

Now, I am not sure if anybody in America can really conceptualize or grasp this figure of \$10.4 trillion, trillion with a T. But I did a little math and what that means, Mr. Speaker, is if we wanted to try to solve the problem of Social Security for future generations and solve it today, every American would have to write a check out for \$34,000; a family of four over \$125,000, to try to solve the problem today.

Now, what happens if we do nothing? And unfortunately, many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are part of the school of thought that we should do nothing. Well, if you look very closely at what the Social Security law says today, what current law says, what it really says is that my children are going to face an automatic benefit cut of probably over a third. Now, when I go to town hall meetings in my congressional district back in Texas and ask how many people are on Social Security and maybe half of them raise their hands, I ask, how many of you would be willing to take a third cut of our Social Security benefits? Not one hand goes up. And then I ask, well, how about your grandchildren? Do you mind if they have their benefits cut by a third? Not a single hand goes up.

Current law says, when the trust fund is exhausted, there will be an automatic benefit cut, and it can approach one-third. Mr. Speaker, that is just not fair. I mean, this is an issue of generational fairness.

I would love for us to solve the problem of Social Security tonight. Every day we put it off, it is costing the American people an extra \$200 million. We are kicking that can down the road, because too many people are looking at that next election and not the next generation. So as much as I would like to solve the problem tonight, I know perhaps that is not realistic.

□ 2200

But surely, Mr. Speaker, surely we can agree that the trust funds in Social Security ought to be dedicated to Social Security. But that is not the case. Forty-nine different times Congress has taken that money, and they spend it for something else.

Now, sometimes they spend it for really good things. They spend it on Kevlar vests for our troops in Iraq. Maybe they spend it to help guarantee a student loan. Maybe they help a low-income person get into their first home.

But more often than not, they also spend it on wheelchairs for Medicare that cost five times as much as those in the VA. They spend it on \$800,000 outhouses in Iowa, and the toilet does not even flush. They spend it on studies of how and why college students decorate their dorm, and the list goes on and on and on.

There is a spending problem in Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, and we need to make sure that the Social Security

trust funds are solely dedicated to Social Security. And so, fortunately, a number of our colleagues came up with an idea.

They call them GROW accounts, and it is a very, very simple idea. It says, take the remaining Social Security surpluses, and we think maybe we have about 12 years left before Social Security begins to go bankrupt. If the tidal wave of red ink only gets larger and larger and larger, let us at least save the surpluses we have and let us get it out of Washington because Washington has been taking that money and spending it on something else.

Let us get it into your account, an account with your name on it, something that you own. And, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people in America do not realize that they do not own their own Social Security. Several Supreme Court cases have ruled you do not own your own Social Security. So this is a very simple idea. Surely, we in Congress can at least agree on this one small baby step, to try to keep the security in Social Security. Let us take these remaining surpluses, let us put them into an account that you own, that Congress cannot spend, that bureaucrats cannot take away. You own it, something that you can leave to your family. Put it in a very safe investment, put it into a T-Bill.

Now, I do not know how anybody, Mr. Speaker, can call this a risky proposition, but they do. Let me tell you what is really risky. What is really risky is Americans leaving their retirement security here in Washington, D.C. when the trust fund has been raided 49 different times.

Mr. Speaker, there have been 20 different tax increases on Social Security, 20 different tax increases. And every time that the taxes are increased, your rate of return goes down. And that is important because we are losing the security out of Social Security.

Now, my grandparents, who are deceased, who were born about 1900, they got about a 12 percent rate of return on their Social Security. That was a great rate of return. My parents, who I alluded to earlier this evening, they were born in roughly 1930. They are getting about a 4½ percent rate of return on their Social Security, and that is not bad. My generation, represented by those born roughly 1960, we are going to get about 2½ percent rate of return on our Social Security. That is barely keeping pace with inflation. And my children, my children, my 3½-year-old daughter, my 22-month-old son, Mr. Speaker, they are going to get a negative rate of return. They are going to put more money into Social Security than they take out.

Mr. Speaker, that is not fair. That is where the risk is. The risk is doing nothing. The risk is leaving our Social Security here. There have been multiple benefit cuts in Social Security. We cannot have the trust fund raided. The tax increases, the benefit cuts, the declining rates of return, the no owner-

ship rights. Surely we can agree on this modest step forward of setting up these GROW accounts so that Americans can count on that Social Security so the trust fund cannot be raided and we can have personal accounts with your name on it. And, Mr. Speaker, that would be one positive step that we could take in this body to help save Social Security for future generations.

Mrs. NORTHUP. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who is a good friend. I also thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and the other Members that joined us tonight to talk about this very, very important issue.

You talk so much about the different generations. It is amazing how many people that are concerned about Social Security solvency think about this in terms of all the different generations. I often picture the generations sort of lined up, my mom and dad, my dad passed this year, but my mom. She is 82, and she is sort of up at the front of the line. And then you get back, as people age, and I am 57 and so I am back still on this side of the line of retirement, eight steps away from retirement. My children in their 30s and 20s are further behind me in the line.

And the way Social Security works is everybody in the back of the line, before they get to retirement, helps pay the retirement for those at the front of the line. The problem is the line in the back is getting shorter as the line in the front is getting longer. What GROW accounts do is allow younger workers in a sense to throw over the line some savings that will be there when they get there. It saves the people behind them in the line from having to fully fund their retirement, and it gives them the confidence that there will be a retirement savings for them.

It begins to change from of a pay-as-you-go system to a long-term funded solvent system that will take care of Americans today, Americans tomorrow, and Americans in the future, so that our whole country will be solvent and able to address the emerging challenges that are bound to emerge with each generation. It is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. It is a good idea for a transition to go through the GROW accounts so that we can set up a system that helps us transform Social Security from a pay-as-you-go to an invested solvent system.

I would like to thank my friends and colleagues who joined us late tonight to discuss this important issue. I look forward to working with you, and I know you do also with all the Members the Congress so that we can serve the American people in a responsible way.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OUR NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight in part of a continuing discussion of our national energy policy, and I come specifically this evening to address some new science. There have been two new developments that are important to America in regard to our energy policy. One is some very new emerging science indicating that we need to change our energy policy and have one that is much more optimistic and visionary; and, two, the results of the energy policy bill that has come out of the House that is now in the conference committee that unfortunately has fallen very short of what this country needs.

And, third, I will finish with an optimistic note about a discussion of how this country can adopt a truly new technologically oriented, optimistic, can-do energy policy that can help our country break our addiction to Middle Eastern oil, stop global warming, and grow jobs in this country with these new energy sources that we need to develop.

But first I would like to start the discussion by talking about some emerging science. There really are three reasons that we need a new technologically oriented clean energy policy for America. We clearly need to break our addiction on Saudi Arabian oil that is a security threat to the United States. That is number one. And we can do it with a high-tech future.

Number two, we have to stop global warming, which is a real threat and the science that I will talk about is in that regard. And, three, we need to grow our economy by having the next generation of technological development to truly have a new breakthrough energy policy for this country.

But I would like to start tonight's discussion by talking about some new science that has come in just in the last several weeks that has a bearing on our need for a clean energy future in this country. This science has been accumulating for the last decade or so; but it is very interesting just in the last several weeks, we have had some very fundamentally profoundly disturbing scientific revelations that lead to the conclusion that our Nation needs to lead the world to a new energy future.

I would like to set the stage, if I can, to talking about some of the things that have been known, at least on a gross basis, that are happening in the world today. And basically what is happening in the world today is in a real sense, it is melting. I want to refer to a picture of the Upsala Glacier in Patagonia at the southern tip of South America, a picture here taken in 1928. This huge glacier at the tip of South America. You can see it here, pretty vast field of ice in 1928. Same picture taken in 2004, basically showing the disappearance of this enormous multi-square mile field of ice that in this

photograph has disappeared and now is essentially a bay at the southern tip of South America, an incredibly rapid, rapid change since 1928. This picture unfortunately is very typical of what is happening in glaciers around the world due to the warming of the Earth.

A picture to show that it is not limited to South America. This is a photograph of the good old United States of America, one of my favorite national parks, Glacier National Park. On the left it shows a picture of the Grinnell Glacier in 1938. You can see it extends down into this basin, comes off this cliff, has a rather large area of flat glacier down in this area.

Same picture, same observation point in 1981. You see that this extent of the glacier has now totally disappeared. There is a lake where the glacier used to be. The Grinnell Glacier is rapidly receding. There were 150 glaciers in Glacier National Park a hundred years ago. There are about 30 significant ones now. And the scientists project that in one of our most treasured jewels of our crown, we will have no glaciers of any significance in Glacier National Park 50 years from now.

So, in fact, what we see is that due to a national or a global phenomenon, some of the most pristine treasures of America are being destroyed by global warming, and so our grandchildren, in hopes of having some some day, our great grandchildren will have to say we will take you to the park formerly known as Glacier because it will not have glaciers anymore.

The point I would like to make is that this is not just an isolated regional occurrence happening at the southern tip of South America or in our treasured Glacier National Park. In fact, it is something that is happening all over the globe. We now know some information that shows the thickness of long-term perennial ice in the north, and we now have very, very conclusive evidence that that ice is melting significantly.

This is a graph showing the extent and thickness of the ice cover in the Arctic in various locations during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s compared to the thickness with observations taken in the last 15 years. The blue, for instance, at the North Pole, shows the meters, just under 4 meters of thickness of ice at the North Pole on average in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. The brown bars show the thickness in the last 15 years. You see it has gone down to under 2½ meters of thickness, probably a 40 percent reduction in thickness at the North Pole.

It is not isolated. In the Nansin Basin there was about 4 meters of thickness. It has gone down to about 2.25 meters. In the Eastern Arctic, it is even more pronounced, from about 3.4 meters down to about 1½ meters. It is the same story all across the Arctic. The Arctic is melting. It is becoming less thick by factors of almost half. Just under half of the ice in the Arctic is gone as a result of global warming,

something that we have grown up with, something that 15 years ago we could not have imagined could disappear.

□ 2215

It is not just the thickness and it is not just in the Arctic. If you look at Greenland, and Greenland for reasons I will talk about is one of the great question marks about what is going to happen to the world in the next century. Greenland is an enormous reservoir of ice, thousands of feet thick covering the continent. But what has happened in 2002, this is a map of Greenland, basically showing where the melt has been in 2002 in these red areas. And you see a rather pronounced area where you have had this very significant melting along the periphery of the Greenland ice sheet.

What scientists have found is a very disturbing phenomenon that has occurred in Greenland and that is that there have been these fissures or crevasses open up that allow this melt water to melt down which lubricates the glacier which hastens the seaward spread of the glacier which can even accelerate the melting even further. This is of tremendous concern. This may get technical but let me notice it.

This is a hidden time but when it comes to climate in Greenland. The reason is off of Greenland is the Atlantic current that operates because of the saltiness, what is called the Halcyon Cycle of cold salt water sinking that creates this current that warms northern Europe, warms the northern Atlantic States of America.

If this ice melts in Greenland it can shut down the Gulf Current. In fact it has done that thousands of years ago. It happened at least once before, shut that current down and actually precipitated, and here is one of the great ironies, a little ice age in the northern hemisphere. That is why the Europeans are terrified of what is happening in Greenland today of this ice melting, making the water fresher, possibly shutting down this Atlantic current, causing this enormous change in our climate factor, a situation in the north Atlantic.

I want to point out these are not hypotheticals, these are not theories. These are not suggestions. These are not abstractions. These are facts. The things I have talked about today are direct observations. No scientist in the world questions them. They are unequivocal and there is no use arguing about them.

So what we have is a rather pronounced worldwide melting of ice and the question now is why is that? Well, there is a clear reason that has now been answered by the scientific community from the international panel of scientists, of over 1,500 scientists from around the world, from every bent, from every philosophical standpoint, geophysicists, geologists, physicists, climatologists, you name it, in the largest gathering of world scientists ever dealing with a climatic issue.

They have said with great confidence that human factors are causing the climate to change, are a significant factor in that change. The National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, and I am proud of the United States of America, we are the world's greatest scientific authority in the world. Our National Academy of Sciences, the people to whom we trust the scientific intellectual treasure trove of America, a few months ago came out with a conclusion that human activities are a significant cause of the climate change that the world is now experiencing. These are not fruitcakes, crackpots or small granola eaters. These are the people that helped put us on the moon, develop nuclear energy, and basically are the reason the United States leads the world today. We need to listen to them when they tell us something very dangerous is going on in the world today.

What is that? It is global warming caused by gasses that we, all of us, put into the atmosphere, and I would like to talk about that for a moment.

There is a phenomenon that actually is a really good thing. The presence of carbon dioxide is really important for us to live. Right now, carbon dioxide, we need to reduce the amount we are putting in the air because carbon dioxide and methane and a few other gasses are causing this global warming. But do not forget it is actually vital to human life on the planet, because carbon dioxide warms the planet. If carbon dioxide and water vapor and other things were not in the air, we would live on a frozen planet. So having the right amount of carbon dioxide is very important. Too much is a problem and that is what we are experiencing now.

The reason this works, carbon dioxide, it is like a greenhouse. You have heard of the greenhouse effect. It very much is like a greenhouse. Carbon dioxide allows energy in but does not allow energy out. It is like a pane of glass. Just like a pane of glass it has a certain attribute. And scientists taught me this and I will share with you this trick, how this works.

CO₂ is like glass in that it allows light energy to come in but not go out. It is like a one-way door. And the reason it is like that is that CO₂ molecules block ultraviolet rays of light, light at a certain spectrum, excuse me, allows it in, allows ultraviolet rays from the sun in to the Earth, and that is the warming component coming in. But when light bounces back into space, it bounces back at a different frequency, at infrared frequencies.

It holds the energy in and that is good to a certain degree, but the problem is now is that the carbon dioxide levels in the air have gone up dramatically and so we have a thicker blanket on the Earth trapping this energy to a significant degree. Let me talk about now how significant that is.

The numbers I am now going to talk about are also fact. They are not abstractions or hypotheticals. This chart

basically shows the CO₂ concentrations in a red line. This is the most disturbing red line that I know of in the world today in the long term because what it shows is for the last thousand years what the carbon dioxide levels were on this red line, and that is expressed in parts per million, how many molecules of CO₂ per million there are in the atmosphere.

If you see a thousand years earlier it was about 280, 278 parts per million on the left side of the chart. We know this because it is pretty amazing. We have air from that period, because there are trapped air bubbles that were trapped by these glaciers a thousand years ago. Scientists drill a core into the ice and they get those little air bubbles and they put them on a device that measures the concentration of CO₂ and you know exactly how much CO₂ there was. So this is a very precise measurement.

So we know a thousand years ago CO₂ levels were 278 or 280. You will see the next hundred years are about the same. The next hundred about the same. The next hundred there are some minor deviations 500 or 600 years ago. They are staying about the same. Then about a hundred years ago we started to see an uptick of CO₂ levels starting to rise. Something happened about a hundred years ago or a little more than a hundred years ago causing carbon dioxide levels to rise.

What happened is we started to burn coal and oil. When we burn coal it puts carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. So those levels of carbon dioxide started to go up, and they kept going up and now they are going up at a rate unprecedented in global history. As far as we know this is the fastest rate of CO₂ acquisition or increase in global history. And what we see now is we are now up to about 370, I believe it is about 378 parts per million. So we have gone from about 275 a thousand years ago and just in the last hundred years we have gone up about half of that again up to about 373, 378 parts per million. So we were a third or half, depending on how you categorize that number, higher than we were and what are called pre-industrial times.

Now, why is that important? Well, it is pretty obvious. If CO₂ captures heat and it traps heat and you increase the carbon dioxide, you are going to increase the energy that is trapped in the Earth and the temperature of the Earth if it is not used in some other fashion. And that is indeed what has happened. We see temperatures spikes shown in these blue areas. And the blue shows the variations and, of course, the temperature does vary to some degree from year to year and even decade to decade. But what we see is we have had a corresponding increase in temperatures on the Earth as well.

The scientific community has come together to tie those two together, and frankly it makes sense to me that if you increase carbon dioxide by a third, as much as you had in pre-industrial times, it is likely you are going to trap

energy in the Earth, and that is exactly what has happened.

It is not just the last thousand years that this correlation has taken place. I want to show a chart which is also observational evidence. This is a chart that is very similar. It shows carbon dioxide levels again in the red line and temperatures in the blue only it goes back 400,000 years. It takes us back further in time. And what we see is that 400,000 years ago we were about 250 and the red line went down and went up and went down and it went down and it went up. And you will notice corresponding changes in the temperature at the same time. When carbon dioxide has gone down, the average temperatures have gone down. Notice we have had some deviation over the 400,000 years.

Carbon dioxide levels have gone up and down. But also notice this, they have never in the last 400,000 years been as high as they are. This is the highest they have ever been, number one. And, number two, the rate of increase is now on this graph essentially a vertical line. The rate of increase of the amount we are putting of carbon dioxide is unprecedented in global history.

So if we look the projection is that if things remain the same we will be up to 550 parts per million by 2050, my kids' lifetime. And by 2100 we will be up to 1,280 parts per million taking a worst case projection. So however you slice it, we are going to have somewhere between a doubling of carbon dioxide and a quadrupling of carbon dioxide in the next hundred years compared to pre-industrial times.

This is bad news for the Earth because we have a system built on a climate regime consistent with somewhere around 300 part per million. And our crops, where our fish are, where we live, how much air conditioning we use, whether we are comfortable or hotter than heck will all change as these CO₂ levels skyrocket.

Now, these are observational issues, observational facts as well that I have given you. Obviously, this is a projection but one that is based on the best available scientific evidence that we have.

Now it just in the atmosphere? No, it is not just in the atmosphere. One of the categorical things that our own oceanographic folks in the United States Government have been studying temperatures in the ocean as well because the ocean is a very efficient sink of energy. It is a storage battery for energy. What they have found is that ocean temperatures as well, and this graph is expressed in heat content rather than temperature, and that is watts per year per meters squared.

The ocean essentially going back from 1993 has had observational changes that have gone up dramatically, as this graph would show, to 2003 as well. And this is actually a piece that had fallen into the scientific puzzle to answer this question when we

have recently found huge amounts of energy essentially stored in the ocean.

Now, this is a concern because the ocean expands as it gets warmer. And if you live on the coastline as I do, the State of Washington, or around Florida or anywhere else for that matter, you need to be concerned about rising ocean levels, not like a tsunami but on a creeping basis, that could inundate significant parts of our coastline in the next hundred years. That expanding phenomenon of water is also increased by the melting of Greenland. And we have projections of anywhere from several centimeters to several meters in the next 100 to 150 years potentially inundating our coastlines. So we have not just the air but the water associated with these problems.

Now, I want to note how this, the things that have happened in the last 4 months that have nailed the nail in the coffin of debate about whether or not global warming has been caused by human, in part, by human-caused action.

□ 2230

Basically, I think that one of the major newspapers I was seeing had a headline that said "The Debate is Over: It's Fact." And I think that pretty much summarizes the state of this situation.

Arguing about whether or not global warming exists right now is a little bit like arguing gravity. It is something you could do several hundred years ago, but not today. We have a lot of questions about the extent, the rapidity, the rate of change, how much coastline will be inundated, how fast the West Nile virus will move north, how fast the tundra will melt. There are a lot of questions about how much and how fast; but the fact it is occurring, clearly, number one, is true; and, second, it is great cause for concern.

These are not abstractions. Our lives are changing today because of this. The ski industry in the Cascade Mountains in Washington essentially was shut down this year. My son is a ski patrolman. He worked for 3 days this year. There was no snow. And having no snow is consistent with what the models predict will become a significant problem for us in the future. And it is not just skiing; we get our irrigation water from there. We run our power in the Pacific Northwest from there. We are experiencing these problems today.

I talked to a friend of mine who went fishing off the coast of Washington. Not many salmon, because the water is six to eight degrees warmer than it has ever been. In fact, we are getting species that have never been seen off the Washington coast. Tuna. Certain species of tuna never seen before off the Washington coast before are now moving north along the coastline because of these warming temperatures.

If you go to Alaska, you will see houses that are falling down because the tundra is melting. And that is significant because the tundra, and this is

what is called a multiplier, a feedback effect, when the tundra melts because of warming, it releases enormous amounts of methane. Methane gas is frozen and stored in the tundra, and when it is released, methane gas itself is a global-climated gas. It is four times worse than CO₂. So when you melt the tundra, you accelerate the rate of change. Just like when you melt the ice, you accelerate the rate of warming.

And that is why the North has warmed up so much, because the ice has melted and now the light is absorbed by the dark land rather than reflected back into space. It is called the feedback loop that accelerates the rate of warming that is going on. So we have the native populations in Alaska now having to move their villages because of the collapse of their coastline. And they are seeing the day when they may not be able to hunt for seals any more because the ice is not coming close to the shoreline to support the sea life.

West Nile virus. You have seen these maps that show where West Nile virus has invaded the United States. It is not an accident that some of these diseases are moving north that are carried by mosquitoes, because those insects are moving north. It is not an accident that you are seeing these horrendous fires in the western United States, because the trees have no moisture in them and they are also dying because of beetle infestations.

Why did these beetles all of a sudden show up? These trees have been there for eons. Why all of a sudden are these forests being killed by these insect infestations? Well, one thing we can say is that the milder winters allow these insects to live. So our forests are significantly affected by this situation.

The point I am making is that when you grow a garden in Seattle, Washington, right now, you notice that flowers are coming up earlier. That might be a good thing, but it is not so good a thing if it means we are not someday going to be able to grow wheat in southern regions of the Midwest because it will not support that type of vegetation. So the point is there are real things happening today; and, sadly, we are not responding to them.

Coming back to the pieces of the puzzle that have come into play very recently, there has been a lot of debate about global warming; and as many things in science do, we have advanced from questions to hypotheses to theories to observations to arguments to debates to consensus. There is a consensus in the worldwide scientific community that humans are now playing a role in climate change that is assuredly affecting the globe. And in the last several months, there have been several major studies by very well accredited organizations that have come up with pieces to that puzzle.

For instance, in the last 2 weeks, the Royal Academy of Science in Britain

completed a study of the acidity in our world's oceans. Now, the acidity of our world's oceans are affected by the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere that is then dissolved in the ocean. Because carbon dioxide, through a chemical reaction, can make the world's oceans more acidic. They are a little bit alkaline-based now.

Now, the Royal Academy of Sciences goes back to Isaac Newton, I think. Talk about a prestigious group. How are you going to argue with this group? They have concluded that there is a very significant increase in the acidity of the world's oceans because of the increased carbon dioxide going into the atmosphere. That amount, if I understand this correctly, is almost a 30 percent increase in the acidity. It is still alkaline, but it is becoming more acidic, and it is going down in a PH level from, and my numbers may not be correct, if you want to check this, you can go on a Web site called realclimate, it is either dot-org or dot-com, which should give you the numbers. But it is a logarithmic scale. You can see it has gone from 8.5 to 8.2 or 8.1.

Now, that does not sound like much, but it is a logarithmic scale, which means about a 30 percent change, which is significant. And that is significant because life in the ocean, our coral reefs or shellfish, or anything that makes calcium-based covering, like shells and corals, depends on that level of acidity to allow their life forms to exist.

Our coral reefs now are in deep trouble because of temperature. We have had massive bleaching, which is basically the death of coral reefs. They have a life form that builds the reef, and those have died just because of the warmer water. But the changes in the acidity levels, the PH levels, is also a means of mortality for our reef system. Many scientists are very concerned that this could greatly upset the balance of life in our oceans associated with anything that essentially uses calcium that is affected by the PH levels in the water.

So there is one thing that has changed. The National Academy of Sciences, secondly, America's most prestigious organization, and a pretty conservative group, not known for wild ideas, in the last several months came out and said that they had a consensus that human activity is a significant factor in global warming. A significant second thing.

Third thing. A study done of the world's oceans by a third group concluded that the salinity of our oceans is changing significantly because of this fresh water melt coming off from Greenland. When Greenland melts and the Arctic melts, that fresh water goes somewhere. It goes in the ocean and changes the salinity levels because that ice is melting.

Fourth. We have seen significant localized temperature differences of varying significant degrees, six to eight degrees off the coast of Washington, for instance. Those are just

things in the last several months that are occurring.

Now, what they add up to is a picture of a changing globe, one that we are partially responsible for and one that we do not know exactly where it is going. I talked to a scientist down in South America who is studying the rain forest; and he is finding that the vines, now this was in Panama, and he was one of the first guys that had a crane and they put these big cranes up and the crane goes around, they have a little basket and they can look at the top of the rain forests. I went up in one of those cranes. They cover about 2½ acres of ground. It is amazing being up there.

This scientist told me that in studying the rain forest, what they have found is that the type of vegetation in the rain forest is changing dramatically because of the increasing CO₂ levels in the atmosphere. What we see on this chart at first seems like an abstraction; but when you see these CO₂ levels going up dramatically in the atmosphere, that is not just an intellectually interesting point. It means a change in our world.

What it means in the rain forest, this scientist told me, I think his name was George, though I cannot remember his last name, is that certain plants metabolize carbon dioxide better than others and they grow faster than others. What they found is the parasitic plants, the plants that basically use other plants for a structure, like vines, and the vines are called lianas, and the lianas are increasing their rate of growth explosively and are sort of taking over the canopy of the rain forests.

So when we went up there, you could see these places where the canopy of the rain forest was just covered with vines. He told me that 25 years ago that was simply not the case. So what we are seeing is major changes in vegetation patterns in certain places associated with carbon dioxide as well.

So what do we conclude from this? Well, I think that we need to exercise common sense. What this scientist told me, and I thought his characterization of this problem was one of the most sort of commonsense ones I have heard, he said we are now engaged in the largest experiment in human history, and we are the guinea pigs. And he meant by that that this whole global warming experiment that we are conducting in the world, we are the ones likely to be affected by it in ways we cannot fully predict.

In other words, we cannot fully predict the year we will not be able to grow wheat in the southern Midwest. We cannot predict that. We cannot predict the year we will not be able to power our electrical turbines in the Pacific Northwest because of the lack of snowpack, or the year that we will have a 20 percent reduction. We cannot predict when that will happen. We cannot predict the year that malaria will spread significantly north in various environments. We really cannot predict

when that will be. We cannot predict when we will have to move the villages in the Arctic because of the receding shoreline. We cannot predict the dates those things will happen, but we are running this large craps game about what we are doing with our Earth by continuing in this course of putting carbon dioxide in the air in this steady curve.

And now I am going to come to what this Congress has to do with this. What the United States House of Representatives, and there are 435 people who work here, 100 over in the Senate, and there is one President and one Vice President, what that group has decided pretty much, at least the majority at the moment, what they have decided is that this explosion of carbon dioxide, this enormous ramp-up of carbon dioxide that has never happened before in the Earth's history as far as we know, that is having these prolific changes on life forms across the world is just hunky-dory and that we can just take our chances.

This U.S. Congress has decided to just roll the dice and let it happen, no matter what is going to happen. We do not have either the insight or the instinct or the willingness to do anything about this problem. And I stand here tonight to say that anybody that spends just a few minutes, just a few minutes acquainting themselves with the recent science on this issue will come away with the conclusion that inaction on this problem is massively irresponsible to our grandchildren and our great grandchildren, and in some parts of the world to ourselves.

That is the situation that is happening in the U.S. Congress because we do not pay attention enough to the science that has shown the conclusion that we have a problem on our hands. This Congress has done nothing about this problem. The President is not willing to deal with this problem. Disappointing. He ran for office saying he was going to support a carbon dioxide cap so we could put at least some limitation on the carbon dioxide we put out. He ran for President telling the American people he would do that, and he has not done a single thing about global warming in the 5 years he has been in office.

There is no excuse for that dereliction of duty. None. He owes us better. And we are capable of doing better because we are the smartest, most technologically oriented people in the world. We owe ourselves and our kids a solution to this problem.

□ 2245

Now what has the President said he was going to do about this problem. Here is what he said he is going to do. He says he is going to have a voluntary program where he will ask major players to volunteer to solve this problem.

Well, you can run a PTA bake sale on a voluntary basis, but you cannot reorient the energy policy of America on a volunteer bake sale. It is a joke. It is

a sham. We would rather have the President just admit that he refuses to do anything about this problem. That would be straightforward. But this volunteerism is nothing but a scam. We need to act. We need to do some common-sense things to deal with this CO₂.

Why am I suggesting we have a cap on carbon dioxide. The reason is what we have found is when we cap these pollutants, it works. We have had what is called a cap-in-trade system now for over a decade for sulfur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide. That has been very successful. It has limited those two pollutants without damaging our economy one hoot. And yet this pollutant, the one that is going off the charts, the President refuses to do anything about. We need a CO₂ cap to lead us in ways that we can reduce our contributions of CO₂.

Now there are some other common-sense things we can do. Unfortunately, we have not done them. We can improve the mileage we get from our vehicles. The reason we know that is we have done this. We know that Congress can effectively increase the mileage of our vehicles. If you look at this graph that shows the mileage our vehicles have gotten, as we increase our mileage, we reduce our CO₂ emissions.

In 1975, our cars got 14 miles to a gallon. And then the Congress and the President acted in a bipartisan to increase mileage. In 1984 it got up to 24.5 miles a gallon. Trucks also went up. The average almost doubled. We almost doubled our mileage because we decided to do so. We took some common-sense measures to increase our mileage.

Then in 1985 the Federal Government went to sleep and the Federal Government refused to take any further action to increase mileage, and mileage went down. The average mileage of our total fleet, cars and trucks, had gone down in 1985. Since 1985, we have mapped the human genome, we have invented the Internet and applied it to great usage, and yet the mileage manufacturers provide us has gone down since 1985. We can do better than this.

I am 6 feet 2 inches, 200 pounds and driving a hybrid car that gets in excess of 40 miles a gallon. It is safe, it is comfortable. We can do better.

If we inflated our tires to the manufacture recommended level, we would save more gas than we will ever get out of ANWR if we destroy that area through drilling. So there are things that we can do.

I want to suggest a solution, and that is we can pass the New Apollo Energy Project, a bill that I have introduced with other Members of the House. The New Apollo Energy Project will have an aggressive technologically based way to solve this problem, and it will do that by using what America is great at, which is our creative genius. And the reason we call it the New Apollo Energy Project, it is to kindle the spirit that we had when John F. Kennedy stood right behind me on May 9, 1961,

and he challenged America to go to the moon in 10 years and return a man safely. That was very daring. We had not even invented Tang yet, and our rockets were blowing up on the launch pad. But he did it because President Kennedy understood one thing about the American character, he understood that Americans are genius when it comes to innovation, and that Americans love a challenge.

We need now a bold vision and a challenge to America to invent our way out of this difficulty, to invent the new clean, renewable energy sources that can help solve this problem, to invent the new, more efficient cars, refrigerators, air conditioning units, building, houses, you name it, in a way to use energy more efficiently.

We know if we do that, and the New Apollo Energy Project will do that, we will harness the talent of America to get that done. The reason that we are suggesting this is not just global warming, there are two things that the New Apollo Energy Project will do.

Number one, it will break our addiction to Middle Eastern oil. We know that the energy bill that passed the House, a sordid affair that gave 94 percent of \$8 billion, 94 percent of the bill that this Chamber passed, I voted against, 94 percent of the \$8 billion of taxpayer money went as a direct subsidy to the oil and gas industry, to the most profitable industry in America, to an industry that is getting over \$60 a barrel for fuel.

Hooking our wagon to the oil and gas industry to try to drill our way out of this problem is simply doomed for failure. The reason it is doomed for failure is that the oil is not here, it is elsewhere. We only have 3 percent of the world's oil supply, but we generate 25 percent of the world's CO₂ production. The oil simply is not here. Dinosaurs went somewhere else to die, actually leafy vegetation material. They went mostly to the Mideast, to Venezuela and Indonesia and off the coast of Norway, but not here. So we are chasing a losing proposition here to try to drill our way out of this problem.

Besides, even if it was here, we would be competing with China now with this huge new economy to compete for this new resource. No, this is a failure just waiting to happen. So this 94 percent solution is money that is not going to solve our energy problems.

The New Apollo Energy Project, by contrast, will say we do not have to think about what the Saudi Royal House thinks about our public policy. When we make a decision on the Middle East, we will be free of that. We will not have to face the prospect of our sons and daughters dying in the Middle East again. We have lost enough. Now it is time to get serious about this, and an oil and gas driven policy is not a serious energy policy, it is a sham.

But this New Apollo Energy Project will have a third and very important benefit. It will grow jobs in this coun-

try. You have to ask yourself why are we letting the jobs to build fuel efficient cars go to Japan. Those cars should be union jobs here in the United States. Why are we letting jobs go to Germany for solar cell production, they should be here in the United States.

The New Apollo Energy Project is as American as apple pie because it means American jobs. Two causes for optimism in that regard, and a lot of people think when we talk about new energy that somehow it is just pie in the sky, but they really have not paid attention to look at the science that is going on in new energy.

What we find, and these are graphs of the prices of renewable energy systems in the last 30 years or so. What we see is that all of these new technologies have come down in price dramatically. We look at wind here that in 1980 was 30 cents a kilowatt hour, is down to about 4, 5, 6, and is projected to continue to go down.

In my neck of the woods, wind is a huge new growth industry. We are putting in North America's largest wind farm in southeast Washington, a utility very close to where I live. It is essentially market based in a lot of places.

We see photovoltaics have gone by a factor of about 5 in the last 30 years, from 100 cents a kilowatt hour down to about 22 now and projected to go further.

Biomass has gone from 12 down to 7 or 8; solar thermal has experienced the same thing.

What we have found is while oil has been going up, renewables have been coming down, and renewables are somewhat more expensive today, most of them still, than fossil fuels. But that is not going to last long because China is coming on, and if you have seen what has happened to the price of oil, we are going to be in an international bidding war with the Chinese economy, and that price is going to continue to go up. We have something cheaper in these technologies which have become more cost based because they have become more efficient, and we use scales of economy. Every time we build one of these, the price goes down.

Let me show you the house of Mr. and Mrs. Alden Hathaway in Virginia. It was built for about \$365,000. A little more expensive than a normal house, although not much. By using solar panel roof, passive energy, an in-ground heat pump, decent design, net energy consumption used by fossil fuels is zero. Zero.

It is a comfortable home. I have seen it. It would not stand out in any neighborhood, a place to be proud of, and has zero energy consumption. And the secret is they have net metering. When the sun is shining, and even through clouds it works, certain levels of clouds. It feeds electricity back into the grid and their meter runs backward. You sell your energy back to the utility, and they have to pay you for it

when we pass my bill, the New Apollo Energy Project.

The point I have is this is real. It is out there today. It is happening. I read in this morning's newspaper about a fellow developing a senior citizen housing complex with essentially the same technology in Thurston County, Washington. This is with us. All this Congress has to do is to listen to the science, be optimistic about American technological development, and have just a little bit of common sense to act in a positive way in the future.

Unfortunately, it has not done that yet, but I stand tonight to say that with this emerging science, with the clarity that has emerged about the threat of global warming, with our positive view about the confidence we have in America's technological ability, we are going to solve this problem. It is doable, it is achievable. The New Apollo Energy Project will help to do that.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3199, USA PATRIOT AND TERRORISM PREVENTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. INSLEE), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-178) on the resolution (H. Res. 369) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3199) to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3070, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. INSLEE), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-179) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3070) to reauthorize the human space flight, aeronautics, and science programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

31ST BLACK ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my fellow colleagues and Greek Cypriots through the world in remembering the 31st anniversary of the tragic invasion and occupation of Cyprus by Turkish armed forces.