to OCS development, we are seeing those same levels of technology. Well valves are dependable. We have not had a well blow out since the Santa Barbara accident in 1969. We recognize that our technology allows us to do more than 30 years we could ever have dreamed about. Let's allow us to use our ingenuity to produce so we have the resource we need as a country. Let us use our ingenuity to take this resource and to develop the renewables and the alternatives that are the future of this country. Let's use our ingenuity to be more creative when it comes to conservation and efficiencies. The ingenuity we use with our production of oil and gas is something that should not be disputed but should be encouraged.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the time in morning business until 12:30 be divided equally between the two leaders or their designees and the time consumed by Senator MURKOWSKI count toward the time in this agreement. I ask the following Senators on the Democratic side be recognized: DORGAN, 15 minutes; DURBIN, 10 minutes; BAUCUS, 12 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this has been an interesting morning to watch the Senate debate. It reminds me a bit that the strongest muscle in the body is the tongue. Debate that I have heard this morning is quite extraordinary. We have people come to the floor of the Senate, and they say that something like 85 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is not open and available for leasing and drilling. That is not true. Two-thirds is open and available for the Minerals Management Service to lease.

I want to talk a little about where we are with respect to this issue of production. I have seen the big old sign that my Republican colleagues have been using. It says: Produce more and use less.

We will have a chance again today to decide whether members actually want to produce more. Some people believe the only way you produce energy is drill a hole someplace and search for oil and gas. I support that. But another way to produce energy is to produce homegrown energy from solar, wind, biomass or geothermal sources—another homegrown energy plan.

We have had a chance for at least six separate times to vote to extend the tax credits to support renewable forms of energy to produce more energy. Six times we have been stymied. I will talk about that a bit in a moment.

The first car I got as a very young man was a 1924 Model-T Ford I bought for $25 and lovingly restored it for 2 years. I have described this often.

I discovered as a young boy that you couldn't date very well in a 1924 Ford. So I sold my model T. But it was interesting restoring an old Model T Ford. I understood that you put gasoline in a 1924 vehicle the same way you put gasoline in a 2008 vehicle. Nothing has fundamentally changed. You to go a gas pump someplace, stick a nozzle in your tank, start pumping and then pay the price. It is drive and drill approach. It has been that strategy forever. Some of my colleagues come to the floor of the Senate dragging a wagon of the same old drive-and-drill policies. Keep driving and drilling, and things will be fine. The problem is the hole gets deeper every single year. They come here once a decade and say: Our strategy is to drill more.

I support drilling for oil, but I also think we ought to do a lot more than that. We ought to have a game-changing plan, some sort of a moonshot plan that says: Ten years from now we need to have a different approach to energy. John F. Kennedy didn't say: I think we will try to go to the Moon. I would like to send a person to the Moon. I hope we can go to the Moon. He said: By the end of this decade, we will send a person to the Moon. We will have a person walking on the Moon.

That is what this debate ought to be about. In the next 10 years, here is the way we are going to change America's energy plan. That ought to be the debate.

There are a lot of things we can and should do together. There are far too few things we are engaging in together on the floor of the Senate. We had a energy future speculation bill defeated, or at least the minority that puts up the sign that says produce more and use less voted in unison to stop movement of it. We had a bill on the floor that said: Let's get rid of excessive speculation in the futures market that is driving up prices. We had people who testified before our various committees who said as much as 30 to 40 percent of the current price of gas and oil is due to excess speculation. In 2000, 37 percent of the oil market was speculators. Now it is 71 percent. It is unbelievable how rampant speculation has become in the oil futures market. But the oil speculators have a lot of friends here, enough friends so they could stop that kind of legislation that would put the brakes on some of this speculation and put some downward pressure on prices. The oil speculators have a lot of friends here.

Big oil companies have a lot of friends here. With record profits, the largest oil company, ExxonMobil, spent twice as much money last year buying back their stock as they did in investing in infrastructure for producing more oil. Let me say that again. The biggest oil company in the world spent twice as much money buying back its stock as it did exploring for more oil. We are paying at the pump enormous prices so one would hope at least a substantial portion of that money would go back into the ground to find more energy resources. But sadly it is not.

Again, these Big Oil companies have plenty of friends in this Chamber. They view their role as a set of human brake pads to stop whatever is going on. They don't support anything. Just make sure you stop things.

Let me describe one of the things that makes so much sense to me that has been stopped dead in its tracks. It was stopped last year on June 21, 2007. It was stopped December 7, 2007. It was stopped December 13, 2007. They stopped it on February 7, 2008. What is it? It is our ability, as a country, to change the game and say: We want to encourage production by taking energy from the wind, solar, wave, and other forms of renewable energy. We had a vote on all those occasions to provide tax credits and stimulus to say: Here is the kind of energy we want to produce in the future. This is a new energy future. On each and every occasion, the minority that comes to parade with a big, old sign calling for producing more, on each occasion those who hold up that sign today voted against producing more. Isn't that interesting? They voted against producing more.

Let me tell you what we did in this country with respect to energy. In 1916, we put in place long-term, permanent, robust tax incentives to say to people: If you want to explore for oil and gas, God bless you because we need it. We want to provide big incentives for you to do it. Almost a century ago we put in place those tax incentives. That is how much we wanted to encourage people to find oil and gas. Contrast that with what we did to encourage people to wean ourselves off the need for fossil fuels. At least 60 to 65 percent of that oil comes from off our shores.

In 1992, we put in place a tax credit for renewable energy, a production tax credit which was short term and not particularly robust. We extended it five times. We let it expire three times. We have had a stop-and-start, stutter step approach.

Look at this chart. Here is what has happened. This shows you what has happened to wind energy. When the credit expires, the investment goes to zero. Put the credit is extended, the investment goes up. When the credit expires, the investment drops off. It is unbelievable, what a pathetic, anemic response by a country. So we have a piece of legislation that says: Let's extend the wind energy tax credit. Let's extend the tax credit that takes energy from the Sun. Let's produce energy from the wind and the Sun and geothermal and so many other forms of renewable energy. The minority side says no. They don't want to do that. On June 21, 2007, we failed to get cloture by one vote. A large portion of the minority side said no. The same ones who

are holding the sign that says produce more said: We don't want to produce more. On December 7, the same folks who hold the sign said: No, we don't want to produce more. December 13, they still said: No, we are not interested in producing more. February 7 of this year: We still are not interested in producing more.

But during the last week or so, they show a big, old, oily chart on the Senate floor that says produce more, use less. Well, perhaps we will have a chance to vote once again. Then the question is, Is their policy just drill a hole, which is a yesterday forever strategy, or is their policy a game-changing policy to join us and say: Let's do something different for a change.

Given the circumstances we have, those who decide it is in their interest to block everything, should rethink that plan. I have said often, Mark Twain was once asked to engage a debate. He said: Yes, as long as I can have the negative side. They said: But, Mr. Twain, we haven't even told you the subject. He said: It doesn't matter. The subject doesn't matter. The negative side will take no preparation. So it is on the floor of the Senate. Coming out here simply to block everything and then hold a sign that says: We support producing more. That takes no preparation. It takes a little bit of gall, I might say, but it certainly takes no preparation.

The question is this: Should we do everything? You bet your life. We should drill more, in my judgment, and there is two-thirds of the Outer Continental Shelf that is open for leasing and drilling. I support that. We ought to conserve more too. We are prodigious wasters of energy. We ought to have much more energy efficiency for every single thing we do. Everything that is turned on from a switch that we flick on or off should be examined. So produce and conserve, and most importantly have a game-changing plan to say: We want renewables in this country.

T. Boone Pickens was in town last week. He was like a big old boat coming through, leaving a big wake in the background of the boat. He said: You can't drill your way out of this problem. What we need to do is wind from Texas to North Dakota, in the area where we have all this wind energy potential. We need to develop more solar in the Southwest, where we have a tremendous capability. We need to produce that way and develop an interstate grid system for transmitting energy all around the country, just as we did with the interstate highway system.

That makes a lot of sense to me. But we can't do that with the pathetic approach that exists on providing incentives to renewables. As I indicated, we put in place permanent, robust incentives for looking for oil and gas in 1916. We have these short-term incentives, and we can't get them passed. Because on occasion after occasion, time after time, the folks who now come and hold a sign that says produce more said: No, I will not vote to produce more. When it comes to renewable energy, I am going to vote to stop it.

We can get oil from the ground. I understand that, but we can also produce biofuels from a whole series of feedstocks. We are using a lot of corn. But the bill we have tried to get passed has a significant tax incentive for the cost of facilities that produce cellulosic biofuels. Does that make sense? You bet your life it does. That is production for America. If you say you are for production, don't hold up a sign. Just vote for this legislation. Then you will really be for production. The new credits for qualified plug-in electric drive vehicles, how important is that? It is unbelievably important for us to convert from the internal combustion engine to an electric drive vehicle and then, eventually, to hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. That is game changing. But the legislation in which this occurred, that is legislation the minority that has been holding the signs all morning opposed.

All I say is this: You want to do a lot of everything. Let's do a lot of everything. Let's advance America's energy future. We go to Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Venezuela, or Kuwait and say: In order for America's economy to run, we need a large portion of our oil and gas from you, you need to provide that to us. It impacts so many other parts of our country that we can't possibly control.

Should we continue down this road? I don't think so. It is a disappointment to me that it is toward the end of July, and we still have this kind of discussion on the floor of the Senate. We should have had 100 Senators in support of legislation to shut down this unbelievable speculation that is going on. I understand oil speculators have a lot of friends here now. They have a lot of friends in this Chamber, enough to have stopped this oil speculation legislation last week. We ought to have 100 votes for people who say we are going to support homegrown energy. We are going to support big, aggressive tax incentives to produce energy here at home, and that includes wind, solar, geothermal and biomass, and we are going to change the game. Ten years from now, America is going to have a different energy future. Instead, we got the ''yesterday forever'' crowd who comes to the Chamber and slouches around with their hands in their pockets and says: We always liked what we did, and we want to do it some more. Then, 10 or 15 years from now, the same crowd will be back saying the same thing. They will say no to anything that will change the ground, and yes to anything that continues this unbelievable dependence.

My hope is we can find a way, perhaps, to join together and decide we ought to produce more in a smart way. We ought to be much less reliant on foreign energy, on the need for oil from overseas. We ought to be much more vigilant on aggressive conservation and energy efficiency measures. This Congress in particular ought to decide that it is finally, at long last, going to vote to produce energy in a good way. That is, to produce homegrown energy from wind, solar and so many other sources of renewable energy.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator the assistant minority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Dakota, who has come to the floor almost every day to talk about the energy crisis. But if the American people had their choice, all of us would be talking about it every day of the week. It takes anywhere from an hour to 2 hours to go from downtown Chicago out to O'Hare. I have made the trip a lot. But recently, the fellow who was driving me said: I have noticed something strange. Even during rush hour, there are fewer cars out here. I know a lot of people are on vacation, but something is changing.

I have noticed it all over my State, and I think people are noticing it all over the country. What is changing is people are looking at gasoline that costs $4.50 or $4.30 a gallon and saying: I will drive less. I am going to look for a car or truck that is more fuel efficient. People are understanding in their daily lives that things are changing, not always for the better, because as the price of oil goes up and the price of gasoline goes up, we may make energy-conserving decisions, but some of those are forced on us. Some of those are painful, painful when we pay for the gasoline each week and painful when people find their family budgets wrecked by the cost of gasoline.

They are not alone. The major airline companies have now announced dramatic cutbacks in scheduling and in employees. They can't keep up. The price of jet fuel has gone through the roof. I have met with the CEOs of these companies. The stories they tell are very sad. They can't afford to fly people anymore. They can't charge enough. They can't make enough. They are charging us now for everything in sight, $15, $20, $50 for a second bag they check, trying to keep the airlines afloat. And some of them will fail, I am afraid, unless something dramatic happens.

So it is no surprise that on the floor of this Senate we have talked a lot about this energy issue. There are two distinct points of view, and I think they tell the difference between outlook. Senator DORGAN of North Dakota talked about ''yesterday forever.'' On the Republican side, their idea is to drill more oil, keep drilling, keep finding more oil. Sadly, they have ignored the reality.

The reality is this: If you take a look at all the oil reserves in the world, the United States has 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. Ninety-eight percent, of course, is in countries such as

Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Canada. We have 2 percent of the oil reserves.

The oil consumption by the United States? We consume 24 percent of the oil. In other words, we cannot drill our way out of this. We cannot find enough oil here to sustain the American economy. If you are going to be honest—and you should be with the American people—if we made a decision tomorrow to start drilling in any specific spot, for instance, off the coast of the United States, it takes literally years for that to happen, for it to go into production, and to deliver the oil to the United States. Estimates are 8 to 14 years.

So coming to the floor and saying: Drill more, drill now—well, the reality is, ''drill now'' means drill in 8 to 14 years. That is going to have little impact on current gasoline prices, no matter what we think. That is the reality. The question, obviously, is: Are there places we should go to drill? Well, of course there are. The United States is in control of its sovereign territory as a nation, and its offshore territory as well. The Federal Government owns many public lands, and some of those are used for ski resorts and national parks and mining.

Some are used for oil and gas exploration. We say to the companies: If you would like to drill more oil and gas on our land, the Federal land, pay us a lease, pay us a rental, and we will allow you to do so. The oil and gas companies gobble up this territory. In fact, 68 million acres of Federal land are currently under lease to oil and gas companies for that purpose: to drill for oil.

What are they doing with those 68 million acres? Well, it turns out a lot of them are not being utilized. This is a little map of the Western part of the United States I have in the Chamber. The land you see in red is Federal land leased to oil and gas companies not in production. When the Republicans say we have to put more acres out there for them to drill, the fact is, they are paying us to lease acres they are not touching. I do not know what the explanation might be, but of those onshore, 34.5 million acres have been leased from the Federal Government and go untouched.

It is just not onshore. If we think the mother lode is offshore, as shown on this other map, these are acres we have leased in the Gulf of Mexico, and all those in red are currently untouched—leased, so the oil and gas companies believe there is oil or gas there but untouched.

So to argue there is not enough acreage for us to go searching for oil, there is some 68 million acres of leased Federal land to oil companies, and zero of those acres in production onshore and offshore.

We recently had a lease to offer 115 million more acres of Federal land available to these companies for lease for oil and gas purposes. This was in the last year—since January, I should say, of 2007. Mr. President, 115 million acres were offered.

What does 115 million acres of land that the Federal Government owns and will lease to oil and gas companies represent? This is the path, as shown on this map, of Interstate 80, which most of us know. It goes from New Jersey all the way to California. This represents a 67-mile-wide swath along I–80. That is the size of the acreage we have offered to the oil and gas companies to drill on for oil and gas. Of that, they have accepted 12 million acres they bid on. Another 103 million acres have gone unclaimed by these oil and gas companies. So it is not as if there is not land available. There is—a lot of it—millions and millions of acres made available to these companies. Some they are paying for, some they could lease. There is plenty of land for them to drill.

So why, then, is the Republican approach that we need to drill more, when the opportunity is there? There are plenty of acres, and we know that even with drilling, we are going to wait 8 to 14 years to see the first drop of oil. Well, here is what it is all about.

For the last 8 years, the White House has been under the control of a President and a Vice President with a deep background in the oil industry—both President Bush and Vice President CHENEY. And not coincidentally, the oil companies have done very well. The policies of this administration have been very friendly to these oil and gas companies. They are reporting record profits, which I will get to in a moment.

So the last gasp before this crew leaves town is for the Republican side of the aisle to give to the big oil groups more leased land, give them more land to stockpile inventory for future purposes. That is what this is all about. It is not about solving the current energy crisis. It is not about bringing down gasoline prices. That is 8 to 14 years away, if ever. It is about, frankly, giving big oil exactly what it wants.

If you think I am making this up, take a look at the full-page ads in your hometown newspapers by the American Petroleum Institute supporting the Republican position. What is the American Petroleum Institute? The largest and smallest oil companies in America. They understand this is their last grab under this administration and the Republicans want to give them that grab and take that land and try to convince the American people it will make a difference when it comes to our energy policy. Quite honestly, we know better.

Now, in a short time—maybe a matter of days, maybe this week—the oil companies are going to be reporting their latest profits. This chart will show you what is happening to big oil profits since this administration took office. Starting in 2002 to 2007, you can see a dramatic increase in billions of dollars for oil and gas companies in America. These just are not large increases for this industry, these are the largest reported profits of any business in the history of the United States of America.

The oil companies have done extraordinarily well. Notwithstanding all the other arguments, the fact that the Republicans want to give these oil and gas companies one last grab at this land is an indication they want the profit margins to continue.

But is that what we are all about? Is that why we are here, to make sure wealthy, profitable companies make record profits unseen in the history of the United States, at the expense of families who pay for the gasoline, at the expense of businesses that cannot survive, at the expense of our airlines that are shutting down their planes and schedules, at the expense of farmers in my State of Illinois and across the United States? I do not think so.

Our responsibility has to go further. Our responsibility has to go to the point——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. The point I want to make is this: We have to look ahead. If President Bush was right when he said America is addicted to oil, how can we break the addiction? We will never be oil free. That is ludicrous. We will have a dependence on fossil fuels, on oil, for my lifetime and well beyond.

But if we want to be fair to the next generation, we have to be pushing for an energy agenda which sees a source of energy homegrown in America, so we are independent and do not have to rely on OPEC and foreign countries, a source of energy that is kind to the environment, so we do not make global warming worse for kids in the future, and a source of energy that is affordable.

In order to reach that goal—and America can reach it—you cannot look backward, as the Republicans have by saying: Let's keep doing what we have always done. Let's keep drilling for oil.

You need responsible exploration and production of oil, and you need another future agenda: a next-year agenda that says we are going to look to a way to produce energy to keep this economy moving that is affordable.

We have the bill to do it. It is a bill that has lost on the floor of the Senate. It is the energy tax production credit. It is one that will produce energy. We cannot get enough Republican votes to support it. We are going to try again. We are going to keep trying because with this bill we are going to expand tax credits for biomass and hydropower, for solar energy, for biodiesel production. We are going to have tax credits for local governments in renewable projects, advanced coal electricity demonstration projects, plug-in electric cars, heavy vehicle excise tax for

truck idling reduction. It goes on and on—a list of ways to conserve energy and look to future uses of energy that are consistent with an American economy that will grow and not be too expensive for the American people.

That is what we have to move to. This afternoon we will give our Republican colleagues a chance to take their signs that say ''produce more'' and turn them into a vote for this tax program that will produce more. I hope they will join us in this effort.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 2007

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4137, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, there is no objection on this side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4137) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the amendment No. 5250 at the desk, which is the text of S. 1642 as passed by the Senate, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

Mr. ALLARD. No objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5250) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4137), as amended, was read the third time, and passed.

Thereupon, the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GREGG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. COBURN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

ENERGY

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, it is time this Senate begin to act on what it is going to do to increase the supply of energy. It is time to lay aside politics. It is time to begin to look for real solutions to solve this country's energy problems.

What we have heard so far from the other side has nothing to do with increasing the supply of energy. We heard speeches on the Senate floor attacking speculation. Speculation works as a normal way of doing business on the futures market. What is against the law, which creates problems, is if you have manipulation of the markets. That is where somebody goes in and takes some kind of action on the market that somehow is going to artificially drive up the cost of fuel. It is manipulation. The administration has discovered a company or two that is doing that. They have been working on it for some time.

This shows the regulation process is working. We heard testimony in one of the committees on which I serve and we had a discussion on the supply of energy and the manipulation of the markets, and the regulators agreed they need to do more. I agree with that. We need to make sure they have the manpower they need to adequately enforce what we already have on the books.

I am looking for real solutions and my Republican colleagues, I believe, are looking for real solutions because we realize how important it is we become less dependent on foreign oil and not more. It is important for the security of this country, now and 20 to 30 years down the road, that we increase our supply of energy. So we need more energy, and we need to consume less.

Increasing taxes, which has been talked about on this floor, is not the answer. We are going to have a tax proposal that will be brought up, perhaps, on the floor of the Senate that will temporarily cut taxes for renewable energy—and, by the way, I am a strong supporter of renewable energy—and put in place a permanent tax increase on business. That is not the way we should be doing business on the floor of the Senate. That does not increase the production of oil.

Now, making it more difficult to produce more energy through more regulations is certainly not the answer. But we have heard proposal after proposal on the Senate floor claiming they are going to increase the supply of energy by increasing the regulatory environment, making it more difficult to go out and produce energy.

One of the things, in my view, that would produce more energy is utilizing capped wells, we have a lot of capped wells out there. These are existing wells that do not have to be drilled. They were shut down because at one point the economics were such that they could not make a profit with these wells. So they capped them and said: We are going to quit wasting our money on that one and go on to new areas where we can provide more oil for this country—oil and gas.

Well, the cost of the market is such that now it is feasible to begin to open these capped mines. We need to make sure we do not pass a regulation in this body that is going to make it more difficult for them to uncap those wells. That is a ready resource of energy.

We also heard comment on this floor about the fact that we have all this leased land out here. Leasing land does not equal more oil and gas. Many times, when you go onto a parcel of land and lease it, you have no idea whether there is oil or gas underneath there until you begin to put in some test wells and test the area. Just because you talk about all of this land that is available for leasing doesn't mean there is oil and gas on it. Leasing land doesn't mean there is oil and gas on there.

What happens with many of those leases is they may have found they are not productive. The leases are let out for 5 years or they may be let out for 8 years or 10 years. Then, if they are not producing, they put them back on the market and see if anybody else is interested in using the technology they have to try to discover if there is a source of energy under the surface of that land.

The important point to make is that just because you have land available doesn't mean there is oil and gas underneath it.

So my view is—and I think the view of many Republicans—we need to increase the production of energy, whether it is natural gas or whether it is oil shale, in order to bridge the gap to develop technology that is going to produce more energy in the future. I happen to feel that nuclear power is something we have ignored, and we need to do more in the way of nuclear power to meet the needs of providing adequate energy supply to our businesses and to our homes.

Let's talk about the pain at the pump. Throughout this great Nation, people are struggling with high gas prices. I am looking for some renewables to deal with cars. A lot of the renewables happen to deal with wind, solar, happen to deal with geothermal, biofuels. Now, there is something that might be able to be used with cars, but most of these renewables we are talking about can't be used in the car world.

People are feeling the pain. It is when you pull up to the gas tank and put your credit card in there and you fill up the tank, and when you look at the total at the end is when you really begin to hurt. High gas prices not only affect our ability to get around but increasingly are affecting each facet of our everyday life.

Americans are feeling pain at the pump due to high gas prices, and increasingly they feel pain at the kitchen table too. As gas prices go up, so do food prices. Food prices go up because it costs a lot to produce those food products that will end up on the table. America's farmers and ranchers