

Drilling off of our shore means jobs for Americans right now, real jobs, high-paying jobs, the kind of jobs that support whole families and pay to get kids into college. And it's not jobs on just oil platforms in the gulf. Think about all the other support industries, transportation, food, equipment, parts, insurers, construction and so. These real, high-dollar jobs would give a boost to our economy. These jobs are vital to America's families and to our economy, and it would keep American money in America. There's a real solution right in front of us for job and energy development.

But the government continues to move in the opposite direction. The cap-and-trade national energy tax, now called the climate change bill, will destroy the U.S. energy industry. Millions of jobs that go along with it will also be lost.

□ 1945

It is a national tax on energy consumption. Plus, it won't really help the climate. Instead of taxing energy, we should find more energy and encourage American energy development.

But we cannot drill off of our shores because I guess it will upset the blood pressure of the environmental elites. So, no new drilling.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do have breaking news. The administration does support offshore drilling. According to the Wall Street Journal, the government is loaning over \$2 billion in taxpayer money to a Brazilian company called Petrobras. Now, where did the United States, first of all, get that \$2 billion to loan to a foreign company? I thought we were broke. How come taxpayer money is going to a Brazilian oil company anyway? Why isn't that money staying here in America?

This Brazilian oil company is drilling off the shore of, not the United States, but Brazil. And are we getting that oil? Well, no, because China has a contract to purchase the hundreds of millions of barrels of oil those Brazilian oil fields will produce with taxpayer money. Isn't that lovely?

Let me explain it this way. Here is a chart. Right here this represents the United States. Of course we have these signs, no offshore drilling off the United States coast. We can't do that. But we are sending \$2 billion of American money down to a Brazilian oil company so they can, of course, drill off their shores. And is that money or oil coming back to us? I don't think so. That bag of money is going to China.

Now, this seems a bit strange to me. Why are American taxpayers footing the bill in Brazil without getting the oil or getting the money? Why aren't we expanding our own offshore drilling instead of sending American money to Brazil? Does anybody have the answer to that question? It seems like we should drill off our own coast, keep American money in America and take care of our own energy needs. We have millions of jobs just sitting there wait-

ing to be created off our shores. Drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf and extracting oil shale would provide the much-needed boost to the American economy. And we should stop funding oil-producing countries that support terrorism and the Middle East.

So what are we waiting for? If we would have started a year ago when the ban was lifted, our economy would be better than it is today. We would have had more jobs, jobs, jobs. It is way past the time for us to get started taking care of America. Don't drill in Brazil with American money. Don't take care of China. Drill American and take care of America.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great State of Michigan where we currently have the highest unemployment in the Nation and where our citizens have suffered more than most in this economic downturn. And every week when I come to Washington, I am constantly amazed that this Congress isn't laser focused on creating jobs, because the question being asked by the American people is: Where are the jobs?

When President Obama said he wanted an economic stimulus bill principally focused on tax cuts and infrastructure investment, I was all for it. But the bill that was passed by the Democrat majority in Congress really was unrecognized from what was originally proposed. That bill focused much more on expanding the size of government than expanding jobs in the private sector. Americans were told that if this huge expansion of government were passed, that 2 to 3 million new jobs would be created and unemployment would not reach 8 percent. And what are the results actually?

Well, since that time, our economy has shed nearly 3 million jobs and the unemployment rate has now reached nearly 10 percent. In my home State of Michigan, it is in the 15 percentile.

Nine months after the passage of the failed stimulus plan, Americans are still asking: Where are the jobs?

After passing a jobs bill that did not create jobs, House Democrats passed a cap-and-trade national energy tax. This national energy tax will destroy millions of jobs in this struggling economy. Manufacturing, which is so important in my home State of Michigan, would be especially hard hit when millions more good-paying jobs are shipped overseas to nations that are not going to put this jobs-killing tax on their manufacturing companies.

Struggling American families will also be very hard hit. The Obama administration's own estimates project that this legislation would cost our economy \$200 billion every year, which means an increase of \$1,700 for every American household. That means hard-pressed Americans are going to pay more for energy while at the same time having their jobs put at risk.

I would ask this, Mr. Speaker, as the American people continue to do: Where are the jobs?

Congress is now considering a health care reform bill that would amount to a government takeover and would be funded with job-killing tax increases and cuts to Medicare impacting the coverage of millions of American seniors. That bill, H.R. 3200, places an 8 percent tax on payroll for every business in this Nation that does not offer health care coverage to their workers.

Well, I have talked to countless employers, and they tell you that their costs run much higher than 8 percent, so they would end the private coverage that they currently give to their employees and dump them all out on the public plan.

Republicans have been accused of being the party of no because we have stood against this job-killing agenda, but we have offered alternatives, better alternatives, and it is actually the Democrats in Congress who have said no to these ideas. Let me cite a few specific examples.

We have offered an alternative to the stimulus plan that, according to the formula created by President Obama's own economic team, would create twice the jobs at half the cost. We have offered an all-of-the-above national energy plan as an alternative to the Democrats' national energy tax. Our plan would encourage the development of clean alternative energy while allowing the development of domestic supplies, which would bring energy costs down instead of driving them up. And it would create jobs here in America, and it would make America more energy independent.

We have offered commonsense approaches to health care reforms that would provide greater competition, increase access to care, and reduce costs. We feel that individuals should be able to purchase health care across State lines, and small businesses should be able to group together to open up more options and reduce costs to protect private health care. And we believe we need to enact real medical liability reform to end junk lawsuits that drive up

costs by forcing doctors to practice defensive medicine.

I raise these points because I truly believe we have to have bipartisan consensus to address the challenges that are facing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are way ahead of the politicians here in Washington. They understand the need for jobs. They understand that bigger government will not increase jobs but will put millions more jobs at risk.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past the time we start listening to commonsense Americans who continue to ask: Where are the jobs?

#### CELEBRATING CHICAGO

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, George Will once said, "Chicago Cub fans are 90 percent scar tissue."

So as we stand here 4 days after the city of Chicago, and all of the United States, were disappointed by the IOC's decision, I can assure you that there is no city better equipped to handle a little disappointment.

And despite the tremendous efforts of President and Mrs. Obama, Mayor Daley, Pat Ryan, and thousands of volunteers, that is exactly what we felt in my hometown last week: disappointment.

But the city of Chicago has already shaken it off and is waiting with open arms for the world to visit. Because as I have said before, Chicago was a world-class city before the Olympic decision and will be a world-class city tomorrow.

My hometown is often referred to as "The Second City," but most people don't realize that the nickname has nothing to do with our relationship to other cities. The name refers to a city which was rebuilt in the years following the Great Chicago Fire, a city where we pull ourselves up by our bootstraps, dust off our shoulders, and get back to work.

So with congratulations to Rio, I would like to offer a list of the top 10 reasons the world should stop by for a slice of deep dish in Chicago, the greatest city in the world.

Number ten: The architecture. One of Chicago's great residents, Daniel Burnham, was known for saying: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood." From the Louis Sullivan buildings downtown to Mies van der Rohe's collection at IIT to the neighborhood bungalows to the Sears Tower that scrapes the sky, Chicago's architecture is distinct and historic.

The schools. I am a proud graduate of Roosevelt University, the University of Chicago, and Loyola University, and had the honor of teaching young Chicagoans as well. Chicago is a place that inspires great ideas, but the Windy City is also a destination for the

world's greatest minds. Close to 90 Nobel laureates have passed through the halls of the University of Chicago and Northwestern University.

Green space. My district is home to one of the country's largest urban parks, Lincoln Park, which is also home to the oldest public zoo in the country, still free admission. Want to play 16-inch softball? We have 552 parks to choose from. No glove needed. And the forest preserve system is home to 68,000 acres of open space.

The lake. Chicago has one of the most beautiful shorelines in the world, 26 miles of lakefront with 15 miles of beaches. It is a front row seat to one of the largest freshwater sources in the world, and a reminder of our responsibility to conserve it.

The museums. The Art Institute of Chicago, just one of our museums, displays some of the most famous pieces of previous centuries and trains artists to produce the finest works of this century.

The arts. Chicago's music is played all around the world wherever people love the blues, gospel, jazz, or rock. And we are home to the preeminent Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the Lyric Opera. Most of the great comedians on Saturday Night Live and 30 Rock came through Chicago, home of The Second City troupe.

I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that no one in Copenhagen has ever had a proper hot dog or slice of pizza unless they have spent a little time in Chicago. From breakfast at Ann Sather's to chicken dinner at MacArthur's, to a midnight snack at the Wiener's Circle and all the pierogies, tacos, and steaks in between, it is the finest eating on Earth.

Sports. All of our teams are among the oldest in their leagues, and all of them played right in the city. They have all won championships. Some more recently than others, but every one is entitled to a bad century.

Number two, the neighborhoods. Chicago has a beautiful downtown. Nothing is more majestic than coming northbound or southbound on Lake Shore Drive, but it is the diverse neighborhoods that make us world class. In one sense, the world doesn't need to come to Chicago; it already has. From Bowmanville to Bronzeville, Portage Park to Albany Park, Pilsen to Pullman, take the "L" around Chicago, and you have visited dozens of countries without ever leaving the city limits.

Finally, the number one reason the world should come to Chicago is the same reason I never left: the people. The Second City has always been second to none. Why? Because the people of Chicago look not at what we lost last week in Copenhagen but at what we now have the opportunity to accomplish. We know that our organizing efforts were not wasted. We can build better schools on safer streets. We can build better transit with greener technology. And beyond our bid plans lay big plans for our future.

In the words of Superdawg, one of Chicago's iconic hot dog stands, I look forward to welcoming you by saying, "Hiya, from the bottom of my pure beef heart."

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to coming back next summer with Chicago's Stanley Cup.

#### AARP: HELPING SENIORS OR HELPING ITSELF?

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when seniors across the country found out that the Medicare plan that was proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle was going to cut Medicare and Medicare Advantage by \$500 billion over 10 years, they became very concerned, and they became very, very concerned about the organization called AARP supporting that plan that was going to make great cuts to seniors' medical coverage.

And so about 60,000 of those people said they were going to quit AARP because of AARP's endorsement of the very costly and benefit-cutting plan proposed by the Democrats. So AARP came out with this statement: "None of the health care proposals being considered by Congress would cut Medicare benefits or increase your out-of-pocket costs for Medicare services."

That's what AARP has been telling their seniors. But let me just read to you the facts from people who are working on the bills here in Washington, D.C., in the Congress.

The first one is the \$113 billion is a reduction in the extra benefits, the added, additional benefits that Medicare Advantage enrollees have available to them. That statement was made by a staff member of Senator BAUCUS's committee, the Finance Committee in the Senate. That contradicts what AARP said.

The Medicare Advantage cuts contained in the Democrats' health bills pending in Congress "could lead many plans to limit the benefits they offer, raise their premiums, or withdraw from the program." That statement was made by our Congressional Budget Office. Again, they refute what AARP said.

The next statement, "While these programs need to be made more efficient, if the proposed funding cut levels become law, millions of seniors and disabled individuals could lose many of the important benefits and services that Medicare Advantage health plans make so valuable." That statement was by Humana.

Humana is an organization that sells these plans, the Medicare Advantage plans, and they have been stopped because they told their enrollees what was going on with the Medicare Advantage cuts in the Democrats' proposals. As a matter of fact, late last month the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid