

Thursday that the main proposals being considered would fail to contain costs.

They say it will, but this article and this man says it will not. It will not contain costs, one of the primary goals, and could actually worsen the problem of radically escalating medical spending.

I hope everybody in the House is paying attention to this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE WESTERN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, 134 Republicans came here to the floor and spoke for 1 minute each about the issue of jobs and where they had been, for, indeed, we were promised that there would be jobs that would be created and saved if we simply passed a stimulus bill and didn't take the time to read it like a couple of others we did. Unfortunately, the reality has not been quite the same. In fact, this is basically the report card that we came up with.

This administration said that if we quickly pass that huge stimulus bill, there would be some unemployment but it would only be 8 percent. In fact, the dark blue line here is what they said would be the recovery path of our economy. They said if we didn't do that, we would follow a trajectory of the light blue line and actually have 9½ percent unemployment. That is a difference of 3 million workers being

out of a job if we took the time to actually read the bill and think about it.

The sad part is, though, after 5½ months, the trajectory line is actually the red dots there, which means we are far exceeding anything that was projected whether we did the stimulus or didn't do the stimulus. In fact, you can arguably say that we might have been better off not doing anything at all.

The Vice President was correct when he said that this administration totally misread the economy. Nonetheless, Speaker PELOSI and President Obama have teamed together to put up the largest budget, and we're still in the process of voting for it. We are on track now, Mr. Speaker, of actually spending \$4 trillion in this year's Congress. We are spending money like it was Monopoly money with the possible exception that you can't pass go and you don't get \$200 every time you do it.

To put this kind of concept in place, at \$4 trillion, we would be spending \$1 billion every 2.2 hours. To put it in perspective again, if you tried to pay off \$4 trillion, that means every single household in America would have to cough up 35 grand to cover it. And the problem that we have with that is simply we don't have that kind of money lying around, whether we spent it or not. In fact, we will be predicted to be in a deficit. CBO scores this year's deficit at \$1.85 trillion. That's the amount of money we'll spend that we have absolutely no funds for.

Now, you can see on this chart, back there at the turn of this century, we actually had a surplus. You can notice when 9/11 hit we went into deficits. Those grey lines are the deficits run up by the big-spending George W. Bush—at least, he was accused of that. What we have over here is what we have been spending ever since. The light red lines are the estimates of the Obama administration. The dark red lines are the estimates of our Congressional Budget Office, and they predict that this year it's \$1.85 trillion that we will overspend.

Now, this isn't perhaps the best view. This is only a 1-year shot of what we are doing as far as our finances. If we actually took a bigger view of it and tried to find all of the things we still owe, we are actually at about \$11.6 trillion in total debt. And if you add things like the bailouts and the bank rescues and the auto recovery loans we have, we're about \$23 trillion in debt, which is difficult when our total gross domestic product is about \$14 trillion.

Let me put that in a kind of perspective for you.

When we went to the Moon, if you put the money we spent on that effort to go to the Moon in today's dollars, we would have spent around \$200 billion. Everything FDR did in the New Deal to try to get us out of the old original Depression in today's dollars would be about \$500 billion. If you took everything we spent on World War II, that's about \$4 trillion. Today, we are spending, in real dollars, \$4 trillion and

a deficit of almost \$2 trillion and a total deficit of \$23 trillion of everything combined. That was not the change that we were promised.

And the proponents of the stimulus package, quite frankly, view its failure in the fact that we didn't put enough money into it and that perhaps we should have another stimulus package to spend more money. The Democrats' solution, quite frankly, is we need to spend more money. The bottom line, though, is spending money is not the same thing as creating jobs. There are other alternatives that are out there.

The Republican Party has introduced almost a thousand bills of alternatives that have never been allowed to be discussed on this floor. We had one called the no-cost stimulus bill. It was estimated that it would grow our gross domestic product by \$10 trillion and create 2 million jobs and would cost the taxpayers exactly nothing and has still yet to be allowed to be discussed on this particular floor.

Now, we come here today as part of a Western Caucus with the understanding that much of what we do in the West is a catalyst for us solving this particular problem in moving our economy ahead.

Unfortunately, this administration, which misdiagnosed what the stimulus would do, has also misdiagnosed the opportunity that so much of our public lands have offered to us. It is not an effort to try to destroy the environment, but there are enough resources we have in this country that we could create an energy policy that would indeed build real jobs.

Unfortunately, this administration looks at the gift that it has at its disposal and instead goes in the opposite direction. It creates an environmental policy that is aimed at benefiting special interest groups so that instead of our using our resources to create jobs, we actually are sacrificing jobs to a false ideology.

In this opportunity today, we are going to be talking about some of the things this administration is doing which actually harms this country and loses jobs when we have a great opportunity to try and grow jobs if we'd just use the resources that we have wisely.

I am joined and will be talking with Representative MCCLINTOCK of California. He has a unique area that deals with the forest area that has a chance of actually bringing people together for a benefit that could grow jobs, help the economy, help the environment, and for some reason, we simply are not doing it.

We will be joined later by Representative THOMPSON of Pennsylvania; not necessarily the West, but he has the same situation with a forest in Pennsylvania and, once again, the administration's misuse of land policy is costing people jobs and should not be there.

I'm joined by my good friend Representative BROWN from Georgia. He's going to try to put all this into some kind of perspective at the same time as

we deal with this issue and other issues, all of which have the same problem of costing us jobs. And hopefully there will be a few more Members who will join us before this hour has concluded.

And I'd also like to talk about a couple of policies that this administration has started which, in reality, costs American jobs when we should be producing jobs with the resources that we have.

But, Mr. Speaker, with that said, I would like, first of all, to yield some time to Representative MCCLINTOCK of California, who has a wonderful opportunity of creating jobs in California, desperately needing the jobs, desperately needing the income, but is faced with a unique barrier that's going to be extremely difficult to overcome.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I want to thank my colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding and for organizing this Special Order for the House tonight and for the attention he's devoted to the suffering in my district that's been caused by the lunatic fringe of the environmental movement that now seems to be so firmly in control of our national policy on public lands. At this point, we're not just trying to create jobs, we are desperately trying to stop losing them because of these policies.

You know, a generation ago we recognized the importance of proper wildlands management. We recognized that there is a balance between the environment and the economy and that both can thrive through proper policy. We recognize that nothing is more devastating to the ecology of a forest than a forest fire, and we recognize that public lands should be managed for the benefit of the public. We recognize that in any living community, including forests, dense overpopulation is simply unhealthy.

So we carefully groomed our public lands, we removed excessive vegetation and gave timber the room that it needed to grow. Surplus timber and overgrowth were sold for the benefit of our communities. Our forests prospered and our economy prospered, and forest fires were far less numerous and far less intense than we see today.

□ 2015

But that was before a radical ideology was introduced into public policy—that we should abandon our public lands to overgrowth and overpopulation and, in essence, to benign negligent. We are now living with the result of that ideology. Forest fires that are fueled by decades of pent-up overgrowth are now increasing in their frequency and their intensity and their destructiveness. One victim of this wrongheaded policy is the environment itself. Recent forest fires in my region make a mockery of all of our clean-air regulations. And anyone who has seen a forest after one of these fires knows that the environmental devastation could not possibly be more complete.

But these policies also carry a tremendous economic price. Timber is a renewable resource. If it is properly managed, it is literally an inexhaustible source of prosperity for our Nation. And yet, my region, which is blessed with the most bountiful resource in all of California, has literally been rendered economically prostrate by these policies. A region that once prospered from its surplus timber is now ravaged by fires that are fueled by that surplus timber.

Which brings me to the story of the townspeople of Quincy and El Camino, both little towns in the northeast corner of California. Two months ago, 150 families in each of those little towns received notice that the sawmills that employ them must close. The company made it very clear in its announcement that although the economic downturn was the catalyst, the underlying cause was the fact that two-thirds of the timber that they depended upon had been held up by environmental litigation. Despite the recession, they still had enough business to keep those mills open—and to keep these families employed—if the environmental left had not cut off the timber that those mills depended upon.

Now bear in mind that the population of the town of Quincy is about 400 families—the greater Quincy area about 1,250 families. We are talking about pink slips going to 150 of those families. And they are not the only ones who have lost incomes. Many more jobs were lost indirectly—the folks who drive the trucks and sell the supplies—all lost their jobs as well. This occurred despite the groundbreaking work of a local coalition called the Quincy Library Group that forged a model compromise between environmental, business and forest management advocates a decade ago. That work had culminated in legislation called the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act. It was adopted 11 years ago in this very Chamber by a vote of 429-1. This consensus agreement provided for sound and sustainable forest management practices that in turn would support both local jobs and healthier forests. As Senator FEINSTEIN, a Democrat, pointed out at the time, every single environmental law, including the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Forest Management Act, would be followed as this proposal is implemented. Yet despite a model compromise that produced a model law, the will of the Congress, the livelihoods of hundreds of innocent families, and the fire safety of scores of mountain communities is being challenged and undermined by a constant stream of litigation from groups purporting to support the environment. And I say "purporting" because, as the Web site of one of those groups declares, their number one policy goal is to "eliminate commercial logging on all public lands in California." Their policy is not to protect the environment. Their pol-

icy is deliberately to destroy commercial enterprise.

We held an informal hearing in Quincy after the mill closures that my friend from Utah was kind enough to join us for. And the stories we heard at that hearing were absolutely heart-breaking. It is a story of how, despite the law, this constant litigation, which is ultimately rejected by the courts, has nevertheless delayed implementation of the Forest Recovery Act until the mills collapse, and that's what we are dealing with today. They know they don't have to win the litigation, all they have to do is draw out the process. And they have done that very successfully until 150 families in Quincy and another 150 families in El Camino lost their jobs. We then held a formal hearing here in Washington, and from that hearing, Congressman HERGER has introduced his bill, H.R. 2899, to prevent frivolous litigation from continuing to destroy those jobs and continuing to impede the fire safety measures that are so vital to the preservation of these forests. I'm in the final stages of preparing legislation to at least grant litigation relief for the land that is actually within the Quincy Library Group territory defined in the legislation. And of course these bills are already being attacked by the same radical groups responsible for the litigation and regulation that is destroying these jobs, destroying these families, destroying these communities and destroying our forests. These extremists even oppose the salvaging of timber that has already been destroyed by forest fires or by disease. Now think about that. Trees that are already dead cannot be salvaged because of lawsuits filed by these extremist groups. And again, they know if they can simply delay the salvage for 2 years, the trees decay to the point where they can't be recovered. And they would rather let those trees rot on the ground rather than to be removed and salvaged to provide jobs for families and lumber for homes and revenues for the national Treasury.

The economic suffering this is now causing is immediate, and it is acute. But an even more ominous effect is placing at risk our mountain communities and our national forests to intense wildfires made possible because overgrowth is no longer being removed. As one forester told me, those trees are going to come out of the forest one way or another. They are either going to be carried out, or they will be burned out. When the excess timber was carried out, we had a thriving lumber industry that put food on the tables and clothes on the children of thousands of working families throughout northern California. More importantly, we also had much healthier forests and far fewer and milder forest fires than we suffer today. This isn't environmentalism. True environmentalists recognize the damage done by overgrowth and overpopulation and recognize that the role of sound forest management practices

is to maintain healthy forests. We are also watching them systematically shut down our public land for public use and public benefit. And every time a little town like Quincy or El Camino is strangled to death by these policies, it has a ripple effect throughout the Nation. Our Nation loses tax revenues, commerce withers, the price of raw materials rises and public resources are diverted to provide economic relief. And our forests suffer as well.

But there's one infinitely higher cost that I haven't mentioned yet, and that brings me to the tragic news that I must impart to the House tonight. There is a raging fire in the Shasta/Trinity National Forest as we speak right now. It's called the "Backbone Fire." About 2 hours ago, I received word that a young man, Thomas Marovich, Jr.—20 years old—from the little town of Aiden in my district, was killed this afternoon fighting that fire. And every time a little town like Aiden mourns the loss of a promising young man like Thomas Marovich, Jr., it is not only a tragedy—if preventable, it is an outrage.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the great silent majority of Americans to rise up against the most radical elements of the environmental movement that now seem to control so much of our public policy and to demand that we restore our public land for public use and public benefit, and that we restore the sound forest management practices that once minimized the forest fires that are now again destroying communities and taking lives.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Would the gentleman yield for one moment?

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Absolutely.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This is truly a tragedy that you have mentioned that is taking place in your home district. As I was out there in the community of Quincy, I was noticing that the concept that they said is that if they could thin those forests, they could minimize the risk of forest fire as well as using the resources that would be pulled out to create jobs at the same time.

Could this fire have at least been mitigated if we had gone through these practices of thinning the forest under proper procedures that would help the forest as well as help the economy at the same time?

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Well, that is why for many years we thinned those forests, to reduce the intensity of those forest fires, to reduce the number of those forest fires, and from that excess timber, we provided a thriving economy throughout that region. And by the way, we also provided a tremendous revenue stream to the national Treasury because that timber is on land owned by the people of the United States. So we had healthier forests, and we had a healthy economy. Both have been imperiled by those policies. And then to that you have to add the tragedy of the human loss of those heroic young men like Mr. Marovich who gave his life today to try to stop those

fires, which are much more intense today and much more numerous today than they were a generation ago when we practiced sound forest management practice.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. To the gentleman from California, I thank him for joining us here. I know that we all send our sympathy to the community and especially the family at this time of their particular loss in a heroic effort to try and help and save others.

Part of the problem that the gentleman from California is talking about is because of the land that is owned by the Federal Government. On this particular chart, everything that is in red is owned by the Federal Government. You will notice that it has a preponderance in the West. And where Mr. McCLINTOCK is talking is that area in California surrounded by red. Let's face it. If you live in that area that is surrounded by red, you really don't have a whole lot of options. The Federal Government controls what opportunities you do or do not have.

Let me give you just one example in my State of a different area. And I want to introduce you to a young man by the name of Mr. Pitchforth. Mr. Pitchforth is a young and exciting school teacher who got 12-, 13- and 14-year-olds excited by geography and history, which by itself should give him some kind of hero's medal. This September, though, he is not going to be teaching school. He is not going to be teaching school because the district in which he lives is one of those red areas in which this administration unilaterally and arbitrarily decided to take 77 oil and gas leases and suspend them, take them off the market, making them unusable. And in so doing, took neighboring and abutting pieces of property owned by the school trust lands and make them also sterile for this time period. The schools lost money. And in so doing, their reaction was to fire the first teacher hired. Mr. Pitchforth is not there anymore. You see, this doesn't deal with just people who are working in oil and gas. There's collateral damage from every one of our decisions that the government makes. Mr. Pitchforth isn't working because of a choice he made, but because of a choice some bureaucrat back here in Washington made. And it's not fair. It's not fair for him. It's not fair for his family.

There's other collateral damage that takes place in this area where the Secretary of the Interior decides to pull these leases and suspend these leases for the rationale that the Bush administration did them too quickly. Actually, the Bush administration took 7 years to go through the process. I guess 7 years was not enough time to decide whether we were doing the right thing or not, at least that is what the Secretary said. Let me read to you a letter from, once again, somebody who is not directly employed but who is in the transportation business that does the shipping of materials both to and from

those potential sites. As he wrote the county commission where he lives, Let me applaud your efforts in trying to get the message to our Interior Department that their actions have caused great harm to the economy of our area and to individuals living there. At the end of 2008, we employed over 230 truck drivers and leased 204 trucks. Our payroll was \$12 million a year. But since the first of the year, we have laid off 36 trucks and 47 drivers. There are now 47 families without income nor payroll benefits associated with them. Our overall payroll is down 29 percent, projected now to be down to \$9 million by the end of this calendar year. On a personal note, my son who has worked in the oil fields for the past 8 years has never been unable to find employment until now. He has been off now for 3 months and is getting very discouraged. My daughter is a single mother of two growing boys. She has been struggling to make ends meet with the economy the way it is now and seems she has lost hope of ever finding employment elsewhere. To Brett who is the field manager who was laid off on July 1, July 13 he and his wife had a baby. To Jody and Jeff, two truck operators, Jody lost his truck because he couldn't make payments after he was laid off because of the decision made by the Secretary here in Washington. Curtis was a craftsman and a cabinetmaker who lost his job due to the cancelled contracts once they realized these leases were taken off the table. Travis, a construction worker, husband, father of two children, laid off, once again, as soon as a bureaucratic decision here in Washington was made that had unintended consequences far beyond what was anticipated when a bureaucrat in Washington decided to make decisions on what should take place on the ground out there and took the opportunity of solving our problems and creating problems and taking jobs away from people.

We talk about the numbers unemployed. Each of those unemployed numbers is a face and a real person with a real family and a real issue. I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Georgia to try and put this in perspective. And then we will be joined by two other members of the Western Caucus.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank you, Mr. BISHOP, for yielding me some time. I was really touched by the faces that you've brought forward to the American people tonight here on C-SPAN about these people who have lost their jobs and my good friend TOM McCLINTOCK talking about the National Forest and the mismanagement that is going on because of the endless environmental wacko lawsuits that are going on there and the unfortunate untimely death of this young man who was fighting those fires that probably could have been prevented if we had managed the forest in a better way, in a correct way, according to normal silviculture practices.

□ 2030

Civil culture means forestry practices to the best extent for economic purposes, and I thank both of you for bringing the face of people to this discussion tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a medical doctor, and I've seen the faces of a lot of patients who have struggled with the cost of health care expenses, the cost of health insurance and medication and hospital bills. In over 3½ decades of practicing general medicine in rural south Georgia and now northeast Georgia, I've literally given away in my services several hundred thousand dollars of my services if I had charged for them.

We have a proposal that I call ObamaCare that's being debated here in the Halls of Congress. Mr. Speaker, the director of the Congressional Budget Office last week said that if ObamaCare is passed it's going to cost 750,000 people their jobs across America. Three-quarters of 1 million people are going to be put out of work just because of passing a bill that supposedly is going to make everybody covered by health insurance.

But the Congressional Budget Office director also said that even in the next 10 years not everybody would be covered. Let me say that again, because what we keep hearing from the Democratic side is we're going to cover everybody; everybody's going to have health care. Well, everybody does have access to health care today. Federal law requires it. What everybody does not have is health insurance.

But our Democratic colleagues want to give free health insurance to illegal aliens, and that's what ObamaCare does. It gives free health insurance to illegal aliens. The 12 million, 15 million illegal aliens in this country who are criminals have entered this country illegally. Virtually all of them have illegal documents. They've broken many Federal laws. They're criminals. And my Democratic colleagues want to give them free insurance. It's going to cost 750,000 American citizens jobs to do so.

Mr. Speaker, this House considered a bill just a few weeks ago that they, my Democratic colleagues, call cap-and-trade. I call it tax-and-trade or tax-and-cap because it's about taxes. It's about revenue. We hear over and over again that it is going to create all these green jobs. Well, it will create some green jobs. In fact, I saw a friend, my next door neighbor in the hall over in the Cannon House Office Building, bring in a chart where he's going to talk about green jobs, and it indeed will create green jobs, but what you're not being told is what happened to Spain.

Our President has lifted up Spain as being the model of what we need to do on these green jobs and environmental policy. Well, about a decade ago Spain put into place a similar piece of legislation as our tax-and-trade bill that's languishing over in the Senate, and I hope the Senate will defeat it. But in

Spain, for every single green job that was created, 2.2 other jobs cost. In other words, 2.2 people were put out of work for every one person put to work by these green jobs that tax-and-trade is going to create.

I know my Democratic colleagues can add and subtract. I don't want to accuse them of not doing so, but if you subtract 2.2 from 1, you get a minus 1.2, and that's exactly what's going to happen. If the American people don't stand up and say "no" to tax-and-trade, or tax-and-cap, whatever you want to call it, and tell the U.S. Senators, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to be disastrous and it's going to cost American jobs and to defeat it over there in the Senate, there will be 2.2 people put out of work for every 1 person that is put to work.

I already said the Congressional Budget Office says 750,000 people are going to lose their jobs because of ObamaCare, but it's going to do many other things, too, that are disastrous. ObamaCare is going to insert a Washington bureaucrat between every patient and their doctor, and the Washington bureaucrat is going to be making, Mr. Speaker, every single individual in this country's health care decision. The patient, the patient's family won't be able to make those decisions. The doctor won't be able to make those decisions. It's going to be a Washington bureaucrat that makes that decision.

We were told by our Democratic colleagues it's all about lowering costs; but just last Friday the Director of the Congressional Budget Office said that it's not going to rein in the cost of health care. In fact, it's going to cost more money.

So let me get this right. It's going to cost more money to put in place ObamaCare; it's going to take decisions away from patients and their family and their doctor about making health care decisions; and it's going to put a Washington bureaucrat in charge of those decisions, and that Washington bureaucrat is going to say whether a patient can get needed treatment, surgery, x rays, MRIs, or not.

We already know in countries such as Great Britain and Canada that in those socialized medicine, government-run programs, that the death rates for cancer overall are much higher than here in the United States. Women who get breast cancer in Canada and Great Britain, roughly 50 percent of them are dead after 5 years. Prostate cancer, the same, roughly 50 percent of people that are diagnosed with prostate cancer in those countries, or 60 percent, are dead in 5 years. Here in the United States, it's over 90 percent are still alive. So what's going to happen here? Our death rates are going to go up for all cancers.

Just today, we had a bill here on the floor that I talked about that is one to try to encourage people to understand diabetes. As a medical practitioner, I've treated diabetes for years, and the end result of diabetes and the reason

it's so important to catch it early and to treat it is that people die at a young age when they have diabetes, a lot younger than they should if it's treated.

But the thing is, as we ration health care and the Washington bureaucrat tells patients that they can't get the tests that they need, they can't get the life-saving coronary bypass surgery or stints and the procedures they need to help them not die from heart attacks or from strokes, the Washington bureaucrats are going to say particularly to the elderly that you can't get the dialysis that you desperately need because you're old and it's not cost effective, it's not comparatively effective, and thus, you just must die and not get the treatment that you desperately need.

So people are not only going to be put out of work but people are going to be in poor health. We're going to degrade the quality of health care delivered by doctors and hospitals across this Nation because a Washington bureaucrat's going to say "no" to patients and say "no" to doctors.

This is going to be disastrous. We're creating a debt and a deficit that's unprecedented in the history of our Nation. We're going down a track right now, Mr. Speaker, that every great nation in history has gone down: Great Britain, Spain, even Rome. We're going down a track of spending money that we don't have, creating debt that we cannot pay. We're robbing our children and our grandchildren of their future. They will live at a lower standard than we live today because of this huge debt that we're creating, Mr. Speaker, this huge deficit that this administration is creating.

I hear from our friends on the Democratic side, even just this week I heard them blame President Bush for the debt and deficit. Well, I blame President Bush for being a big spender and he was. While I was here during the tail end of his Presidency, I fought all those big spending bills. I fought the Washington bailout of Wall Street.

But President Bush was just a piker compared to what this administration's doing. We're creating unprecedented debt and deficit that our grandchildren cannot pay. So their standard of living is going to be worse than it is today.

Mr. Speaker, there are going to be a lot of people put out of work. During the Great Depression all the spending that FDR did did put some people to work, but the unemployment rates bounced up and down and stayed very high.

Mr. Speaker, in my district in Georgia, many counties have over 13 percent unemployment today. I've talked to several managers of plants, manufacturing plants in my district, that tell me that if this tax-and-trade bill that the Senate has over here that this House passed, they are they're going to lock the doors. Those jobs are going to go overseas because they can't afford to pay the higher energy tax.

Most Americans are going to have a hard time, particularly the poor and the people on limited incomes are going to have a hard time paying the higher energy cost.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have stood up over and over again and have talked about the proposals that we have made, proposals to stimulate the economy and create jobs; proposals to lower the cost of health care expenses to all Americans; proposals that would stimulate the economy; proposals that don't cost our grandchildren their future and, in fact, will not even cost the taxpayers today any increase in their taxes. But those proposals are not heard because the leadership of this House and the leadership of the Senate across the way won't let those proposals get to the floor to be discussed, and it's not right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we're robbing America of its future. We're robbing Americans of their jobs today. We're going down a track that's going to put more and more people out of work. It's going to create more problems for people paying their utility bills, their gasoline, their home heating costs and things like that. Even with the mandates from our friends on the Democratic side that they are putting on health care, it's going to literally lower the income of people who are working, and it's not right and it's not fair.

Mr. Speaker, it's got to stop. The American people need to stand up and say "no" to ObamaCare, "no" to tax-and-spend policies that this administration, that this leadership in this House and the Senate are bringing forward because it's going to destroy America.

And I thank my friend from Utah, Mr. BISHOP. I see he has a poster here that we have a lot of these unemployed people in my district. Praise God that we don't have 14.7 million people in my district out of work; but more and more people are becoming unemployed, and they're going to continue to lose jobs in my district in Georgia, and I'm sure they are in yours in Utah if we don't stop this outrageous spending that the leadership of this Congress, of this administration, are doing. We've got to stop it, and it's up to the American people to demand from their Senators and their Congressmen and this administration saying "no" to this outrageous spending that's going on.

□ 2045

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate Representative BROWN from Georgia for joining us. He provides a unique element to the Western Caucus of giving a Southern input, which we find so similar to the problems that we're facing, as well as a medical background. Part of the problems he's talking about is the reason that the policies we have been creating as a government is part of the problem why we have 14.7 million unemployed right now.

I'd like to go to the Eastern part of the country, if I could, and yield some

time to Representative THOMPSON from the State of Pennsylvania, who also has a similar problem, similar situation, with a similar heavyhanded result of bureaucratic Washington decisions, and it has direct impact, so that these unemployed are not just faces, they're real people.

Then, we will be happy to be joined by Representative LUMMIS from Wyoming, who has the same things in her home State as well.

Representative THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for coordinating this event tonight. I'm very proud to represent Pennsylvania's Fifth District and am very proud to be a part of the Western Caucus. We have a lot of wonderful natural resources that, frankly, help to make, Mr. Speaker, make this country strong, and I believe as a part of our promising future if we use them and use them wisely.

Federal policies that lead to job losses is a very personal one for me and many of my constituents in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. My district is home to Pennsylvania's only national forest, the Allegheny, or the ANF as we often refer to it—513,000 acres.

The ANF is as special as the district that I represent and has a long history as an economic and a tourism center for the region. Nearby, in Titusville, Pennsylvania, Colonel Edwin Drake founded the world's very first commercial oil well in 1859. The energy industry has been the economic engine in that region in my district ever since. Now this includes the ANF.

For 86 years, the forest has successfully operated for multiuse purposes. These uses include recreation tourism as well as timber harvesting, oil, and natural gas production. Frankly, before this forest was formed 86 years ago, it was an oil and gas field.

Since oil and gas has been the economic engine in the region for over 60 years, when the ANF was created, the Federal Government only purchased the surface rights. This was done intentionally by the Federal Government in order to leave the mineral rights, meaning the rights to oil and gas and minerals, in private hands. And for some 85-plus years there's been a positive working relationship between the Federal Government, who owns the surface rights, and the private and oil gas developers, who own the mineral rights.

However, this longstanding and beneficial relationship recently has been ruptured. Last fall, the Forest Service was sued by three environmental groups: Sierra Club, the Allegheny Defense Project, and the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics. The Sierra Club is based in the Speaker's home district in San Francisco, California. The Allegheny Defense Fund is based somewhere in Oregon. And the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics—well, they

won't identify themselves. We don't know.

These groups are attempting to apply the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, to the permitting processes, which effectively will shut down energy production in the forests.

Let me be clear, oil and gas production is the major economic force in the region, and has been since that first oil well was drilled 150 years ago.

Penn State University performed a study and concluded that for every 100 direct oil and gas sector jobs in northwestern Pennsylvania, 23 industry support jobs are created, with an additional 40 ancillary jobs in the retail and residential sectors. Want a true economic stimulus that leads us to energy independence? Let's support that industry. Again, I can't emphasize enough how important these jobs are to our region and the local economy.

As a direct result of the lawsuit, the forest service indefinitely suspended the permitting process for all new oil and gas leases in January of this year. To make matters worse, the Forest Service released a settlement this past April that sides entirely with the environmental groups.

This settlement was reached behind closed doors and was reached with no industry input. There was no judge, no court that told them to do this. Applying NEPA was a decision made by the Forest Service and did not even take into account the people that it would hurt directly and the most. No court told them to do this, which means that it was a policy change that occurred within the National Forest Service.

Now, while these environmental groups would like everyone to think that oil and gas production in the ANF goes unregulated, it's rigorously regulated by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. And they do a great job. They always have.

Today, I, along with Mr. BISHOP and 18 other members of the Congressional Western Caucus, sent a letter on this topic to Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack. The Secretary, unlike some Members of Congress and environmental groups, knows that the Forest Service is a part of the Agriculture Department, not the Interior Department.

The bottom line is that Congress and the President have this year alone spent about a trillion dollars in the name of job creation. Yet, some within the administration are also actively trying to make policy changes like this that kill good-paying jobs which have existed for 86 years.

Not too long ago, I was in Bradford, Pennsylvania, on a Sunday morning, and I picked out a small church to worship in. And at the end of the service I had a young mom come up to me. She had three little kids in tow. They weren't very big. The oldest maybe was four years old.

And she came up to me and she said, You're Mr. THOMPSON. She said, I want to thank you for what you're trying to

do to stand up for the right things of making sure that we have the rights to access to subsurface rights. You see, her husband makes his living working on oil wells. At that point, he was struggling to find a job and struggling to be able to support his family because of a policy change by this administration which attacks the subsurface private property rights. And that's not right.

I've talked with businesses that have been in the business, have lived their entire life for generations in the Allegheny National Forest, that own subsurface rights and have every right for 86 years to access oil, natural gas, and minerals that they own. And, because of that arbitrary policy change by this administration, that's been shut down. And these folks who have been in business for just generations are no longer able to support themselves.

This type of attack, this type of policy by this administration on private property owners, it impacts timber workers, it impacts drillers, excavation companies, businesses, schools, townships, and families. Frankly, they're all suffering. And they're suffering because of the arbitrary and devastating policies of this administration on private-property-right owners.

I thank the gentleman from Utah and I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This clearly shows we are desperate to create jobs and yet we have an Interior and an Agricultural Department whose decisions are killing jobs and the ripple effect those jobs have.

I'd like one other illustration of how this is happening. My good friend, Representative LUMMIS from Wyoming, one of my favorite elements about Wyoming is that fact I'm an old schoolteacher. And this chart clearly shows that the blue line is what Wyoming pays their schoolteachers. The red line is what Montana pays their schoolteachers. And the only difference between those two States is Wyoming clearly realizes what can happen and how much good you can do when you develop the resources that are there in that particular State.

I yield to the gentlelady from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding. The chart he shows is exactly right. The fact that Wyoming chose to develop its mining resources and Montana chose a path that retarded the development of its mining resources is the difference in the teacher salaries, as pointed out in that chart.

We have been blessed in Wyoming by having low unemployment and it created an opportunity, until recently, for people from other States who have suffered job losses to find gainful employment and make a new life in Wyoming.

A number of families have relocated, especially from Michigan, to the State of Wyoming, and predominantly the community of Gillette. Gillette, Wyo-

ming, has become Wyoming's third-largest city and is growing in a way that brings young families vibrancy, activity, and the arts and recreation to a wonderful Wyoming community in northeast Wyoming.

It's brought a lot of new people to Wyoming from Michigan looking for a new life and looking for work. Many of them came from the automobile industry and manufacturing industries and mining industries, quite frankly, that were devastated due to the economic downturn. But they were able to find jobs in Wyoming, and we're so happy to have them.

Then, along comes Waxman-Markey, a bill that creates a national energy tax and a bill that creates a tremendous threat, especially to coal mining jobs.

Jobs in the Wyoming mining industry are high paying. Eighty-six percent higher than the average wage in the State. The average annual wage in the mining industry in Wyoming was \$73,000 in 2007. It is an extraordinarily liveable wage in Wyoming.

But, if you look at the total coal mining jobs in the U.S. and the changes in policy under Waxman-Markey and other bills going through this Congress, the outlook for those Michigan residents who have proudly relocated to Wyoming is not very prosperous.

Job losses related to Waxman-Markey, optimistic projections, total U.S. job loss in 5 years: 14,000 jobs lost in coal mining alone. A pessimistic number for job losses 5 years from now in coal mining alone: 35,000 jobs.

Let's project it out because, as you know, Waxman-Markey doesn't take effect completely until the year 2050, but let's just go out 10 years and 15 years.

The projected loss in jobs in 10 years due to Waxman-Markey, under the most optimistic scenario that can be put together: 20,000 jobs lost in coal mining alone. And the pessimistic number: 67,000 jobs. That's the entire population of my community of Cheyenne, and then some.

Of course, 20 years out the optimistic job loss in coal alone: 50,000 people. And the pessimistic number: 125,000 people in coal alone. These are not jobs that can be replaced by green jobs. These green jobs are not projected to pay 86 percent higher than the average wage in my State.

Not only is the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill, the national energy tax, an attack on coal-producing States around the Nation, but other bills going through this Congress are having the same consequence.

Let's take, for example, the Interior Appropriations bill that just passed the House. It had a provision in it that when a company acquires a Federal lease to mine more coal, they will pay a bid bonus payment. That occurs now. The problem is, these bid bonus payments are such a large amount of money that they have been spread out

over 5 years so the companies can borrow less money or use production that they're currently accomplishing to pay in 5-year increments for those big coal bid bonus payments.

Under the Interior Appropriations bill that just passed this House, they will have to pay that all up front. These are staggeringly large numbers, in the tens of millions and sometimes hundreds of millions of dollars.

□ 2100

Companies in this financial crisis cannot borrow those kinds of moneys. Consequently, there will be companies that will not bid, thereby reducing the receipts to the American taxpayer when there's not competitive bidding for the coal or there may be no bids at all because no company can borrow enough money to pay the entire 5-year payment up front.

One little amendment in an enormous bill that has tremendous consequences to coal mining jobs went through without discussion, and there are many such amendments in these bills every day that are an attack on jobs in this country, an attack on jobs in my State. The attack on jobs in the Appalachian States is unbelievable under the cap-and-trade bill. If I were in an Appalachian State, I would be even more concerned than I am for my State of Wyoming, and as the number one coal-producing State in the country, I am tremendously concerned about the loss of jobs.

These policies are not good for America. They're not good for my State. They're not good for the West, and they're certainly not good for the hard-working people of America.

I thank Mr. BISHOP of Utah for allowing me the time to speak this evening.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming who has so clearly pointed out how small decisions that we make here still have enormous impacts. We have seen what this administration has done in an effort, for whatever reason, to harm the creation of jobs when it deals with land policy.

This week the Secretary of the Interior decided to have a time-out on new leases of uranium mining, which will lose at least 1,100 jobs. He earlier decided to put a halt on the development of oil shale projects. That could be up to 1 million jobs. It is estimated at 160,000 jobs that will be lost from the delay on Outer Continental Shelf development. An effort to stop the timber harvest in western Oregon immediately costs another 5,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at what we're doing here, it is very clear that small business and families are struggling today. Republicans have put forth thoughtful, serious alternatives which have been ignored and not even discussed. It's also clear that the President's economic decisions have not produced jobs, not produced prosperity, and simply have not worked. It doesn't mean that we're out of options. We can still have a real recovery.

If we emphasize and create an environment that empowers small business and empowers Americans and we focus on job creation, we stop the attack on the West and other areas of public lands and the people who live there and allow them to develop the resources that we have been given to create real jobs in this country, we can do that. That is still an option that we have. But we have to do it, and we have to do it together.

There are a lot of other examples that I would like to go into, Mr. Speaker, but time does not allow that—maybe at some other time—where decisions by this administration have actually harmed families and their creation of jobs. Once again, we have to change directions. That has to stop.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Justin Cox, Physician, Office of Attending Physician:

OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN,
U.S. CAPITOL,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for trial testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in connection with a criminal case now pending in that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JUSTIN COX,
Physician.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE IS A MATTER OF NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCMAHON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to stand here in the House of Representatives, representing the people of the great boroughs of Staten Island and Brooklyn in New York for the Freshmen Energy Hour. I am privileged to be joined by my colleague, as I come from Hudson Valley in New York, my colleague from the Ohio Valley, the great JOHN BOCCIERI, the gentleman from Ohio, who will join me in this Freshman Energy Hour.

Mr. Speaker, we're here today to talk about the American Clean Energy and Security Act, which was passed recently by the House, and to speak to its merits in order to urge the Senate to pass it as well. I sat here and lis-

tened to our great colleagues from across the aisle for some time this evening speaking on this issue. They conclude that they hope that the Senate looks upon this bill unfavorably as they criticize the initiatives of this bill.

I know that my colleague will mention it, but I would just like to remind them what their former candidate for President in last year's election, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, said about the cap-and-trade legislation as recently as February 17, 2009. He said: It's cap-and-trade, that there will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's a free-market approach. The Europeans are using it now. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain—look, if we do that, we stimulate green technologies. I have great faith in the American industry. This will be a profit-making business, create jobs. It won't cost the American taxpayer a thing.

So I am pleased that those who spoke before me from across the aisle in opposition to this bill referenced the opinion of the United States Senate. And I am glad that Senator MCCAIN was honest and forthright enough to admit that this legislation does, indeed, create jobs, provides for the security of our Nation, and takes care of the environment as well, and, indeed, it is important for us for our future.

As we know, the recently passed Energy and Security legislation comes at a time when inaction will have undue consequences. This comprehensive energy and clean environment bill is a necessary vehicle to ensure our future economic and environmental viability in the 21st century green economy.

I would like to start out by commending the leadership of the House who brought forward this bill and saw that it was passed. The regional differences arising from energy-based issues are often quite lofty, but the leadership did an outstanding job of moving through the legislative process with consideration for different Members' interests.

Since the bill's passage before the Independence Day recess, many Members, myself included, have experienced varying degrees of concern from our constituents, particularly regarding the cost and impact of the bill to their wallets, and quite a lot of this concern has been raised because of misrepresentations from our gentle colleagues from the other side of the aisle as to the aspects of this bill. Together with Mr. BOCCIERI, I would like to address some of these concerns and the pervasive misinformation that has been put out there today and explain how this information will be a cost-saver for consumers and homeowners, will cut down on pollution, and will increase our national security.

At a time when we are importing increasing amounts of energy from hostile regions of the world, we cannot afford to go down the path of energy insecurity. This legislation will redirect

us on a path towards energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I sat here and listened to our colleagues from across the aisle this evening and all day long, hundreds of minutes, I understand, that they spoke about this issue and the creation of jobs in this country. What I found very disconcerting as a New Yorker is that they've totally forgotten the issue of national security and how important energy independence is to this Nation. It's so important to me, Mr. Speaker, because I come from Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York, where, on 9/11, over 10 percent of the people who were killed in the attack on the World Trade Center came from our boroughs, although we have less than 5 percent of the population in that area.

I remember that day as clear as any other in my life—in fact, more profoundly. It was a bright, sunny day. And I remember it because I was involved in my first election campaign that day. It was a primary for the New York City Council. We were in church at about 9 a.m., as we do on every Election Day after opening the polls and campaigning a bit. The police officer who I was with received an emergency call and took us out and said that something terrible had happened and we have to go down to the harbor.

When we got down there, we saw the World Trade Center aflame, and the second plane had just struck. We went back to our office to close down the election, and as we were there, we saw the horrors of what transpired on television as the buildings collapsed. I will never forget it. I will never forget being on the pile the days after and the bucket brigade. I will never forget seeing President Bush say to our Nation and to those who lost their loved ones that we will never forget.

After we closed down the election, we weren't sure what to do that day, so we went to the local hospital and set up a blood bank to await the injured people to come back from the site. But as hour and hour went on, we realized that no one was coming back and the enormity of the tragedy. I mention this because I think it's so important that our Nation does not forget the costs of dependence upon nations around this world for oil who want to see our great American democracy torn down. Our way of life is an affront to them, and they will do anything to tear down America.

So when you have this discussion about energy and whatever they want to call it, let us never forget that this is about energy security first and foremost. America cannot go on the way it has, relying on foreign oil from countries who want to tear our country down. Even though we made a pledge at that time to end dependence on foreign oil, the chart that I have here will show that just in the last year, in 2008, the amount of oil that we imported from foreign countries was 66.4 percent of our usage. The dollars we spent overseas, \$475 billion. How many of those