

So I wish to share with you tonight some of those families' stories and what this closure, what the stealing of American jobs means and also comes with a warning, a warning that I've been repeating for the last 6 months. As Niagara goes, so goes this Nation. And as Kimberly goes, so goes our country.

This is a photo I'm showing you of the Wendel family. This is Don Wendel who worked for 30 years in the Kimberly mill. His wife is Ann on the far left of the picture; his daughter, Kathleen; and the son is Anthony. And he said, "Our daughter is a junior in high school and the thought of paying for college with this uncertain future is daunting. We also need to move to a larger home or add on to ours, and this now needs to be postponed indefinitely. We may have to sell our car we bought in March."

To sum it up, "It is shocking and disheartening that the owners, instead of researching options to make this mill profitable, made such a quick decision to shut it down. It is causing such great devastation to so many families, and the entire Kimberly community."

He's not alone. There are hundreds of others, like Jerry Jansen who worked there for 41 years. His wife is Donna; children, Craig, Scott and Matt; and many grandchildren. What does he say about this impact of the closing of the mill? "Just over 2 years left until I can collect Social Security. I don't know what I'm going to do until then. Nobody is going to hire someone my age."

To sum it up, "I feel like my life has been sucked out of me."

For generations, his family has worked at that mill, not just his family but his in-laws as well.

Another family, Tom Kilsdonk has been there for 24 years. His wife, Jodi; his children, Karley, Camie, and Hannah. And he said, "I have a major changes coming in a short period of time. Financial, emotional, social. My wife now works two jobs with no health care. It will not be enough."

To sum it up he said, "I feel like someone blindfolded me, dropped me off in the middle of the forest and left me there. I am angry, frustrated and nervous."

Well, to Tom Kilsdonk, to the Jansen family, to the Wendel family, there's somebody listening, and I have the honor of representing you and coming here to Congress to share with my colleagues your story. Your story must be told not just across Wisconsin, the Midwest, but across the country. Your story is not alone.

These unfair and unbalanced trade deals and the failure of this administration to administer justice, to apply the law equally, and to allow the illegal dumping of Chinese paper and South Korean paper into our domestic marketplace has damaged not only your lives but your entire city and entire region. This is a matter of national security. It's called job security. It's something that we have to fight for each and every day here in Congress.

And, yes, it's true, there are three components to the cost of doing business in the paper industry: energy, raw materials, and labor. We have to work hard here in Congress together and join hands across the aisle to solve these complex problems of energy and the economy.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SOUDER 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 California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN 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 January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

As we gather here this evening, we have heard a lot of speeches and discussion about one of the number one questions we have in this country, and that's our energy policy. We all went home and a lot of us didn't want to go home on August 1, and we stayed down here to get an energy policy in this country, but as we did go home, we faced a lot of questions from our constituents.

I, for one, represent the National Manufacturing Association, one of the largest manufacturing districts, with manufacturing jobs in the Congress, and the number one agriculture district in Ohio. We have got a lot of needs in our district concerning energy. And that energy isn't just talking about oil to put in our cars, but it also depends on what we have in our factories.

□ 2000

This evening, we have a number of Members who I would like to bring to

the podium to talk a little bit about what's happening, not only in their States but across this country. The first Member I'd like to introduce this evening is our distinguished Member from Texas, our ranking member on Energy and Commerce, Mr. BARTON.

Good evening, and thanks very much.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, thank you, Congressman LATTI, and thank you for hosting this Special Order.

It's nice to be on the floor with the cameras on and with the microphones on. I was one of, I think, 135 Republican Members of the House who participated in what I called our American townhall meetings here on the floor during the August work period where we spoke to the tourists who were coming through the Capitol. We talked about the need for a comprehensive energy policy. We did it without the benefit of microphones and with the cameras off, just speaking extemporaneously to educate the American public and to keep a vigil for the American public for a real energy policy.

I notice that our distinguished Speaker today held a press conference at which she announced yet another attempt to politically confuse the American people by putting a so-called "energy package" on the floor perhaps on Thursday, perhaps on Friday, perhaps some day next week. One of her aides, in response to a question from the press corps after that press conference, said—and I'm not going to say this is an exact quote—that they would never allow the Republican energy package to come onto the floor because it was too radical. Well, that must be a different definition of "radical" than is in Webster's Dictionary, because what the Republican energy package is is the radical notion that Americans, themselves, can develop American resources so that we have American-made energy/American-produced energy to keep America's families and America's factories humming and being productive. I don't think that's radical.

I want to talk a little bit about a part of that energy policy, the Republican energy policy, which would be to allow drilling in ANWR, up in Alaska. I've been having my staff do a little bit of research, and I thought it might be beneficial to give the benefits of some of that research here to the Members on the floor and to others in the country.

In 1910, almost 100 years ago—I think it was while Teddy Roosevelt was President—the Congress passed a law for the development of American resources. That law stated that the Presidents and Congresses could set aside certain portions of Federal lands for different purposes if they felt that there might be some economic development potential in these Federal lands. It was called the Pickett Act. So, in 1924, they decided to create what we now call the Alaska Naval Petroleum Reserve. Now, there is a reason they picked this part of Alaska, which is to the west of Prudhoe Bay, fronting on

the Arctic Ocean. Here is the scientific basis on which they picked the Alaska Naval Petroleum Reserve in 1924.

New England whaling ships, as they had gone after whales in the Arctic Ocean, noticed that there were some oil seeps. So, based on that scientific evidence, they set up the Alaska Naval Petroleum Reserve. They didn't have the benefit of modern seismic geology or of any satellite photography or of any of the 3-D seismic differentiation that we have today. Some New England whaling ships, as they went ashore to look for water and things of this sort, noticed some oil seeps.

Okay. Fast forward to 1960. Alaska becomes a State, and the Alaska congressional-senatorial delegations decided that we needed to preserve some of these Alaskan lands. Alaska had been a territory. Now Alaska becomes a State. So they passed an act in 1960 that created to the east of Prudhoe Bay an area that we now call ANWR. Now, of course, there was a little bit more science available in 1960. So, when they set up the Alaskan National Wildlife Reserve, they were searching for oil, and they had discovered in what we now call Prudhoe Bay a specific geologic formation that they thought had the potential to find some oil.

It turns out they found the largest oil field on the North American continent that has been discovered here today, and so they wanted to set up a wildlife reserve. They already had the petroleum reserve to the west of Prudhoe Bay, so they decided they needed a wildlife reserve, and they set up what we call ANWR, but they had done enough scientific exploration that they knew there was an area that might have a lot of oil and/or gas. It was called section 1102.

So, when they created this reserve for wildlife, they put a section in the law that said, in this area, we want to really do some exploration activity to see if there might be something that could be developed commercially. Lo and behold, when they did that exploration activity of the discovery well, which was, I believe, drilled by Texaco, which is yet to be made public—it's proprietary information—there is enough that is known, we think, of that one area, of this one little section that is 3 square miles, that there could be 11 billion barrels of oil.

Now, as to the Alaska Naval Petroleum Reserve to the west of Prudhoe Bay, Speaker PELOSI and her Democratic friends have said we can drill over there; we can drill over there, but in the area that's now called ANWR to the east of Prudhoe Bay, you can't drill over there; you can't drill over there. There's no ecological difference. There's no environmental difference. There's really no wildlife habitat difference.

Just by happenstance, in the 1920s, we set up the petroleum reserve because whaling ships had seen oil seeps. In the 1950s and early 1960s when we created ANWR, as we were creating the

wildlife reserve, we did carve out this section 1102 because we thought that might have some potential, and it appears it has huge potential, but today, we can't drill there because of moratoria that have been put in place in the last 30 years.

Now the question is: If we can only drill one well in America next year, where would it be? Would you drill down in Congressman CARTER's district in Texas? in Mr. LATTA's district in Ohio? in Mr. BROWN's district in Georgia? in my district in Texas?

Mr. CARTER and I represent a State in which we've drilled 2 million wells since 1895, 2 million. The probability of finding an 11 billion-barrel oil field in Texas by drilling one more well is one in 2 million. That's not very good odds. The probability of finding a major oil field in Ohio where they've drilled several hundred thousand wells is a little bit better. It's still not great. The probability of finding a major oil field in Georgia by drilling one well next year—I don't know how many wells have been drilled in Georgia. It's probably several thousand—is not too great.

If you drill one well in ANWR, you've got an almost 100 percent chance of finding a well that will produce tens of thousands of barrels a day, millions of barrels a year, billions of barrels over the life of the field, but we can't do it because, in the 1920s, we said the petroleum reserve is to the west of Prudhoe Bay. In the 1960s, we said the wildlife reserve is to the east. Even in section 1102, we put a moratorium in place.

Now the question to Mr. LATTA and to the Members of the House: Is it radical to say let's drill up in ANWR? Let's see. I don't think that's radical. Is it radical to drill in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, which even the Democrats are beginning to think might make some sense? Is it radical to see what's off the Atlantic coast? Do you know how much exploration, how much seismic, how much geologic exploration we're doing off the Atlantic coast? Nada. Zero. None.

The Canadians are producing north of Maine. The Cubans are trying, and the Chinese are looking to produce south of Florida, but we've put the entire Atlantic coast off limits. Is it radical to at least see what's out there? I don't think that's radical.

Is it radical to try to develop our 2 trillion oil shale reserves, the 2 trillion barrels in Wyoming and in Colorado and in Utah? I don't think so.

So, Mr. LATTA, if I were the Speaker, which I'm not, instead of these political flimflams that we've had now for the last year, here is what I would do—and I ask my colleagues: Is this a radical proposal?

I would pick a group of Republicans and Democrats who are respected in both parties. Let them put together a bipartisan proposal. Then on the proposals that cause the most angst in the liberal left of the Democratic Caucus, pick a conservative Democrat and a

pro-energy Republican, and let them offer an amendment to the base package. Bring it to the floor. You don't have to bring the Republican bill to the floor. Bring this bipartisan bill with some amendments where we're not sure of the outcome, and let the House vote.

Now, in prior Democratic-controlled Congresses, that's basically why the energy packages were put together. They weren't put together by the Speaker's aides in a back room with no hearings and with no process. It was put together. It was bipartisan. It would come to the floor with amendments.

When we elect the Speaker for this body, the majority of the House—which right now is Democrat—elects that Speaker. It's what we did with Newt Gingrich. It's what we did with Denny Hastert when the Republicans were the majority. It's what the Democrats have done with the distinguished lady from San Francisco, Ms. PELOSI.

That Speaker has an obligation to, in this case, her party, the Democrats, but the Speaker also has an obligation to the American people. The Constitution and the rules of the House do not say that, once you get to be Speaker, you can only let bills come to the floor of which you know the outcome and that fit the political profile of the majority within your caucus.

Let's let there be a real debate on the floor in the next 3 weeks. Let's let there be real amendments. Let's see where the votes are. Now, my guess is the American people are smarter than the Speaker and the Speaker's staff. They want a commonsense, comprehensive energy policy that develops American-made energy for American use in the United States.

We'll win those votes, I believe—"we" being the American people—if we get them. If we don't, as Leader BOEHNER has said, the Republicans are not going to accept a facade. We want the real deal. We want the real policies debated and voted on on this floor before we break for the elections in November. If we do that, Mr. LATTA, the American people will win. Over time, energy prices will come down, and our economy will continue to grow.

I'm glad to participate in this Special Order. I appreciate the time. With that, I would yield back to you.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Texas and all of his hard work through all of these years on this energy debate because, as he mentioned, this country's future is at stake. Our standing in the world is at stake. It's not time to wait to get something done down the road. We have to do it right now.

At this time, I would like to recognize my good friend from Georgia (Mr. BROWN). I appreciate all of his work that he has done over the last year on trying to get an energy policy in this country. I appreciate it.

The mike is yours. Thank you.

□ 2015

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. LATTA, for yielding.

I appreciate this opportunity to come and speak today on this issue that is so drastically important to the American people. Everybody, rich and poor, black and white, all races, all nationalities, everybody in America is suffering from the high cost of energy.

When we voted on the morning of August 1 to go home for a 5-week break, that afternoon I was part of the group of Republicans here on the floor demanding, demanding that we go back in session to find some commonsense solutions to the high cost of gasoline at everybody's gas pump. Everybody in this Nation, even if you don't have a car, if you drive a bicycle or a motorcycle or a scooter, is suffering from the consequences of the high cost of energy. When you go to the grocery store and try to buy bread, milk, eggs, bacon, the cost of those goods in your grocery store are going to continue to go up because of the high cost of energy.

We hear from the controlling party, the Democrats, from Speaker PELOSI—now, there are some on the other side that would like to have a vote, that would like to see the energy costs come down. Many of our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle would vote for a comprehensive energy plan that would literally lower the cost of gasoline, would lower the cost of heating oil, would lower the cost of all energy sources here in America. But they can't have that opportunity to vote on a comprehensive plan. We can't have an opportunity to vote on a comprehensive plan. Why is that so? Frankly, if the American Energy Act would come to this floor for a vote, I think it would pass overwhelmingly. But Speaker PELOSI and STENY HOYER, the majority leader, won't let that act come here, to have an up-and-down vote, to have an open discussion, a frank debate about all the issues within that act.

Now, what does the act do? The act taps into our own American energy sources, taps into our own energy sources. Doing so is absolutely critical. We have to stop this dependence upon Middle Eastern oil. We are funding governments who hate America, who want to destroy us, and they are in turn funding al Qaeda, the insurgency in Iraq, the insurgency in Afghanistan. They're funding people who are in our country today who want to attack the very fiber of our Nation. We have to stop that dependency upon foreign oil, whether it's Middle Eastern oil, Venezuelan oil, North African oil, or anywhere else. We have to tap into our own natural resources. America is the only nation in the world, the only nation in the world, that won't develop its own natural resources.

I became a political activist coming to Washington. I was practicing medicine in rural South Georgia, coming here to this Nation's capital to lobby as a volunteer about hunters' rights and gun owners' rights and conservation issues. I'm a scientist. I'm a med-

ical doctor. And I believe that all of our policy ought to be based on science. Not on emotionalism, not on what the name of something is, but on science. And I believe very strongly that we have to be good stewards of God's creation. We're charged biblically to do so. We have to be good stewards of our environment. And I'm a conservationist, a very ardent conservationist. We can tap into our own natural resources. We can develop those God-given resources, what we call fossil fuel, air through wind as it moves around our country, through the sun, through solar resources. We can tap into those resources. But we are denied a vote on an act that would do everything. We call it the "all-of-the-above plan."

We hear our colleagues on the Democratic side, the controlling party, say, well, let the oil companies drill. They already have leases. They can't drill. Why is that? My friends, my colleagues, American people, oil companies can't drill because of endless lawsuits by the radical environmentalists. Any bill that's presented has to include some mechanism to stop the endless lawsuits by these radical environmentalists that don't want any drilling. They don't want us to develop any of our natural resources. They don't want us to do anything. I think they want us to live in a cave or in a tree. Come to think of it, they don't want us to live in the trees because they think that destroying the forests would be adverse to their philosophy. So I think they want us to live in a cave. I guess we'd have to go and pick up sticks to make a fire and cook our food. A lot of them don't want us to even go out and harvest some of the bountiful animals that we have in those forests that I enjoy eating as a hunter and as a fisherman. But the leadership of the Democratic Party is listening to those radical environmentalists, and they closed down this Congress on August 1 at 11:23 in the morning when many of us wanted to just come to this floor, as is our right, as is our privilege, to talk about energy.

That afternoon I was here as part of that group, as I have already mentioned, demanding the ability to bring the American Energy Act to the floor for an up-and-down vote, to have a debate, an open debate, with amendments, to allow everybody to put their two cents worth in, to talk about their philosophy, to offer their suggestions, to find some commonsense solutions to our energy dependence on foreign sources.

It's a national security issue for us to be dependent upon those nations who want to destroy America. It's an economic issue because our dependency upon them makes us subservient to them.

The high cost of energy is raising the cost of health care in my business. It's raising the cost of groceries in the grocery store. It's raising the cost of every single good and service in this Nation.

I as well as many others came during the August break to this floor to try to do the people's work, to demand a vote on a commonsense solution to this energy crisis we have in America. Right now today America is drilling for ice on Mars; yet we cannot drill for oil in America. It's insane. We have to change that. We have to tap into our oil and gas resources offshore and in ANWR.

I have already mentioned that I hunt. I have been on the North Slope of the Brooks Range. I've been out flying over the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR. I've seen the caribou herds that we keep hearing about from the Democratic majority that would be harmed. That's hogwash. They didn't want the pipeline. I have flown over the pipeline. I've camped out by the pipeline. I've seen the caribou herds in Alaska blossom and reproduce and get more numerous because of the pipeline. I've seen pictures of grizzly bear walking down the pipeline. It's actually helped the wildlife.

We have the technology today where we can tap into those oil resources in ANWR, offshore, all over this Nation, and can do it in an environmentally responsible way, as we must, as I want to see happen, as a lot of my Democratic colleagues would like to see happen. But we cannot get a vote.

I have got a picture here. One of the Democratic folks told us the Democrats' energy plan was to "drive small cars and wait for the wind." I don't think most of us want to drive around in small cars waiting for the wind. We don't have to. We can lower the cost of gasoline. We have to tap into our own natural resources to be able to do so. We can stop our dependence on Middle Eastern oil by voting into law the American energy plan. We can make America secure by voting for the American energy plan.

Whom is Ms. PELOSI listening to? She's from San Francisco. She thinks those radical environmentalists out there are normal people.

But the American people know different. The American people know and want an energy plan that makes sense to lower their cost of gas at the pumps. But we need more than that. It's September. People are starting to buy their home heating oil. Poor people, retirees on fixed incomes are going to have to pay a lot more money for their home heating oil. Many are not going to be able to afford to buy their supplies for the winter. The people that we hear from the Democratic majority that they want to represent the most, the poor people and the elderly of this Nation, are going to be radically affected and harmed because Ms. PELOSI and Mr. HOYER, the Democratic leadership, will not allow a vote on the American Energy Act.

I represent the 10th Congressional District in Georgia, northeast Georgia. One of the cities in my district is Athens, where the University of Georgia is. I'm a proud Bulldog. Go Dawgs. Our

head football coach, Mark Richt, has a three-word phrase he uses to energize the football team: "Finish the drill." As a congressman, I have got a three-word phrase to energize America: "Start the drill." We have to start the drill. We have to tap into our own natural resources and develop America's resources. We have to develop alternative sources of energy. That's absolutely critical because we have a dwindling supply of oil and eventually it's going to run out. We have to develop the wind and solar energy that my Democratic friends just keep talking about. T. Boone Pickens says that's half the answer. That's hogwash also. It's only a small part of the answer. It's less than 10 percent. But we have to develop wind and solar. The American Energy Act does that.

Just south of my district, just south of Augusta, Georgia, the Georgia Power Company is trying to put in two nuclear reactors, and they have been doing that for decades. But because of the radical environmentalists and governmental regulations and endless lawsuits, they can't build the two nuclear reactors to add to the two that are already there. We have the technology to make nuclear energy safe. Nuclear energy is the only thing that makes environmental sense and economic sense to develop electric energy in this Nation. We have to develop nuclear energy.

□ 2030

We have to develop hydrogen. We have to develop new batteries. We have to conserve. And I am a conservationist. Conservation has to be a part of the answer. We have to do it all. Well, guess what, American public? The Republican's American energy act does all of that. We must have a vote.

So, Republicans, on the afternoon that we were forced to go home on this 5-week break, Republicans have been coming here every single day since that day, since August 1, to try to get our Democratic colleagues to come back here and do America's work, the American peoples' work, to vote on a comprehensive energy act bill that would do all of the above: Would tap into America's bountiful natural resources, that would develop nuclear energy, would develop alternative sources of energy, would develop conservation issues, would stimulate the innovativeness of the American public to develop new sources of energy. There may be a source of energy we have never dreamed of.

We have to do all of those things. The American energy act will do just that. We can't have the Democratic energy plan of driving small cars and waiting for the wind. We have got to lower the cost of gas at the pump. We have got to lower the cost of home heating oil.

Republicans are here fighting for the poor people. We are here fighting for the elderly on limited incomes. The Democratic leadership are just doing what my son calls "dissing" them. The leader on the Democratic side, Speaker

PELOSI is dissing poor people, dissing the elderly, those who are hurt most by us not having the vote.

So I come here tonight with my colleagues, and I applaud Mr. LATTA and Mr. BURTON and Mr. BARTON and Judge Carter for coming here tonight to bring forth to the American people the idea that Republicans are here for the American people. We are here trying to find those solutions. We have been here through the whole August break, inviting our Democratic colleagues to come back and do the peoples' work, the poor peoples' work, the elderly's work, everybody's work, to lower the cost of energy.

And so I just call upon my Democratic colleagues, particularly those many over here on the Democratic side who would like to have a vote, please ask your leadership to bring the American energy act to the floor for a vote with an open rule so that we can have all the amendments that you want to put in, all the amendments that our folks want to put in, have an open debate, but let's do the American peoples' job in the peoples' House. Let's do the peoples' work to find some solutions to this energy crisis that is an economic crisis and a national security crisis for America. So I call upon my Democratic colleagues to get your leadership to allow us to have a vote on the American energy act.

I thank Mr. LATTA for the opportunity to come here and discuss this, and I applaud your efforts, I applaud my other colleagues' efforts, and I thank you for this opportunity. Maybe the American people will listen.

When I was here in the dimly lit House with no microphones, no cameras—different from tonight—and we had the tourists sitting here on the floor of the House, I asked them to go home and not just enjoy being in this historic moment sitting on the floor of the House of Representatives but to go home to contact their Member of Congress and demand a vote on the American energy act.

Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen one time said, when he feels the heat, he sees the light. What he was saying is when his constituents in his State start contacting him through calls and letters, that he would start feeling the heat. We need the American public all over this country to start putting heat on their U.S. Senators and their Members of the U.S. House by calling, writing, e-mailing, visiting district offices, visiting Washington offices, and demanding a vote on a comprehensive energy package that would lower their costs of energy, whether it's gasoline, home heating oil, electricity. That is what the American energy plan is all about, is to lower our energy costs.

So I applaud your efforts tonight, sir, my friend, and dear colleague, and I ask the American public to get busy to apply the heat to your Member of Congress. Write them, call them, e-mail them, and demand a vote on the American energy act so we can have an up-

or-down vote, open debate to lower your cost of energy, lower your cost of gasoline, lower your cost of groceries, lower your cost of health care, lower your cost of every good and service that you have to buy to make America secure. Energy secure.

I thank you, sir, for your leadership. I applaud you, and I thank you for this opportunity to come back today.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate your willingness to be with us tonight, your hard work, your dedication to be back here during the August break and make sure we get that word out to the American people that we had to be here, not on break, but be here on this floor and make sure that we get an energy plan, especially all-of-the-above. We are talking about everything from nuclear to clean coal technology to hydroelectric to drilling for oil and natural gas and all the alternatives.

At this time, I'd like to recognize the gentleman from Indiana for I believe he said a few minutes. I appreciate your time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I see my other colleague who's here. I hope I am not jumping in front of you. If I am, I will pledge to you I am going to talk a very short period of time so you can get to the mike and express your views.

My brother, Congressman LATTA, is a State representative in Indiana, Woody Burton, and he called me the other day and he gave me some startling facts. I think the American people would be interested in hearing these things he told me because I'm sure it's happening all over the country.

He said that sales tax in Indiana is down by 28 percent, which means simply that people are buying so much less because they are spending their money on gasoline and getting to and from work and on buying products that they have to have to survive. Food. Milk in Indiana had gone from about \$2 a gallon, up over \$3, and they are making packages of food that are close to the same price but they contain less of the commodity. And so sales tax is down in Indiana by 28 percent.

But just to let you know how much the people are spending on gasoline, gas sales tax is up 24 percent. So you see a direct correlation between the amount of money people are spending on products that help the economy and the amount of money that they are spending on gasoline to get to and from work and do what they have to do.

My colleague from Georgia just made a very eloquent statement on why we need to deal with this energy crisis now. I won't belabor the point by going into it again, except to say that about 75 or 80 percent of the American people, depending on which poll you look at, say: Drill here, drill now, just like T. Boone Pickens says. They don't want to see \$700 billion going overseas when we can keep that money at home and create hundreds of thousands of jobs which, again, would be a big help to the economy.

I just want to say we really need an energy bill, we need it right away, and

if the American people are paying attention, I hope that they will, Mr. LATTA, take this opportunity to contact their Congressman and Senators because when the pressure is put on them, then they do respond.

I talked to one of my Democratic colleagues today. He is a cosponsor of a bill that I am sponsoring with him and about 20 other Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, which is a bipartisan energy bill. And he said their caucus today was entirely about the energy issue, and he told me he was confident that we would have an opportunity to debate and vote on an energy bill in the next 2 or 3 weeks, which is the end of the session.

I hope he is correct, and I hope if we do have an energy bill, it's a real energy bill and not some kind of a facade. If we get a facade here, I hope we at least have some amendments that we can vote on, which would make it a real energy bill, and that means we'd have to have an open rule.

So let me just say to Mr. LATTA one more time, thank you for doing this. I know it takes away from things you would like to be doing elsewhere, but you come down here on the floor of the House, along with a few of our colleagues, to talk about how important this issue is. And I applaud you for that.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the gentleman's words from Indiana. When you were talking about what your brother had contacted you on in regards to the sales tax issue in Indiana, I know it strikes close to home because it wasn't too long ago that we were looking at our charge card statement for the month and I said to my wife, What did we buy this month? I started looking down the list. It was gasoline, gasoline, gasoline, and mostly my fault because I am out in my district, it's a larger district, and when you're filling up 3 or 4 times a week, you put in a lot of gasoline. It's really cutting into our Americans' pocketbook.

At this time I'd like to recognize the distinguished jurist and the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I know that you have had a lot of discussions with your constituents, especially I know the one that you told us about the long hauler from Texas that took that load to California. I know I have given that example to many people across my district over the last couple of months after I heard it from you.

At this time, I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend Mr. LATTA for yielding to me. Let me say that when the uprising started, I was one of the 10 that began the uprising. I was the fourth person to speak that day. In fact, I got to speak just after the microphones were turned off, just before the lights were turned down. And I'm very proud of the fact that the Republicans stayed in Washington and demanded that the voice be heard of the American people on the issue of energy.

And what we were really saying, we were calling for the Speaker to, Come back, come back, call the House back, let's work together, because we are in an energy crisis. Let's reason this out and come up with solutions that we can all live with that will allow us to prosper in this country. I think that is what this is all about.

So I got to thinking today if you look at the pie chart—and Mr. KING from Iowa had a pie chart in here one day that showed what all our sources of energy are. I can't get the numbers exactly right. I can remember that the alternative energy today, that is wind, solar, and biofuels, is about 2¼ percent of our energy use in America. Right now. That is things we are looking at in the future and that is part of what the American energy act promotes, is research, development and working on those issues. But today it's about 2 percent.

And then the other sources of energy are gasoline and diesel to power our vehicles; natural gas, which we burn in industry and our homes; coal, which we burn in industry and our homes; oil, which we burn in industry and our homes, and a small portion we still use of hydroelectric power, which was one of the original sources of energy in colonial America.

And so what the proposal seems to be and the debate seems to be between our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats who are in charge of this Congress and have the power to make things happen in this Congress, I think that it's that debate we are talking about. It's those fuel sources that we are talking about. And nuclear energy, which make up right now I think it's around 18 percent of our power, but don't hold me to the numbers. But that whole chart makes 100 percent. But I do remember alternatives that today are a little over 2 percent.

The proposal we seem to be hearing is there's some things that now are bad. These are bad resources, even though the rest of the world, when they find natural gas off the coast of Brazil, they celebrate. When they drill a well off of—my wife is from Holland, and back in the sixties when they drilled a well in northern Holland and found this huge source of natural gas, they celebrated.

□ 2045

When people in Venezuela drill wells and find oil and natural gas, they celebrate, and yet we are ashamed of those resources.

Those resources are evil now, so we are basically starting to have a policy being proposed that says that there are some things that are just off limits for power right now because they are bad, and even though we don't have sense enough to know they are bad, we are going to get taught by the government that these are bad. And those things, by the way, most of them have to do with hydrocarbons, but we will start off with the one that doesn't, nuclear energy.

Now, we have heard arguments here tonight and examples were given here tonight of what other nations are doing in the way of nuclear energy. An example was given that the Chinese have on their drawing boards I believe it was 42 nuclear plants they are planning on building. And we are not planning to build, I don't think, any. Maybe there are a couple that are on the drawing board someplace, but we haven't built one in decades. Nuclear energy, our colleagues don't seem to want to open up nuclear energy, so it is sort of off limits.

Now we get off into the really evil stuff. Coal, terrible. You can't use coal. Oil, horrible. Horrible. As Speaker PELOSI said, we have got to wean ourselves off of hydrocarbons. And she said the solution is natural gas. I am sorry, but that is a hydrocarbon too. But still, let's throw natural gas in there.

Now, between coal, oil and natural gas, they probably make up about 75 or 80 percent of the fuel sources for industry and for transportation in America today. If those are off the table, let's just call it a small number, 60 percent, if 60 percent of what we are today using for power is off the table, then we have to replace it with something.

The proposals are solar, wind, biofuels, and new ideas we are going to come up with, like batteries and a lot of stuff, all of which is good and is in the American Energy Act. But today and tomorrow, and in fact for probably about 10 years, these things are not anywhere near the size and capacity to come even close to covering 60 percent of the power in this country.

So we are going to replace these oil, natural gas and coal resources with those power sources overnight, and we don't expect to stop right now on those things and not see prices go through the roof because of a supply shortage?

So what are we going to do for that supply shortage? Well, what we have been doing. We are going to buy from foreign countries, who are happy to have those products and happy to sell those products. But wait a minute. We just saw a comparison of the streets of Dubai. We don't have anything against Dubai. They are good friends of ours. But the change in that country between 1976 and today is like watching a miracle in the development of that country because of their intelligent use of the money that we are buying oil from them with and the rest of the world is.

So as we look down the pike, the corridors of time, if we make all these things off limits, then where are we going to go, except to foreign countries? And what we are talking about as part of our energy crisis is our dependence on foreign countries, whether they are friends or whether they be enemies.

So I think the average American back home in my district, when I talk to them, they all get it. They know that tomorrow, all this year for sure, and probably for at least the next 8 or

10 years, when they get up in the morning to go to work they are going to start a vehicle that is probably going to run on oil, an oil product or a natural gas product, gasoline or diesel. To say that we are going to keep this dependence going is insane in their opinion, and they want to know why we can't go after our own resources.

So why don't we put some things back on the table? Let's put American oil and gas back on the table by going to find it where we know that it is. Let's don't drill where it is not. If you want to lease property that has no oil and gas on it to drill on, you are welcome to lease my place. It is 2 acres right outside of Round Rock, and I guarantee you, you can put a drilling rig on it and it won't produce one drop of oil. But if you like drilling on places where there is no oil, I volunteer mine, and I will take the lease money. But that is ridiculous.

So when we hear proposals, why don't you drill where you have already got leases or where we have already offered leases, and our research tells us there are little or no resources there, why would we place millions and billions of dollars worth of drilling rigs on those sites to lose money? Why would anybody do that? So that doesn't make sense.

So let's go back. Let's start with the hard one, coal. But, you know what? We are learning very quickly how to clean up coal. We are learning how to liquefy coal and find new uses for coal. We are abundantly wealthy with coal. We shouldn't just put that off the table. And I am not from a big coal State, although question have got some coal. But the facts are we can't shove that resource off the table completely.

Oil, we know, as has been explained by Chairman BARTON and others, there are at least 10 billion barrels of oil in the Arctic, up in ANWR, in an area which we intentionally set aside. There is abundant oil and gas resources off all the coasts of America.

Chairman BARTON pointed out the reason they started looking at Alaska is because some whalers saw some oil seepage. Do you know that a place where there is oil seepage to this day is off the coast of California. In fact, those tar pits, that is just really, really thick crude at the top of the ground. But that is off limits.

Let's start being reasonable, taking care of the environment and drilling for these resources, producing them and putting them on the table. I for one am 100 percent in favor of Boone Pickens' proposal that we put natural gas in certain vehicles. It works. But he tells you 20 percent is the solution.

I think wind is a great idea, and it works. But it has got to be boosted to transport, and so we have to work on that. And still, with all the windmills we have got in production right now, we couldn't power Austin, Texas, for 2 days.

So, in order to meet our power needs, we have to be intelligent about what

we are doing. As we reason with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let's look at this picture and say reality says today, tomorrow and at least the next 10 to 20 years, we have to deal with what we have got. We can't hope that miraculously 2 percent of the power generated in America will instantly become 60 percent, just because we wish it to be.

I once asked a physicist from Austin, Texas, how big the solar panel would have to be to power Austin, Texas, for a day on the best day, that being a day in the spring when we don't need air conditioning and we don't need heat, and he said the size of the Texas panhandle. The size of the Texas panhandle is bigger than quite a few of the States in this country. So solar has its means, we will find a way for it, but today it is not going to even power Austin, Texas.

So as we look at this comprehensive energy that we have got to look at, if we are trying to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, let's wisely use the resources we have. Let's protect our environment as we do this. Let's make these burns and new scientific methods. For instance, you can burn things in pure oxygen and have no air emissions. You can capture carbon dioxide and use it to replenish oil fields, to bring more oil to the surface. We can do a lot with science and technology available and all those things on the table to be learned.

The bill that the Republicans are putting forward calls for us to wisely use all available resources, researching and developing the new ideas, offering incentives for more new ideas, offering incentives for conserving energy and all the things we need and want to do to make this country competitive, so that Indianapolis, Indiana, will look like Dubai some day, and not like Dubai in 1976, as was described earlier in a presentation here. Our infrastructure needs resources. We need to start taking care of America.

By the way, these lost jobs that people move overseas, did you ever think the high cost of energy might have something to do with that too?

So let's start thinking about ourselves and let's reason this out together. We have 3 weeks to do it. Time is running out. Our friends are back from their vacations, our Democratic friends are back from their vacations. Let's put our heads together. Let's don't give us an energy policy that comes from one person from San Francisco. Give us a policy that we work out in a bipartisan fashion, and I believe we can do it in the next 3 weeks.

Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the gentleman's words from Texas.

At this time I would like to introduce the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who has been a leader on this energy issue here on the House, in her 1 minutes and 5 minutes and her many, many speeches and special orders. I yield to her at this time.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Ohio who has been leading this Special Order tonight for giving me this opportunity. I hope to have a chart tomorrow that is going to show this better, but I am going to describe very briefly something that I think we need to be talking about.

I am encouraged by the Speaker saying that we are going to have a vote on an energy plan. I am concerned that it is not going to be the vote on the American Energy Act. We need a straight up or down vote I think on increasing American-made energy.

I have said over and over again on the floor, I am pro-American made energy and I think that is what we need to be doing. I was very proud to be here during August when the seats were filled with citizens who were here visiting. There was no mike, there was no C-SPAN, there were no lights on, but we had a great time talking to the American people and I think it showed our Republic at work. People took action, contacted their Members and said we need to do something about it.

But recently we have heard about how the unemployment rate has gone up, and our colleague from Texas, Judge Carter, talked about jobs going overseas. I think we also have seen that as the gas prices have gone up, we have also seen unemployment go up. Again, while I don't have a chart, I am going to make do with the chart that I have here.

When the Democrats took over in 2007, we had an unemployment rate of 4.5 percent, one of the lowest in the history of this country. We had 54 straight months of job increases. What happened? By 11-07, the unemployment rate had gone up, which was about right here, as gas prices started going up. When gas prices got to here, the unemployment rate had gone up to 5 percent. Gas prices in May were up to \$3.84 and the unemployment rate went above 5 percent. The unemployment rate is now at 6 percent, and that is where gas prices went, there.

I agree with Judge Carter. We need to look at why jobs are going overseas, and in large part it is because of the gas prices. The American people simply don't understand why the Democrats are so anti-American energy. If we will drill in ANWR, if we will drill off the coast, we can bring down the price of gasoline in this country. We can bring down the price of home heating oil, which is going to be hurting everybody in this country in the very next few days, because it is hurting them.

I yield back to my colleague who began this so he can close the evening.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the gentlewoman from North Carolina's words. I appreciate her work. I also would like to thank the Speaker for this evening's Special Order.