

designed to engender more self-censorship among other WHO country representatives when they comment publicly on the intersection of U.S. trade and WHO public-health policies.

A large number of WHO staff members are employed on renewable 11-month contracts, meaning that their standing inside the organization is on perpetually shaky ground and hence curbs their ability to voice critical opinions.

Aldis, a U.S. national and permanent WHO staffer, was known among his colleagues for privately airing views critical of the Bush administration and its policy toward the WHO, particularly in relation to the U.S. government's alleged tendency to mix its commercial and public-health agendas.

Aldis reportedly chafed at WHO regional headquarters' instructions to receive representatives from U.S. corporations and introduce them to senior Thai government officials to whom the private company representatives hoped to sell big-ticket projects and products.

In recent months, major U.S. companies such as pharmaceutical giant Pfizer and technology company IBM have asked the WHO in Thailand to facilitate access to senior Thai officials. In turn, some senior WHO staff members have expressed their concerns about a possible conflict of interests, as the requested appointments were notably not related to any ongoing WHO technical-assistance program with the Thai government.

It's not the first time that the U.S. has played hardball with the WHO and Thailand. In 1998, when member nations proposed that the WHO be granted more power to monitor international trade agreements and their effects on global public health, particularly in relation to the access to patented medicines in developing countries, the U.S. government threatened to withhold funding to the organization.

Under that financial threat, the WHO has since largely refrained from commenting critically on the drug-patent issue. International and independent non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as Oxfam and Medecins Sans Frontieres have filled the WHO's leadership vacuum on the issue by filling the information gap with highly critical research reports.

From the United States perspective, Aldis, and by association the WHO, had publicly sided with Thailand on the pivotal drug-patent debate during a crucial stage in the FTA negotiations. Washington reportedly hopes that the comprehensive deal it is pursuing with Thailand will serve as a template for other bilateral trade pacts in the region, including soon-to-be-negotiated deals with Malaysia and Indonesia.

Thai civil-society groups, meanwhile, have complained about the lack of transparency surrounding the negotiations, which caretaker Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra has unilaterally conducted without consultations with parliament.

The U.S. and Thailand have in the past sparred over the Thai government's decision to use its WTO-approved compulsory licensing rights to produce certain generic antiretroviral drugs for HIV carriers and AIDS sufferers. In 2001, for example, Washington threatened retaliatory trade sanctions, including curbs on sensitive Thai export products, if the Thai government allowed the production of certain generic antiretroviral drugs.

Thai activists, meanwhile, have given certain U.S. pharmaceutical companies legal fits. In 2001, for instance, they challenged the legality of U.S. pharmaceutical company Bristol Meyer Squibb's patent over the antiretroviral drug didanosine, or DDI, because it was originally developed by a public

U.S. agency, the National Institutes of Health.

In 2002, a Thai court cited international statutes when it ruled that Thai HIV/AIDS patients could be injured by patents and had legal standing to sue if drug makers holding patents restricted the availability of drugs through their pricing policies.

The verdict was upheld in January 2004, and as part of an out-of-court settlement, Bristol Meyer Squibb decided to "dedicate the [DDI] patent to the people of Thailand" of that particular version of the drug by surrendering it to the Thai Department of Intellectual Property.

The dedication, however, did not carry over to third countries. Under the provisions of a U.S.-Thai FTA, future legal challenges to U.S.-held drug patents would be nearly impossible, Thai activists and international NGOs contend.

Lee's unexpected death has already engendered some serious soul-searching inside the WHO. Lee was widely lauded after his death, but his final legacy to the organization he served for 23 years is very much in doubt.

U.S. President George W. Bush said, "Lee provided tremendous leadership to the international community as it confronted the challenges of the 21st century." U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, Microsoft founder Bill Gates and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter all made similar eulogies to Lee's long commitment to improving global public-health standards.

Lee frequently denied allegations that U.S. political pressure influenced his decision-making, most notably perhaps during a recent television interview with the British Broadcasting Corp. However, it is just as likely that Lee will be remembered for the many times he caved to U.S. pressure on crucial public-health issues, frequently in areas where WHO positions and commitments required that he take a stronger stand, some WHO officials contend.

Moreover, the secretive way that Lee sometimes conducted WHO business, apparently in some instances at the United States behest, already has some officials inside the U.N. agency talking about the need for greater transparency and accountability under the next director general. "It will be very rough waters ahead for the new [director general]," said a Geneva-based WHO official, speaking on condition of anonymity.

As the United States strong influence over Lee comes into posthumous light, the selection process for his replacement will almost certainly be politicized along rich- and poor-country lines, and if the U.S. openly pushes its favored candidate, that divide could widen into a full-blown schism inside the traditionally cohesive organization. Those sharp lines are already emerging.

A report by a WHO-mandated independent commission recently recommended that as a general rule governments should avoid bilateral free-trade treaties that reduce access to medicines in developing countries. An annex to that report, signed by mainly Western experts who adhered to positions held by big pharmaceutical companies, highlighted the glaring differences in opinion emerging among WHO member states.

For its part, the U.S. has long advanced the argument that without strong intellectual-property protection, the pharmaceutical industry will not have the commercial incentive to conduct research and development for crucial new medicines.

However, Brazil and Kenya recently claimed that about 90 percent of total global health-related research and development of Western pharmaceutical companies went toward addressing the medical needs of about 10% of the world's population. Those two countries have since called on the WHO to

adopt systems for intellectual-property protection that would increase developing countries' access to health innovations and medicines.

WHO staffers say they resent what they view as the United States political agenda toward vital public-health concerns, ranging from reproductive-health issues to promoting good dietary standards.

At the 2004 World Health Assembly (WHA), the U.S. broke with the meeting's proposed resolution that reproductive and sexual rights should be considered human rights, and strongly protested the meeting's focus on the public-health risks of unsafe abortions. Lee had earlier that year held up a list of essential WHO-recommended medicines drafted by an independent expert committee for more than two months because of U.S. objections about two listed abortifacient drugs that could be used to induce abortions in emergencies.

The U.S. delegation to another recent WHA took issue with a WHO-proposed diet and health resolution, particularly concerning the acceptable level of sugar content in foods, which by the WHO's expert assessment would have cast U.S. fast-food and soft-drink companies in an unfavorable light. Lee famously bent to the U.S. objections and signed off on a significantly watered-down version of the original resolution.

U.S. interference with U.N. personnel and policy decisions, of course, isn't an entirely new phenomenon. The U.S. is the largest donor to the U.N. and by association to the WHO, and in light of the U.S.-inspired events in Bangkok, senior WHO representatives throughout the organization are likely to be more guarded when commenting on public health issues that Washington considers sensitive.

The Bush administration's tactics, often cloaked as reform measures, in reality aim to bring U.N. agencies like the WHO more in line with U.S. commercial and political interests.

At the WHO, at least, that process has come at the expense of the U.N. agency's stated mission, commitments and, perhaps most significant, its global credibility as an impartial and apolitical actor.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Interstate Highway System.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2012. An act to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act for fiscal years 2006 through 2012, and for other purposes.

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your courtesy in giving me a few extra minutes to get here.

What I want to do this evening, and I am a little short on extra Members and we are going to see how that evolves over the next few minutes, but I want to begin the discussion on an issue that I think is really incredibly important to each and every one of us in this country. And certainly as Members of Congress representing so many people, constituents come to us, I think, every day, and they may not say, what are you doing about energy, but they certainly come to us and say, What is going on with the high price of gasoline? We go to the pump. We see the price going up, sometimes more than one time in a day, and we have seen prices well over \$3 a gallon.

And what we know, of course, is that consumers are paying 100 percent more than they were paying 5 years ago. The price at the pump was about \$1.44, \$1.50, the average price of gasoline 5 years ago; and now we are seeing prices certainly well over \$3 a gallon. And this is at the same time, of course, that we are seeing record profits from the oil industry. And certainly my constituents say to me, What is going on? What can we do about this? Why isn't something more happening? And they do understand there are some causes of this, but what I would like to discuss this evening is what is going on and what we have been doing about it and what we have not been doing about it that we should.

I think that is really what I am most concerned about as I see these issues in my district, not only for gasoline. We are not in the right season yet, but we certainly know that home heating oil and home heating fuel has gone up as well. In fact, I commissioned a study in Pennsylvania to see what the price was for home heating oil last winter, and we saw increases on the average in Pennsylvania of over \$700 a year for a family. That is a lot of dollars, particularly for somebody on a fixed income, young families struggling to make ends meet, and, of course, making some of the choices are really very difficult for families. And, in fact, what we are hearing is that families are telling us that it matters, that they have seen a real effect when they see transportation and home heating costs going up an average of 75 percent increase over what they saw even in 2001.

So what are we seeing? What are we doing about this? What do we expect to do? There is certainly discussion on the floor about this issue. And I know, as Democrats, we have stood and really made quite a few suggestions, some very specific as far as what we can do immediately. The one specific one, of course, was what about price gouging? Are we seeing the price of gasoline go up because, in fact, there was some inappropriate, illegal activity? We have some preliminary information about that. Unfortunately, we do not have a Federal definition of price gouging; so it has been really difficult to be able to say specifically whether, in fact, that is really what has been going on.

And what can we do more immediately to help make sure that the oil industry is doing all that it can to get us more affordable gasoline? But there is no question that those are short-term solutions. Those are not long-term solutions. And what many of us feel is that we should be acting on long-term solutions and we should have been doing it already, and why are we not doing it today, because what we do today matters next year, the year after, and for years in the future.

So what are we doing to make sure that there is an adequate supply of energy in this Nation? Are we smart enough to be doing the kind of innovation and research that we know we need to do to be able to do this? Of course the answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we are; that the answer has to be to diversify our energy sources, to look at the different ways, the innovations, that are out there and bringing different kinds of fuel to our vehicles and to our homes. And we have seen that already. We have had numbers of our Members talk about biofuels and the opportunity for ethanol. We have just seen in my region of the country, and we have seen it elsewhere in the country, the fact that we now have mixed gasoline and ethanol. We have 5 percent ethanol coming into our tanks in the Philadelphia area. That switch was just made a couple of months ago.

But we also know that you can have a flexible fuel vehicle, you can fuel your vehicle with 85 percent ethanol. Well, that is made out of corn in this country. Does that mean we reduce our reliance on foreign oil? Absolutely. And should we be doing more of that? How do we actually begin to make the kind of investments that really would matter where we can actually say we are using the kind of research, the kind of smart scientists, the engineers, the innovation that exists in this country to bring new fuel options to our vehicles and to all of us so that we have a diversity, we have more choices as consumers?

And then, in fact, there was an article in the *Inquirer* just this morning that the oil executives themselves are saying this is a question of supply. It is also a question of demand. If there is less demand, that would make a difference in price as well. A report I heard said if we could just reduce demand by 3 percent in this country, we could, in fact, start to see a reduction in prices.

So we have some real opportunities here. And of course long term if we can start to look at biofuels to be able to get them going, be able to get the production up really much faster, then we really have the opportunity to bring down the cost of fuel in this country for our automobiles.

Now, of course, tied to that there is something many of us also believe, and that is that we ought to be calling on the automobile manufacturers to produce more fuel-efficient vehicles, more hybrids, more flexible fuel vehi-

cles, and more gasoline-driven vehicles that are more fuel efficient. And they can do it. They know how to do it. We need to make them do it more quickly and to be able to create that option for us so that we as consumers, all of my constituents, all of my fellow Congressmen's constituents, all Americans, have greater flexibility and can make choices about what are the right kinds of vehicles for them to drive, what is the most fuel-efficient way for us to be handling our own transportation needs.

So I will just say that those are just some of the ideas. In fact, there are so many ideas. This is one of the things that when constituents ask, what can you do, I say we should be investing in serious ways in this country in these new technologies. And then we should be insisting that our automobile manufacturers and our purchasers, as well, start to participate in this. There are so many ideas out there.

I see a colleague of mine has joined us, and I am excited about that because he is someone who is very knowledgeable about this whole area and what we could be doing. But when we see the city of Philadelphia that I represent, that the new city buses they are buying are hybrid buses, that can make a really big difference. All of our cities should be doing that. All of our communities should be doing that. What about school buses? What can we do to make them more fuel efficient? These are things that we really need to be working on.

And I will say two of the things I have only been focusing on, access to the energy we need and to price and the concern that consumers have on that, but there are two other aspects of this that are very critical for us to understand, and that is that of course it has an environmental effect if we continue to burn fossil fuels at the rate we have been doing that, we actually continue the kind of pollution we have. We cannot just have rhetoric about reducing emissions. We need to take it really seriously if we plan to protect this Earth we live in and protect the environment and the consequences that we have seen of some of the changes in the environment, the increasing number of storms.

Hurricane Katrina is, of course, one of the examples that is in all of our minds; and we are just approaching, of course, a new hurricane season.

□ 1900

The third point I was going to make in addition to cost and availability of fuel and the energy we need as well as the environmental effects is, of course, the third area, which is our national security. We all understand, I hope we do increasingly understand, our reliance on foreign oil. Sixty percent of the oil that we use is imported. We need to reduce, if not eliminate, our reliance on foreign oil. It changes the relationships that we have with nations that are not always friendly to us.

So we need to have a much different relationship to foreign oil than we do,

and that is we have to end our reliance on foreign oil. But that is not going to be done unless we start to really seriously invest in alternative fuels and renewable energy sources, both for our vehicles, and, of course for our homes as well.

So I am going to ask my colleague to join us.

I did want to also say that I hope we can in our discussion also get to a little bit of a discussion about what consumers can do. What can individual Americans do that could really change the way we use energy; put more pressure on us, on Congress, to create those alternatives?

Someone asked me, well, where can you buy ethanol-mixed gasoline? Where can you buy E85 in Pennsylvania? Well, the answer is there is one station in Lancaster, and there is one station in Pittsburgh. If you live in Philadelphia, that is a very long to drive to fill up your tank and not acceptable.

So we need to be kick-starting this. We need to not just do a little bit; wouldn't that be nice, let's do that little project over there, let's see how that goes. We need to make a serious investment that changes dramatically the kind of energy options that we have for our automobiles, for our homes, for our daily lives. And only by doing that will we be able to protect the environment for the future, will we be able to end our reliance on foreign oil, will we be able to bring down the cost of energy for our cars and for our homes.

If we don't do it now, we are going to be having this same discussion, only more seriously, in the years to come.

So, as Democrats we have had a number of proposals, but one of the leaders in really putting forward a new energy policy for this country, and it is a wonderful one, it is called the New Apollo Energy Act, I guess we would like to see if it gets to be an act, and I would want to really encourage it, and I am delighted that my colleague Congressman JAY INSLEE has joined us to talk a little bit about what that would do and how it would get us started in a very, very serious way in changing the way we create the energy for ourselves, for our homes and for our businesses.

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you. I am delighted that Ms. SCHWARTZ is leading this energy discussion tonight for two reasons. One, right now outside the Capitol there is a giant lightning storm going on, so talking about energy in the spirit of Ben Franklin is the right time to do it.

But, secondly, and more importantly, many of us here on the Democratic side of the aisle believe that America is ready for a project with the same scope and ambition and vision as we had with John F. Kennedy with the original Apollo project.

I have introduced H.R. 2828, which is called the New Apollo Energy bill, that basically is working on the belief that this Nation has the same gumption, the same technological prowess, the

same vision that we had in the 1960s when we decided, as challenged by John F. Kennedy from that rostrum on May 9, 1961, to say we were going to put a man on the moon in 10 years and bring them back safely.

We have now introduced this New Apollo Energy Project because we believe that the times that we now live in this decade are both as challenging and as promising as the 1960s were in space. We believe that the challenge we have to deal with energy is of the same scope as America had and Kennedy had dealing during the Cold War with the space race. We also believe that our ability to invent, to tinker, to innovate is as good or better as it was in the 1960s, and we need to have that same spirit with the New Apollo Project.

In fact, I was just reading before I came over here, one of my staff handed me the quote from Kennedy's speech, and one of the things that he said was, I think it was kind of interesting, he was talking about the need for America to be a leader in space. We believe America needs to be a leader, it is our destiny to be a leader, and what Kennedy said was, "If this capsule history of our progress teaches us anything, it is that man, in his quest for knowledge and progress, is determined and cannot be deterred. The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join in it or not. It is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space."

We believe, those of us who are propounding the New Apollo Energy Project believe, that we cannot be a leader of the world unless we decide that we are going to lead the world into a new energy future in this country and later in the world. And to do so, we believe that that is a challenge that is much more than nibbling on the edges.

We got to the moon because we had an aspiration of one giant leap for mankind, not just one little baby step for man. Frankly, this Congress and this administration to date, sadly to say, has been just nibbling on the edges. These tiny little inching forward as a baby would take their first little steps.

We both need and deserve more in this country, which is a very bold and visionary technological leap in energy. So we have introduced the New Apollo Energy Project, which will answer that bugle cry that this country has always answered to really leapfrog the existing technologies.

If I can just briefly describe some of the things we want to do. We want to achieve three ends in the New Apollo Energy Project. Number one, we want to lead the world economically. We want to create good, high-paying jobs in the new technologies of new energy that are right now, unfortunately, going overseas.

Unfortunately, we are losing jobs right now to some of the Japanese

automakers because of auto efficiency. We are losing jobs to some the German solar energy industries. We are losing jobs to Denmark. And I think Denmark is a great country, but to lose jobs to them to create these wind turbines makes no sense. The country that put a man on the moon, to allow other countries to lead in energy makes no sense. So one of the things we need to do is to bring the job growth right here.

The second thing we have to do is truly break our addiction to Middle Eastern oil. Although we laud the President for the first time suggesting after 6 years of urging him, has now suggested that he wants to join us to help to break the addiction to Middle Eastern oil, and that is great, but, unfortunately, the week the President said that, he laid off 150 or 100 researchers in renewable energy at the Boulder Energy Laboratory. So we would like to have some reality rather than rhetoric.

Third, we have to break this tendency to put more carbon dioxide in the air, to deal with global warming. The debate about global warming is over. It was a vigorous and strenuous debate, and it is done. The science of global warming is in, and we need now to really have technologies that will reduce CO₂ emissions.

I met the President of the Marshall Islands the other day, and he told me, he was on Bainbridge Island, I live on an island, Bainbridge Island, Washington, he told me that his entire nation may be environmental refugees because their entire nation is threatened by the rising sea levels together with the collapse of coral reefs.

We had a meeting with Stanford professors last week in the basement of this building, who told us in 100 years there may not be any viable healthy coral reefs in the world because the carbon dioxide we are putting in the air out of our tailpipes and coal-powered plants goes into solution in the ocean, it makes the oceans more acidic, and when they become more acidic, coral reefs cannot survive.

So we got to get these three jobs done. We have got a New Apollo Project to do it, and I would like to discuss it in depth.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. I just want to ask you a little more about that. I think sometimes for those of us who are not scientists out there, there is sometimes a feeling when you hear about that, it is what can we do about that? We need to use all of this energy. We need to use these fossil fuels. How am I going to get to my job? I mean, how can we possibly do this? How am I going to worry about the coral reefs? Why should I worry about that? What can we possibly do about it?

I think what you are saying, and I think what we need to really be talking about, is believe in ourselves as a country, to believe in how smart we

are, how capable we are, how innovative we are, and then to use those assets, which are really our people and how smart we can be, to say in fact we can fix it.

Just as you point out, we did create this space program. We did send to a man to the moon. We have actually even sent some women in space now, you know? But the fact is, I was just thinking about this as well, we have taken real problems, and we have solved them. We have solved some of these environmental problems.

So I wanted to ask you about that, because I think one of the things as I read your proposal I was so taken with is that it also understands that there probably isn't one answer. We don't even know exactly what all the solution is going to be, which I think would be great for Americans, because the fact is we like choices. So it may be that a hybrid vehicle works for me, and a more fuel-efficient vehicle that is not a hybrid works for you. Maybe a flexible-fuel vehicles works for you. Maybe I need a big car, or maybe I don't need a big car, depending on where we live, what kind of job we have. But really the question I have, too, as I look at your proposal is you really look at a lot of different ways to solve this problem and really take the science and use it. So talk about that, if you would. I think that is really important to hear.

Mr. INSLEE. I think you have put your finger on a very important principle as we go forward on energy debate. The debate in energy between those of us who believe in the New Apollo Project and those of us who do not is really a debate between the optimists and the pessimists.

The pessimists believe that we are tied to these really now ancient technologies. Fossil fuels is really an ancient technology. It is from the 1800s. It is old. We have been doing it for a long, long time.

Now, pessimists believe that we are stuck burning fossil fuels, and that is about as good as it gets.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. In fact, isn't that the President's solution, just more oil?

Mr. INSLEE. Just more oil. You just drill more holes in the ground. The problem with that is, unfortunately, for reasons that are past our understanding, the dinosaurs went to die under somebody else's sand. That seems so unfair to us. We use 25 percent of the world's oil, but we only have 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. We could drill in Yosemite, we could drill outside on the south lawn of the White House. The problem is, the oil is not there.

We use one-quarter of the world's oil, but we only have 3 percent of the reserves. So we can accelerate some exploration, but, unfortunately, the oil, frankly, is not there. So for one reason, it is just not there. But the pessimists believe that we cannot invent our way out of this pickle.

The optimists believe that we can do the same thing in energy as we did in

space. Just to harken back in history, when Kennedy said we were going to the moon on May 9, 1961, put that in historical perspective. Our rockets were blowing up on the launch pad. We had launched a softball in suborbital flight. Computers were as big as a room. He didn't know how we were going to get to the moon, but he did know a fundamental lesson of American psychology, which is we are the best inventors in human history, literally. Our culture, our society in America is the best inventive society in human history. So he recognized our ability to innovate.

Now, the New Apollo Energy Project that we have propounded delves on that. Let me just give you an example of just a couple things in my neighborhood.

It was in my paper this morning, in the Seattle Times, about a young man who has built a hybrid vehicle that uses an enhanced battery. It is a plug-in hybrid that has a little larger battery that he adds to the trunk. That car now gets 100 miles per gallon, 100 miles per gallon, and it is driving the streets of Seattle, Washington, today. The reason it does, you plug it in, it gets a little larger boost, it uses electricity now much greater than the gasoline. Now, it does use additional electricity, but it is getting 100 miles per gallon driving on the streets today. This technology exists.

Because of his efforts and some of these other groups that are pushing this, they are now pushing the auto industries to move faster to get to this plug-in hybrid technology. It is there.

We have the largest wind farm in North America being built today, 350-foot-tall towers in southeast Washington, that is generating over \$1.5 million over a several-year period for one farmer of a stream of revenue. This is great for farmers as well. It is going to produce enough electricity for 400,000 people.

□ 1915

We have the largest biodiesel plant in North America now is under design in southwestern Washington which will produce environmentally sound fuel for our cars and biodiesel. And biodiesel is great because it reduces the CO₂ emissions, because the CO₂ goes into the plant, we make oil out of it, and we don't put any net increase in carbon dioxide.

I just mentioned these three technologies out of hundreds that are now coming on.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. A couple things on what you say. One is that I think we also ought to make clear, and I know in your proposal and you are talking about it is that this isn't about a new big government program, this is about working with the private sector and helping innovation, on whether it is actually giving tax credits or helping to make some investment or helping to kick-start one of those ideas for a private company that

wants to do this and wants to explore doing it. That is who is doing it. But what they need is for us to help make that happen so that it doesn't take them 10 years before they grow just enough to be able to prove it to someone, to be able to take a risk.

And I think some of the proposals that as government we could just ensure that loan, so that, in fact, it helps some private bank be able to make that loan and risk it, because we don't know what is going to work. We know some things are working; we don't know which one is going to really take off. We know, again, even with the biofuels we have been talking about ethanol, but there is some suggestion we could use sugar, we could use switchgrass. There is a whole variety of other ways we can do this, the whole question about electric cars and whether that works and how we can do this. There is some other technologies out there, fuel cell technology that we could actually potentially use in cars.

So, again, what we are saying here is that we want to work with the private sector; we want to work with those scientists and innovators and entrepreneurs who will be able to take their ideas and then be able to keep tweaking them, if you will, to see what works, to see what takes off; and to work with our own automobile manufacturers to say, you want to scale it up not just another few cars, but a lot of cars, and how quickly can you do that? How can you make it? How can we keep making cars here that we want to buy, that we can afford to buy, that will use less fuel?

But it is working with the private sector with that innovation, allowing it to be quite dynamic, because we don't know which ones to choose so much. And that is even happening, as I mentioned this about the old-time fossil fuels. There are now clean-coal technologies. In Pennsylvania we are sort of interested in some of that, could that work? Could it help us get through the hump for the foreseeable future?

But I do think it is so important for us not to be so worried that we actually only think in the very narrowest ways about how we can solve the problem for next year or for the year after. This is really looking at both immediate solutions, but then long term, where are we really going with this, and why shouldn't we in America be the ones in the forefront of this? And that is what you are talking about, and I think that is very exciting.

Mr. INSLEE. And I want to dovetail on this point about this is good old American capitalism as work. We believe in the power of capitalism. You look at the space race, and it was not just governmental activity, it was a public-private partnership with private contractors operating in a profit margin or incentives that did help get us to the moon. And we believe the same type of activity can be part of the solution for energy.

And I have to tell you, one of the huge transitions going on in the U.S. economy right now is happening without necessarily government help, which is a huge influx of investment capital. We just had a startup company involving biofuels that was announced last week at one of the largest infusions of capital for some period of time this decade, and we are seeing that.

And we are also seeing an infusion of intellectual capital. I come from a part of the world that is very active in the Internet and software technologies. The Microsoft campus is in my district. And we are seeing a lot of intellectual capital now from software and Internet move over to the energy side. We have seen investments from some of the Microsoft family into biofuels.

I met an interesting fellow a few months ago who was involved in the commercialization of the MRI machine, the magnetic resonance imaging machine, and he made a bundle of cash on that commercialized product that now they put us in the tubes and diagnose our old knees when you get to be 55 and play basketball like I do. So this guy now is involved in perfecting a solar cell panel that is nonsilicone-based; it is based on an organic molecule that you essentially just spray on, and you can reduce the construction cost because silicone-based solar panels are fairly expensive to make. This could be just a spray-on application and potentially reduces the cost 20 to 30 percent.

So here is a fellow that has done well in one electronic business now making the transition to energy, and we are seeing a lot of that. But what we can do is we can help those businesses get a jump start, and one of the important things we can do on that is to offer loan guarantees to guarantee the loan of some of these new plants. We are now trying to hustle along a loan guarantee for a first cellulosic ethanol plant in the world, actually in the State of Idaho, and we are trying to get that loan guarantee perfected so that company can get up and running.

Those are the kinds of things that are an appropriate public-private partnership, along with the tax incentives. I sponsored a bill with Senator BARACK OBAMA called Health Care for Hybrids, and what it would do is to help the auto industry with some of their legacy health care costs in exchange for producing more fuel-efficient cars. So here is a two-for.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Absolutely. And I think that that says how good this can be for business, both the cost of the new businesses that are created as a result of what we are talking about, but I really also means jobs. Coming from Pennsylvania, and I was in the State senate for 14 years before coming to Congress, and we would often have a debate when we discussed some of these changes that we wanted to in terms of auto emissions and how we would respond to this, and what if we actually put more regulation on

businesses, wouldn't we lose jobs? And how will we be able to protect the environment and not lose jobs? And in Pennsylvania it was a really serious issue. And I remember having those debates on the floor of senate, and yet by not moving ahead, we, in fact, lost some of those jobs anyway and didn't create new ones.

And I think what we are talking about here is let us create those new jobs. If you have an innovative entrepreneur of a company, well, they are going to hire people who then get jobs that potentially will grow into more jobs and more jobs. And these are often skilled jobs, they are decent-paying jobs. And if as a result they end with a product, new energies, new ways for us to both fuel our vehicles and also heat our home, and at the same time reduce some of these really serious carbon emissions and be able to home-grow some of our energy, more of our energy, while we are really doing a lot, and we are at the same time reducing costs, we are reducing costs to our businesses. And now some will say to me, if we could just reduce the cost of our energy, well, then maybe I could hire that additional person that I am trying to do. You hear that all the time, just bringing down the cost of electricity or being able to bring down your home heating or heating for business, that action may produce enough residual money for someone to be able to create a new job or two or maybe many more jobs.

So I think we have to see this as just an extraordinarily potential win-win for all of us. And, again, creating that diversity of options for people and the kind of energy, maybe more choices, meaning that there will be a little more competition, means that prices might come down. That helps all of us. But I think what we have to say is this about creating new businesses, creating new jobs, and at the same time creating new sources of energy that could be both safer for the environment and also be able to be far more available without our having to have those serious kinds of negotiations that might get in the way of some of our more international relationships.

And this isn't about being an isolationist when we talk about other countries. The idea is to share some of these innovations. And we have seen that, too. Talk about the high-tech industry, well, it is actually some of our ideas that are now being produced elsewhere. But it is our ideas, and we need to work and bring all those ideas together, create those jobs, create those opportunities, and help our businesses be able to be competitive, because without reducing energy costs, they simply won't be able to.

Mr. INSLEE. It has been very sad to see technology originally developed in the United States, particularly solar cell technology, now being perfected and commercialized in Germany and other countries. To see that hemorrhaging of jobs is really a pathetic

statement of our inaction to have a national energy policy. And we effectively don't have a national energy policy right now, except to just sort of allow the status quo to stumble along.

There is one thing that is very clear about energy: Somebody is going to create millions of jobs and millions of dollars, and we want that to be Americans. In the 1960s, they had the missile gap. Remember, during the Nixon-Kennedy debate there was a debate about the missile gap. In a way, we have an energy technology gap right now that, frankly, other countries are getting a leg up on us. And the reason is, is that those countries have developed energy policies that have decided to leapfrog technologies and develop technologies there. We can't allow that gap to continue to widen. And that is why this New Apollo Energy Project, H.R. 2828, if you want to take a look at it, is going to answer this challenge.

When Kennedy set us forth in the original space race, it really was not for economic reasons, it was largely not for a job creation program. But if you look at what it did create, can you imagine had he not challenged America to start the original Apollo Project? We would not have a computer industry in this country, we would not have an Internet-based industry, we would not have a satellite-based industry. We would likely probably not have a nanotechnology-based industry. That has been the mainspring of economic development and job creation in this country.

So I think the important thing to realize about energy is we are not just acting to \$3 a gallon gas, we are not acting just to save the planet we live on from the ravages of global warming. We are doing it from a positive economic growth-oriented proposal. And I think you can honestly say that this is probably the best thing the U.S. Congress could do to really grow the U.S. economy right now, because it is the one thing that the world obviously needs. Our market is not just in America. When we develop a clean-coal technology, we want to sell that technology to the Chinese and to India. And assuming we can do that, there is enormous growth potential.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. I was going to bring up another aspect of all of this discussion. I think also that sometimes when people hear these kind of conversations, they think, well, it is not really about me. What can I do that would really affect carbon emissions in this world? You know, how can I actually help save the planet and create more energy sources?

But the fact is, and if we could just talk about this for a minute, there is a lot that people can do. And, again, I am reflecting back. I remember when we first started talking about recycling, and I remember some of my colleagues would say, well, no one is going to want to bother doing that. And now people are doing this all across the country, and it actually makes you

much more aware. It is something you can do. It saves cost at some level.

But when you think about what some individuals can do related to energy, and I thought we could talk about that. Again, if you are a business owner, there is so much you can do in your own plant potentially to be able to reduce your energy consumption so that you could reduce your costs. All of us know about if you can weatherize your home.

Well, I just went to visit a new building in my district that is actually on the campus of a university that they just built a green building. Well, I think I have seen green buildings, you know. They have sort of motion detector electric lights, or they have more efficient plumbing appliances and all that. But this building, actually the roof looked like it had grass on it. It had green plants on the roof. It was new to me. I didn't know that that existed. But they said this isn't new. This is something we are experimenting with, but, in fact, it is not just grass, it is a little more complicated than that. But it is going to reduce their need for heating and cooling that building dramatically. Dramatically. So if you could, I don't know what the number was, cut it in half, cut it 80 percent. They are trying to perfect this, of course.

My guess is that they are going to be able to come up with something as we experiment with these ideas that we can do in our homes, in our businesses, in our public spaces. And we should be leaders in that as public officials, as elected officials. This is something we should be doing because we know how important it is. And we know that we should learn from each other. We always talk about best practices. Well, we should start to scale up on this, as they say. We should start to say: If it is working in this State, why isn't it working somewhere else? And the States are innovative to change. We are interested to hear what you are talking about in terms of the State of Washington. We are proud in Pennsylvania that we have wind farms and they are working, that they are working, as I said, on clean coal, that we are creating incentives for businesses to be able to reduce their costs of energy.

Public transportation obviously is something we are not even getting into here, but some of the newer technologies on that.

But just to comment on what we can do. I know there is a Federal program, I don't think it is known well enough, called Energy Start, where you can buy more efficient appliances. Businesses can get credits, tax credits, for being more energy-efficient.

So as you pointed out, there are little starts here, but if we really want to get serious about this, we have to start talking about it, making it clear that everyone, every business, every family, and certainly our bigger businesses can really start to participate in this in a way that will start to really make the

kind of difference that will see us shifting to these new energy sources and reducing our reliance on foreign oil.

□ 1930

Mr. INSLEE. I would like to compliment you for bringing up the idea of efficiency and not wasting energy. Because one of the things when we talk about energy, it is very easy to just launch into how we are going to generate more energy in an environmentally clean way. Obviously, or maybe not so obviously, the best energy you can create is the energy you do not waste. That is, clean energy is saving dirty energy and not wasting it, and those of us who have studied this believe that 30 or 40 percent of this solution ultimately is using energy in a much more efficient way, as much as inventing new ways to generate it.

That starts at home, with weatherizing your home, as you have indicated, a pretty simple thing, and there are some simple, inexpensive things you can do. There are more expensive things one can do with insulation, green building; and the green building, we just had two young men design the greenest building. They won a national award. We are kind of proud of that. It uses passive solar heating.

They can use solar cell technology now. If you want to build a new home, you can buy shingles that have the solar cells incorporated right in the shingle. There is a home about 20 miles from where we are standing in Virginia that is a net zero user of electricity, and they use massive solar heating. It is a two story, looks like a nice little home you find in any suburban place around Virginia. They use an in-ground heat pump, integrated solar panels on the roof, solar sort of passive heating through the use of the windows and tiles that collect the heat. When they generate more electricity than they use, they feed it back into the grid. That home was built for no more money than an average home. They are using zero electricity off the grid on a net basis. So a family that is committed to this can do it today using even existing technology.

But you said something I thought was very interesting, too, and that is about businesses. We are fortunate to have some visionary business leaders who are already accomplishing what we need to do.

British Petroleum, under the leadership of Sir John Brown, they decided they were going to change their energy use, and this is an oil company. This is an oil company that decided to reduce their carbon dioxide emissions to actually meet the treaty goals of the Kyoto global warming treaty. They were not pessimists. They were not nay-sayers. They just decided to do it; and within 3 years, they met their Kyoto targets of a reduction in their CO₂, and, importantly to their shareholders, saved something like \$300 million in the process because when you do not waste energy you save yourself money.

General Electric, under the leadership of their CEO, has decided to make an enormous investment not only in the use in their CO₂ emissions but in developing these new high-tech, energy-efficient appliances that all of us are going to use.

So we have some business leadership; and regrettably what we do not have, we do not have leadership here in Congress, at least in the majority, who have not joined us optimists in breaking this addiction to oil and gas. The sad fact is that oil and gas still dominate the situation here in the House of Representatives; and until something changes, we are going to follow the leadership of the business community and people around this country who want to respond to this energy crisis individually that we are seeing.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Just to be a little political here for a moment, because you brought up, I think, how do we take what we are saying and make it happen. I mean, that really is sort of what we are talking about; and again, we are starting to sound sort of hopeful, optimistic, and it sounds like a lot of new terms for a lot of people, but I think we will increasingly get comfortable with some of this discussion. You know we can do that, and I think that is one of the reasons that I am on the floor tonight. It is one of the reasons that Mr. INSLEE joined me.

We want to get more familiar with this terminology. What are the alternative fuels? What are the choices they have? What is the flexible fuel vehicle? What are the kinds of options that I have out there in the future? What should I be asking for? How can I save energy at home? How can I save energy for business? How can we encourage businesses to do that? And what is the role of government in all of this?

I think what is exciting here is that there are so many of these ideas out there that if, in fact, we can encourage businesses to push even harder, to move even faster, push automobile manufacturers to higher fuel efficiency, if we went to 33-miles per gallon rather than 22 or whatever we sit at right now, we would save literally 2.6 million barrels of oil per day by 2025. You say, well, that is a long time from now. If we start now, we will start to do it. We should start to do it. We really have this opportunity to do it, and in fact, we know how to make those vehicles. We can make more fuel-efficient SUVs. So if Americans want to buy the SUVs, we can make them fuel efficient.

The fact is we have brought these ideas, brought them up as amendments and bills, and we want to work together to make this happen. This should not be a fight about do we ever use oil again or do we only go to you get to live in a green building or not. It is about moving all of us forward so that we can use less energy, use it more efficiently, bring down the costs for Americans, be more self-reliant. Knowing that we can do this, our role

is to recognize the innovation out there, to create the incentive, to encourage it to move much, much faster so, in fact, we can make this happen.

Occasionally we have to set some of the rules. I mean, sometimes we cannot bring people along. You do have to set rules out there to help make it happen, and to help make it happen much, much faster; but the fact is that this is very much a part of the Democratic agenda to be able to again use our innovation and to use our smarts to make this happen.

I see the pamphlet that you have, and I will maybe yield over, but I know one of the things we are talking about that we have not brought up today is we do need to encourage our young people to be well-educated in science and engineering and technology. We know that that is so important to our future for all of us that if we do not start making sure that our young people and some of the old people who are maybe going back to school or have some new training and education that we actually encourage this so that we do have the best and the brightest who are putting their minds to this work, and that is what we are hoping to make happen as well.

Mr. INSLEE. As Ms. SCHWARTZ indicated, I just happen to have an Innovation Agenda, which is the Democratic suggestion on how we can seize the power of innovation for the country and how the Innovation Agenda is just part of a larger package that one can read if anyone is interested.

We think energy is a very important part, but it is one part of our Innovation Agenda; and page 3 of that basically is our effort to develop a new generation of innovators, and that is what we need to do. That is why we are committed to placing a highly qualified teacher in every math and science classroom, why we are committed to educate 100,000 new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians in the next 4 years, why we want to make college tuition tax deductible for the students studying math, science and engineering so we can have those minds available.

But if you look at page 8 on our Innovation Agenda, you will see our dedication to energy independence in 10 years. I will just mention two of the bullet points in the Democrats' larger agenda. We would commit to substantially reducing the use of petroleum-based fuels by rapidly expanding production and distribution of synthetic and bio-based fuels, such as ethanol derived from cellulosic sources, and by deploying new engine technologies for fuel-flexible, hybrid, plug-in hybrid and biodiesel vehicles. Now, those are different kinds of vehicles.

Coming back to what Ms. SCHWARTZ said, we want to give consumers choices of what kind of vehicles to buy and to use. This is not a command-and-control suggestion we are making. We think we want to develop an economy so that you can decide what kind of vehicle you want to use. That might be a

flex-fuel vehicle. That is a vehicle that can burn gasoline or biofuels, and Brazil has done this through great genius. Now, when you pull up to a pump in Brazil, if you have a flex-fuel vehicle, you can burn either gasoline or biofuels or ethanol, which makes you in the driver's seat literally, not the oil and gas companies. So you can compare prices and decide what to burn.

Now, the reason they have done that is Brazil basically told the auto industry to start producing these vehicles, give consumers choice, and that is what we stand for in giving consumers choice so that we are not victims of the oil and gas oligopolies in our country. We talked about fuel-flexible, hybrids, plug-in hybrids, and biodiesel.

The second bullet point in our plan will create a DARPA-like initiative within the Department of Energy to provide seed money for fundamental research needed to develop high-risk, high-reward technologies and build markets for the next generation of revolutionary energy.

We do realize that there is some basic research that the government is good at that is very high-risk. It might be hard to get a bank loan on some of these cutting-edge technologies, but we have had very great success in the Defense Department with a group called DARPA, the Defense Advanced Research labs. They have done great work in the Department of Defense. We need to use that same strategy in energy, and that is why Democrats are proposing to have a similar energy advanced research program in the Department of Energy. We are very optimistic about that.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. I think this is something that is so exciting I think for all of us. It is something I have been excited about, too. We see the National Science Foundation being able to do some of this research, and again, some of the funding we give to scientific research is done by scientists who work for the government. So it is also given out in grants that are then either given out all over the country to innovators who are doing this kind of work, but then because we are involved in it, we have scientists sort of talking to each other, being able to give that information back on a national level, being able to share that information, being able to again act more quickly on that shared information to see what is working and what is most effective and cost effective and actually what is fuel effective.

These are, I think, really exciting, exciting options for all of us. It is something we can do, but again, I think we should be clear, we are not doing it now. That is detrimental to all of us, not just because when we go right today to fill up our tank we are paying \$3 or more a gallon and because the vehicles we drive are not as fuel efficient as they could be and the homes we live in are not as efficient either as they could be. It is because we actually have not gotten serious about taking

this next step and we need to. We need to again because of the high cost to our families.

If you look at families that are paying several hundred dollars more, in some cases several thousand dollars more, those are really tough decisions for a lot of our families in this country, what do we do and how do we make ends meet when we have these concerns. I hope they are hearing us. We want you to push us. You should push us. You should push this administration to do more.

Again, you pointed out the oil and gas industry could be a part of this. They should be a part of this because they also have scientists. They could be more fuel efficient. They should be.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield for a moment, this is a point that is absolutely galling to me, and folks need to understand this. This Congress is pathetic, with a capital P, when it comes to energy policy. We are doing nothing significant to really reduce our dependency on oil and gas. This place is awash in oil. It is a slave to oil. It has not broken its addiction even to the political ties that bind it to the oil and gas industry. As a result, it has done nothing significant to move forward on energy.

When we have all these new technologies coming on, solar cell technology which costs 80 percent less than it did 10 years ago, those prices are coming down spectacularly, wind energy that is coming down, has come down 20 percent so that it is competitive right now today in the State of Washington with other sources, has come down 20 percent. Instead of making investment in those technologies, you know what this Congress did? It stood up and gave another multi-million dollar tax break to the oil and gas industry of your tax money, and that is boneheaded.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. They did the same thing they have been doing.

Mr. INSLEE. They did the same thing they have been doing since the 1800s. The way I described this is this Congress last year passed a great energy policy for 1890. It was visionary for 1890. It is Neanderthal in the year 2006.

When you look at when this country has made great advances, we have done it in two major challenges that our country had in the last several decades, the Manhattan Project which developed nuclear power, and it was a major investment by the United States of America because of a major challenge. The second was the original project in the space race, and we responded and were successful. The third now needs to be an energy revolution in this country.

But the fact of the matter is under this Congress and in this management of Congress, we are investing less than 15 percent of the equivalent of what we would have done in either one of those projects; and as a result, we are getting

teeny, tiny little baby steps that we are encouraging when we should have these great leaps for mankind.

□ 1945

You know, if this Congress was running the space race, the quote would have been, "Another little step up the cabin of a DC-3," because that is about all we would have invented. Kennedy got us to the moon; this energy policy won't get us to Cleveland.

We believe we need a very significant ramp-up both in Federal research and development, basic R&D, tax credits to manufacturers, to help them manufacture fuel-efficient vehicles; tax credits to consumers to allow you to decide how to buy both a fuel-efficient car and build a fuel-efficient home; and use of the procurement policy.

We haven't talked about this tonight at all, but one of the great tools we have in our toolbox in energy policy is the Federal Government procurement power. The Federal Government is kind of the 800-pound gorilla when it comes to buying things in this economy. The Federal Government needs to start buying fuel-efficient cars, fuel-efficient air-conditioning units, and building green buildings. There is much more that we can do.

We are taking little baby steps there. The Pentagon is looking at a fuel-efficient battery. One of the competitors trying to develop this is in my district. It is called Neopower. They are building a fuel-celled battery that will actually power computers and radio devices using fuel cells. So as we ramp that up, hopefully we will have much more efficient batteries that can last much longer and not burn gasoline-generated electricity. But we are just starting.

I don't know how to categorize it other than to say that we need a revolution, and what we are getting is not even an evolution. It is almost a devolution, going back the wrong way.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. It is not using our imagination and our skills to move forward. And, also, I will just second the point you made. I do feel very strongly that the public buildings, for example, and our public procurement, that is what we buy, we should be setting an example. We should be practicing what we preach. We should be doing as best we can.

Again, it is not so easy for us to change our patterns, you know, what we are used to doing. Someone said, when gasoline prices were so high, one of the suggestions we were trying to make to people is if you are going to run your errands, try to be more efficient in the way you drive and do that. You could save yourself a few gallons of gasoline every week, several a month. That could make a difference. Think about carpooling.

It is hard to change our own patterns, and I think that is true in government, too. We should be setting an example that when we actually build a new building, that it is more energy-efficient; when we change light bulbs,

and I think there were just some changes made in some of the hallways and some of the office buildings, but are we encouraged to turn the lights off? We keep a lot of lights on every night. What would that save if, in fact, we had these all on timers or motion detectors?

We should be thinking about this in a way, because if each of us reduced our energy consumption by 10 percent, maybe some of us could even do better, we could have a dramatic impact on the amount of energy and fuel we would need.

So, again, this isn't picking and choosing. This isn't saying, I am going to blame individuals for not doing all they can. We are not blaming anyone. The idea is for us to really use all of our power, if I can use that word, all of our power to make it clear that we want less costly, more efficient fuel for all of our needs.

And we are going to have these needs. We are going to need this energy for our needs. They are not going to get fewer. There are more of us, more people, more densely populated, and we need to figure this out and do so in a way that doesn't just say let us just give a little more subsidy to the oil industry. If we just took the subsidies, \$8 billion, \$9 billion from the oil industry, maybe collected those royalties for offshore drilling from the oil industry, and said let us take that money and invest it in these new technologies and invest it in renewables, use the incentives so people will build buildings that will be more fuel-efficient and energy-efficient, what would that do for us?

In fact, what we know is that that is really significant. The amount of reduction in energy needs would be really significant and would have an impact. And at the same time, we would be learning better what, in fact, works best for us so we would be able to move ahead.

I just want to say one more thing, and then I want to reflect on some of this, too. I think we also have to say to people that we have done this. I think you are right to use the example of the man on the moon, but we have even done smaller things; for instance, when we found out that lead in paint was extremely harmful to kids in this country. We didn't always know that. There was lead in paint, and we all painted with that, used that paint, but, in fact, those paint chips actually caused brain damage for our kids. Well, we did something about it. It didn't happen immediately. People finally had to get outraged by it. Members of Congress finally had to stand up and say, you know what we are going to do, we are going to take lead out of paint.

Now, originally people said, I don't think we can do that. I don't think we have the technology to do that; how do we do that? Well, some smart people got together and figured out how to do it, and they did. We don't allow lead to be put in our paint anymore. We don't have chlorofluorocarbons anymore, be-

cause we realized it was causing a big hole in the ozone layer. It took a while for us to agree to do something about that, and some people said, oh, it is not really a problem, but it turns out it was a problem, and the fact is we could fix it, and we did.

So I just want to reflect on that because people sometimes think this is just too big. I can't do it, you can't do it, how are we going to do it? But the fact is we can if we get serious about it. If we understand the different roles of the private and public sector, we can actually do something really dramatic about creating less expensive, more home-based energy.

Mr. INSLEE. I just want to point out the history of our own country is that we will succeed on this because we have succeeded.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, because of what Congress did, and President Carter, we increased our fuel efficiency at least 50 percent. And if we had simply continued on that path, we would be free of Persian Gulf oil today. We could have solved this problem if we had simply continued with that success.

But I want to close by thanking you for your leadership on this and by saying that the Democrats are optimistic on energy, Democrats believe in innovation, and Democrats believe in paying for it and not having a deficit. And we are going to do that by closing some of these giveaways to the oil and gas industry.

Thank you for your leadership.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. And I'll just also end by saying thank you very much, Mr. INSLEE, for joining me and for helping, I hope, being able to talk about what is such an important issue for every American, and that is how to create less expensive, more available, more home-grown energy.

So thank you very much for joining me this evening, and I look forward to getting this done with you.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here to open up for another discussion with the 30-something Working Group. We will be joined later by our friends from Florida who have been rooting on the Miami Heat in the last few days and are very excited about some key victories. So Mr. MEEK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ will be here soon.

The issue tonight, Mr. Speaker, for all of us as Americans, I believe, is one of the most pressing issues our country has faced in a long time, and that is the issue of our national debt and our annual deficits that we are running here in the United States of America. We have always prided ourselves in the United States of being able to balance