant site in this country was 1977. Last one to go on line was in 1996. That's a crisis.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It's a crisis, and if the gentleman would yield.

It seems that our energy policy right now is being determined by bureaucracy and by socialistic tendencies, not by the free market. It's imperative that people have the ability to choose the energy needs that they have.

Here in the State of Minnesota, the people that I represent, they're all very soon going to be turning their thermostats up. Some homes are heated by natural gas, some by fuel oil. And we're going to be looking potentially at dramatic spikes in costs for people on their fuel oil and home energy heating.

People in Minnesota don't have a choice. They have to turn on their fuel.

As the gentleman had stated, people right now are making choices about whether or not they could even afford to go to work if they're travelling 50 miles to be able to get to work.

I represent people in the great city of Saint Cloud, Minnesota. I toured a nursing home recently. One thing I was told by the administrators was a lot of the people that they have doing some of the basic work in the nursing homes are making not a high level of income and they don't see also that it's worth it for them to go to work. This is not a good situation that they're being put in. And again, this is artificial because we don't need to be in this situation.

Again, it's because, unfortunately, the Democrat-controlled Congress has maintained a prohibition-era mentality with American energy production. They're just saying, "No way, no how." I don't understand that, Representative LATTA. I absolutely don't understand the mindset that says when you're sitting on your own solution, why in the world wouldn't you legalize and open the door to American energy production so we can create jobs and people can pay a lower cost, and so we aren't sending \$700 billion overseas.

Here is something I'm very concerned about, Representative LATTA. It is Sharia Law, because many of the Islamic nations are now wanting to do business under Sharia Law, Islamic law. This is happening now in the United Kingdom, and this is very concerning. All of the equity, all of the liquidity, the dollars that are available to do business now are in the hands of the people of the Middle East. It makes sense. We just sent them \$700 billion of American money—

Mr. LATTA. In one year.

Mrs. BACHMANN. In one year at the gas pump.

So just think about this now: \$700 billion has left American pockets, has gone overseas to the Middle East, to OPEC nations that don't like us very much, they're sitting on \$700 billion worth of capital. Guess what Americans are starved for right now? Capital. Money. We have to go somewhere. Our banks right now are starved for money. We're in a credit crunch right now. But Middle Eastern nations are saying, "Hey, you want to do business with us? You need to come under Sharia, Islamic law."

So now think of that. American companies would have to come under—not under American law, but under Sharia Law if they conduct business transactions, let alone the Chinese nation that is in the process of buying up United States' securities.

These are very sobering times for us in the United States Congress. We may make the most important decision and cast the most important vote of the 110th Congress this week. And that vote will be on how we handle this financial crisis. And would that the Democrat Congress last week had passed a real energy freedom bill so we could unlock American energy re-

sources and create wealth here in the United States rather than taxing the American people yet one more time so we can continue to send more money over to OPEC and tax more money from people to put in Washington, D.C.

You don't want to send more money to the United States Congress that has proved themselves completely incapable of handling the American people's money. The Democrat-led Congress has proved itself completely incompetent in handling the American people's money.

Mr. LATTA. You bring up a very interesting point when you're talking about what is happening, especially with the oil situation.

When we went up to ANWR, there were 11 of us from the House side that went up. And we saw that pipeline. We saw mile marker zero, that 800-mile pipeline. That pipeline, as you remember, was carrying 2.1 million barrels of oil a day down it. It's at 700,000 barrels today. The problem we're going to have is we're watching about a 15 percent reduction every year in that pipeline. And because the Prudhoe Bay area and the other areas, they're slowly starting to tap out.

When that pipeline gets down to 300,000 barrels a day, as you remember, probably the most telling problem that we're going to have up there is that pipeline can't flow any more. And it's just that they can't say we're just going to shut the pipeline off and we'll turn it back on in a few years. Once that oil stops, that pipeline is ruined.

So if we can't get that million extra barrels a day that could be coming from ANWR—and let's just talk about that ANWR area as you mentioned a little bit earlier.

It's the size of South Carolina, 19 million acres. Congress, in 1980, had set aside that section 1002 ground which was about 1.5 million acres. The area that we're looking—

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman will yield, it was 2,000 acres out of the 19 million.

Mr. LATTA. That's absolutely correct. And you're looking at that 1.5 million acres. The area that we're looking at is comprised of about 2,000 acres, which most of us from the farm country know that there's 640 acres in a section. So we're talking about 3½ sections of land, a little over 3½ square miles, probably. That's a pin drop up in Alaska.

And Alaskans, 80 percent, want those jobs. They want to make sure that they get that oil down here. They want to make sure there is natural gas. Right now, as you remember, what's happening with that natural gas? They can't bring it itself. There's no pipeline. So they're reinjecting it back in the ground.

□ 2115

When you're talking about your constituents out there wondering what they're going to do this winter about—I've got my constituents right now

that are only buying half a tank of propane because the problem is it is the same price as it was for a full tank last year.

So, the problem is, what happens when they run out of that half a tank of propane halfway through winter? It is a crisis, and we have got to address it, and if we are going to stop the flow of watching our dollars leave this country, if we want to make sure that we can have a future for our kids and that the people aren't living from hand-to-mouth and they start thinking about their future, that they can put things away for their own retirement, thinking about their kids' college education. And then to buy those things, the only thing we didn't talk about. Buying that new house, putting new windows in from that company that makes them up in your district.

So we've got a problem, and that problem's got to be solved now. We can't wait. We can't say we will pass this on to another Congress and pass this on to another generation, because we're going to be held responsible by every future generation as to what we do in this House Chamber in the next week.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, unfortunately, that's exactly what happened last week by the Democrat-controlled Congress. They kicked the can down the road to the next Congress, because the bill that they passed won't produce one new drop of oil or one new watt of electricity.

What was that whole exercise for? Did they not realize that for 21 months that gas prices have gone up 76 percent? This is shocking. This is the only thing my constituents have been talking about is the dramatic escalation in the price of energy. Everyone else seems to get it, but unfortunately, the Democrat-controlled Congress sat on its hands for 21 months, and just as the clock is striking midnight now on the 110th Congress, they pass a cruel hoax of a bill last week that won't go anywhere. It's dead on arrival in the Senate. The President will veto it. And here we are, looking at this huge crisis. And what do the American people have to look forward to? A reduction in energy prices? Not on your life.

Today, there was a dramatic increase in the price of oil. Why? Because international investors in oil commodities see, hey, the Democrat-controlled Congress, they're not going to do anything about bringing down the price of oil, and guess what, the clock is timing out now on the 110th Congress; I guess we can go ahead and increase the price of oil. That's speculators.

What speculators do is set a pricing function, and they do it based upon information. And the information that this Democrat-controlled Congress has sent out to the world markets is don't worry, we're not going to do anything to increase American energy production; we're going to keep it exactly as it is. And what that does is guarantee

that the poor, beleaguered American taxpayer, the forgotten man in all of this, is doomed to pay even higher prices of energy.

This is not good news, not good news at all.

Mr. LATTA. Something else at play in the hands in the last few weeks is called a hurricane, by not having diversification in this country and not having our fields dispersed around this country where we can get oil and natural gas. Everything had to be shut down in the gulf. Not only is everything shut down in the gulf, but we also then lost refineries. We haven't had new refineries built in almost three decades in this country.

So we don't take care of ourselves. The problem has been in this country, we say, you other countries take care of us, we'll pay for this oil. It's not too expensive.

But boy, I tell you, the chickens have come home to roost by now because by watching what's happening in the gulf and still knowing that we can't get the production up in the gulf, they're saying we might be out for another seven to eight days and maybe a little bit longer before we get back up. But at the same time, when I left Bowling Green this morning, I filled up the car. It was \$3.79 a gallon. That was before there was a spike of \$16.37. So when I get home, gas will probably be over \$4 a gallon again, and people are going to say, wait a minute, what are we going to do.

One of the things I did this morning was I was at our senior center in Wood County at their Meals on Wheels, the kitchen where they make the meals. They send out about 750 per day from that place. The problem is this: These folks are out there, a lot of the volunteers are saying, wait, I can't afford to volunteer my time anymore because I can't afford the gasoline.

We've got volunteer firemen around this country, they're out there. We have all these people that do so much greatness for this country by being volunteers that are being shut off from doing it, not because they don't want to do it, because they can't afford the price of a gallon of gasoline.

One of the bills I've introduced recently is to say, let's take that 14 cents for the volunteers that drive that Meals on Wheels vehicle, or their own personal use, and get that up to the business expense.

That's the problem we have. It's not taking care of ourselves. It's only having a very small area that we're going to get our oil from in this country. It's having overreliance, like 70 percent, on other countries that bring us the oil and the resources that we need when we should be taking care of them ourselves.

Mrs. BACHMANN. You're dead on when you talk about the hurricane, dealing with Hurricane Ike recently, and the devastation that ensued in the gulf coast region, and then also we look on the international front what's happening.

Russia invaded Georgia not too long ago, and of course, we know that a big part of that invasion had to do with controlling oil. I mean, it was only a few months ago that we saw newspaper accounts. It almost seemed humorous because there was a Russian-made submarine that traveled under the arctic region and planted a Russian flag at the bottom of the Arctic Sea and said, We take this Arctic Sea for Russia.

Well, as if the Americans hadn't been there years prior and had made claims, but it makes sense because just several weeks later the U.S. Geological Survey released a report that stated there's an estimated 90 billion, 90 billion barrels of oil that are under the Arctic Sea. There are tremendous international pressures right now and particularly with Russia making very aggressive incursions in the Arctic and also in Georgia. This makes the United States even more vulnerable.

But again, great news is on the horizon. We have the answer right here in our border. The problem has been the Democrat-controlled Congress has said "no" to American energy production.

Mr. LATTA. Well, I want to thank the gentlelady for her time this evening and for her expertise and all of the work that she's done.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MIKE McNULTY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the Special Order in honor of the retirement of Representative MIKE McNULTY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bittersweet moment for me and for all of the members of the New York State delegation specifically and the Members of the House of Representatives in its entirety because our good friend, and my best friend in the Congress, MIKE McNULTY, after 20 years of laboring in the vineyards here in Washington, getting on a flight every single week, coming down to Washington, going back home, representing the people of his district so diligently, will be leaving us at the end of this, his tenth Congress.

He is going to be sorely missed. They said, people don't have friends in Washington. This is truly an outstanding misstatement in the case of MIKE McNULTY. He has friends galore on both sides of the aisle that he has met and kept and maintained close relationships with throughout his entire political career, which is not just the 20 years that he has spent here with us.

At the age of 22, MIKE entered politics, one of the youngest mayors in the history of anyplace in America. He went from the supervisor of Green Island to the mayor thereof, represented those people for so many years before being elected to the New York State Assembly, and proudly served as their assemblyman before coming here.

We have many members of the delegation who wish to speak, some of whom are here tonight, Mr. Speaker. I will fill in and continue some of my remarks, but I want to get some of them up to the microphone at this late hour. I guess we will start with Mr. HINCHEY, if you are prepared to start us off.

Mr. HINCHEY. Well, I thank you very much, and I very much appreciate your taking the time and providing us with the opportunity to say a few things about our close friend and ally MIKE McNULTY, someone with whom we have worked for a long time, and I say that myself because MIKE and I have been working together first in the State legislature in Albany since 1982, and I think about 6 years later, 1988 he was elected to the Congress of the United States. And I'm happy to say that I was very envious about the fact that he left Albany and came to Washington, and I tried to follow him. It took me a few years to do it, but in 1993, I came down here and I've been serving with him ever since, both of us here in this Congress.

He's an extraordinary man, someone with a very remarkable history. He started out in public office because of his strong desire to serve other people as the town supervisor in Green Island. At the age of 22, he was elected to be the town supervisor, and when he was elected at that age, he was the youngest town supervisor elected in any town in the State of New York.

So from the very beginning, when he first became involved in public life and working on behalf of the general public, he started off in a very remarkable way.

After being town supervisor, he was elected mayor, and then as I said, he was elected to the State Assembly in Albany and served there in a very, very envious sort of way, a remarkable kind of way, one that made us all pay attention to him. He was a very, very strong leader in Albany, New York, in the State Assembly.

But then when he came down here to Washington, he started off in something else that was even more dramatic. Shortly after he was elected and came here, he became a member of the Ways and Means Committee, one of the most important and significant committees here in this Congress. And as a member of that committee, he has done an extraordinary job.

He is now chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, and he has done a very wonderful piece of work, strengthening Social Security, protecting Social Security, protecting it from people like the President of the United States who in 2005 wanted to