

honoring its international agreement by returning these fuels for the purposes of nuclear nonproliferation and safeguarding.

Today, H-Canyon and its HB-Line operations are supporting the DOE Highly Enriched Uranium Blend-Down program and Plutonium Disposition program. By blending down highly enriched uranium and isolating plutonium from surrounding corrosive elements, H-Canyon ensures our country's national security, while simultaneously providing fuel which is currently being purchased by the Tennessee Valley Authority to empower commercial nuclear reactors.

As difficult funding decisions are made in this Congress, I urge my colleagues to support the mission of H-Canyon. It is a vital national asset that has served our country since victory in the Cold War and will continue to protect and serve Americans both home and abroad for decades.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CONGRATULATIONS, HOUSTON TEXANS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you would wonder how do you claim victory out of a season that if you are a professional football player does not end in the Super Bowl.

I rise today to congratulate and thank my hometown team of the Houston Texans, a very young franchise that came together and showed their mighty might and kept on plugging until they got into the playoffs and even to the point of meeting the Baltimore Ravens last Sunday.

There are many good things to say about this team; and in the backdrop of the holiday of Dr. Martin Luther King, it is also a tribute to these young men who worked together and showed themselves as brothers, coming from so many diverse backgrounds from around the Nation. Their owner, Bob McNair; their coach, Coach Kubiak; their defense coach, Wade Phillips; General Manager Smith; and some of their stars, like No. 80 and Arian Foster and their young quarterback and many others showed themselves to have good character and good examples for our community.

And, yes, let me thank them for the service they've given to the young kids in Houston, Texas. From the foundation of No. 80 and the many individual acts of kindness, we appreciate the Houston Texans.

So, tonight, you may not be in the Super Bowl, but you are our winner. We thank you for being the kind of young men that are modeling yourselves to be the kind of leaders that middle school boys and girls and others can have as a shining example. Go, Texans. Maybe not this year, but I

know you're on your way. But most of all, you have served yourself well in the area and the arena of professional sports. We can truly be proud of you. Congratulations, young men. Do well in the off season, and we're ready for you to come back.

Houston loves you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIVERA). The Chair will remind Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important hour tonight because we are talking about the security of this country, and we are talking about having a secure source of oil and energy into the future. And as Americans around the country know, it hasn't been too long, they just go out and look at what the gas pump says, and I know when I left Bowling Green, my hometown in Ohio this morning, gas was \$3.49 a gallon. And you know, we only have to go back to January of '09 when President Obama took office and gasoline was \$1.78. So we've seen a dramatic increase in the price of gasoline.

What we need to do is we need to talk not only about the security but where we are getting our oil from, because oil runs our manufacturing and it's very, very important. I serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee. And earlier this year, manufacturing jobs in this country on just our committee alone, on Energy and Commerce, we had 1,729,250 manufacturing jobs on our committee alone, according to National Manufacturers. Today, that number has dropped to 1,526,941, or a loss of 202,309 jobs in manufacturing.

And when I'm out talking to my folks in manufacturing, small and large, one of the things that really hits them is what the cost of energy is and where it's going to be coming from. And when we've got the problems over in the Middle East and with Iran, and there is a question as to whether we're going to have a secure source in that region of the world, it pushes up the price of energy, and it affects the jobs in this country.

But we have a unique opportunity in this country, and the President does. And what the President can do is to get this Keystone XL pipeline going; and we've urged him in committee, and we're urging him in Congress, to make that decision to get this going.

Let me just go through a few facts, if I may. First of all, a lot of people might not realize this, but the Canadians are the largest folks up there to the north to provide energy to us in the form of oil. We get 13 percent of our

current U.S. energy, our oil needs come from Canada, and 23 percent of all U.S. petroleum imports come from Canada. A lot of people might think they come from over in the Middle East. They don't. They come from our friends up north, our good neighbors up north. Another statistic that I think is really important to point out is that when we send a dollar to Canada for Canadian products, we're getting 90 percent back from the Canadians on purchases they make of U.S. goods and services.

So it's a very, very great relationship that we have with the Canadians because it's a great relationship, our largest partner to the north, and when it comes to trading.

But Canada is only second to Saudi Arabia for proven recoverable oil reserves with over 170 billion barrels in the form of the oil sands—170 billion barrels. And, again, as the largest supplier of oil to the U.S., Canada provides consistency and stability with nearly 2 million barrels per day, which is currently more than, again, of the 20 percent of U.S. imports. And approximately 56 percent of all Canadian exports of oil to the U.S. flow into the northern Midwest region. That's Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Ninety-four percent of all those imports into the region come from Canada, and 76 percent of this oil is from the oil sands. Forty percent of all the oil refined in this region also comes from that area of the oil sands.

A report that was issued by the Canadian Energy Research Institute, the CERI, states that U.S. jobs supported by Canadian oil sands development could grow from 21,000 jobs today to 465,000 jobs by 2035. It's also important to note that we are looking at about 20,000 jobs right now, and another 100,000 jobs on ancillary if this pipeline gets approved and gets moving. So it's incumbent that the President takes action so we can get these jobs in the United States; but also, more importantly, along with those job is to make sure that we have a secure source of oil in this country.

2,400 American companies in 49 States are involved in development of Canadian oil sands. That's important, because it's just not the Canadians up there that are doing this. It's American companies, American jobs making sure that we have that stable source.

So when it comes right down to it, we need to have the President act immediately and favorably on this to get America moving on jobs, but also, at the same time, to make sure that we have a stable and a secure source of energy in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, why are many of us on the House floor tonight after regular business talking about

the Keystone Pipeline? Because it's a win-win—20,000 immediate contracting support jobs for the construction of a 1,700-mile pipeline from Alberta, Canada, down to our refineries in south Texas and then over to Louisiana. Beginning when this pipeline is finished, it will bring about 600,000, 700,000 barrels of oil to the United States from our good friend, Canada.

□ 1920

Now, just to put that amount in perspective, \$700,000, they expect that by the time it's fully operational it will be \$1 million.

To put it in context, today we are importing 900,000 barrels from Venezuela. We import 1.2 million from Saudi Arabia. So take it which way you want, but our friends from Canada, Alberta, just a few hundred miles north of our border, will produce enough oil to almost completely offset the heavy crude from Venezuela or Saudi Arabian oil. The reality, my friends, is that we have enough energy resources in the United States and Canada to be free of OPEC oil.

Now, we talk about 20,000 direct jobs from a \$7 billion project that is sitting waiting to go. They have their project labor agreement sitting. There are union folk ready to go to work. All it has to do is be approved, the permit for this, approved by the President. Once he says yes, 20,000 people go to work and we put ourselves on a path to greater energy security.

That's one of the reasons why I fought so hard to get onto the Energy and Commerce Committee—to set us on a path to energy security where we don't have to send our money, U.S. consumers' dollars, to buy the energy necessary to propel our economy. But a funny thing happened on the road to energy security. The environmentalists said that this is heavy crude, and it is going to expel in the process too much CO₂. They want to stop fossil fuels. So instead of using the most energy-efficient refineries in the world that would have the least emissions of CO₂, I guess the environmental community would rather it go to China, where they have few pollution and carbon controls on their refineries. And by the way, China just bought half of the oil sands just a week ago; they'd be glad to buy the other half if we don't. So it's going to be refined.

The President has until February 21 to say yes or no to this. That was by act of Congress, setting that deadline, because the original application was filed September of 2008, 3 years and 4 months ago. The average is 18 months for a transcontinental pipeline. This administration has been dragging its feet because they don't want to irritate the environmental community, which has been heightened now since we're into an election year. I wish we could have done this before we got into 2012, where it could be based on the merits and not the politics, but politics is what we're dealing with right now. The

President said several times in the last few weeks that, geez, because Congress has forced my hand on making a decision before February 21, that's not enough time, so I may just have to deny it. Well, that's complete bull.

Here's a document. I apologize to the gallery and maybe our C-SPAN viewers because the print is rather small, but this is an administration document from their agency dated July 25, Executive Office of the President, July 25. Let me read the important sentence here, the significant sentence in their document, the bill that we had then on July 25. They say it's unnecessary because the Department of State—who makes the recommendation to the President—has been working diligently to complete the permit decision process for the Keystone XL pipeline and has publicly committed to reaching a decision before December 31, 2011.

Two other documents from the State Department have said that they have all the information they need, they're working diligently, and they will have the recommendation to the President by December 31, 2011, which of course they have not made. And the President says, geez, Congress, no reason for you to get involved because we're working diligently and we have all the information we need, and we will make a decision. Then, just prior to December 31, they're starting to say we want more information, or you're putting us in a box where we're going to have to say no. Bull. This is all politics. Stop playing politics, Mr. President, and put us on a road that we can be energy independent. And at a time of high unemployment, where these tradespeople are standing around waiting for work, put them back to work now, Mr. President.

I yield back the balance of my time.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is important that as soon as we get back here today, it is our first day back, that we get back on the focus of creating jobs in this country. And not jobs that government says we can create, but sustainable jobs that are created by the private sector; private capital assuming risk, hoping for a return to get economic growth. There's no better opportunity to do that than with the Keystone XL pipeline.

This is what we're talking about. Here's the oil up here in Edmonton. There's already a pipeline that goes down into my district actually, Patoka, a refinery in Wood River, and a new refinery also in the central eastern part of the State of Illinois.

The Keystone XL would be this blue line, which will bring more crude. Why do we need another pipeline, a bigger pipeline? Because there's so much crude oil up there in Canada, and they

really don't have the ability to refine it, they really don't have the ability to market it. Let's get this crude to U.S. refineries so that we can then access it to our markets.

The great thing about the folks from the Midwest, as you had Mr. TERRY, you had Mr. LATTA, we already understand the benefits of the Keystone pipeline because we're already receiving the product to our refineries.

This is the oil sands. It's just oil that coats sand. And they boil it off, they recover the froth, they turn it into a liquid product called bitumen. And then it eventually gets turned into synthetic crude, and that's what we're talking about.

The third-largest oil reserves in the world are right here. How do you get it? A lot of times you do it through surface mining. Here's an example. Now the trucks are actually a little bit bigger in the mining operation, they're about seven stories tall—the tires are at least one story tall—built by a U.S. company called Caterpillar, located in Illinois. And that's where many—50 percent—of all these heavy dump trucks go, to mining operations around the world. One of their bigger markets right now is right in Canada.

Robinson Oil Refinery is the other refinery in Illinois. It's receiving the oil sands product, moving it into a product to meet to the market. So these are real jobs at a real time that will create real jobs—20,000 immediately, and as my colleagues have said, ancillary jobs.

You have pumping stations. You need to build the pumps. You've got to have the electricians that operate it. So this is something—private capital, return on investment, energy security. The President says he believes in the free flow of oil when he's trying to address Ahmadinejad in Iran and the Strait of Hormuz. There's no better free flow of oil than permitting the Keystone XL pipeline.

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

□ 1930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, you are going to be hearing a lot, and we're all going to be talking a lot, about the Keystone pipeline. And the reason that we're talking a lot about it is that between now and February 21, President Obama has a decision to make. President Obama has been tasked by this Congress to make a decision by February 21 on whether or not to approve the Keystone pipeline.

Now, the President, frankly, should have approved this project months ago when, back in August, the State Department, which was tasked by the President to make a recommendation, was getting ready to actually make a recommendation to move forward on

the Keystone pipeline. And of course what we're talking about is creating jobs in America. There will be 20,000 American jobs created if the President moves forward with the Keystone pipeline. But also American energy security is at stake here.

The President has continued to punt this issue. In fact, just a few months ago, the President tried to push this issue off until after the election. Just right after the State Department was getting ready to say, Let's go forward with the Keystone pipeline, all of a sudden, some of the radical environmental groups came forward. And these radical environmental groups, who are against any form of American-created energy that doesn't involve wind and solar power—whether it's oil, gas, nuclear—they're against all American energy.

So these radical environmental groups went and had a protest over at the White House. And they intimidated this President enough to where President Obama said, okay, he's going to push it off until after the election, thinking that he could just hide behind radical environmentalists and say, Oh, well, we've got to look at the environmental issues.

Well, this has nothing to do with whether or not it's good for the environment because, frankly, the State Department looked at the environmental issues already. President Obama knows that. The State Department looked at these environmental concerns and said they're not there. In fact, if the President approved Keystone tomorrow and said yes to those American jobs, the Canadian Government and the company that would be building the pipeline would still have to comply with the environmental laws of every single State that that pipeline would go through.

So it's not a question of whether or not Keystone would comply with the environmental laws. They have to comply with all the environmental laws. But what is at stake is whether or not we're going to take these 20,000 jobs in America or whether those jobs are going to be shipped to China because China's already said that they want the Keystone oil, they want the oil that would be created by these oil sands in Canada.

So the question is, Are we going to have that oil from Canada sent into America, or is that oil going to go to China? And of course what that really means is, Are we going to take the 20,000 jobs in America, or is President Obama going to send those 20,000 jobs to China? What does President Obama have against the creation of 20,000 American jobs?

The President loves to give all these speeches, talking about the middle class. And, Mr. Speaker, when the President talks about the middle class, he can't say that he supports the middle class if he rejects the Keystone pipeline because he'll be turning down 20,000 American jobs that will be com-

ing down with over \$7 billion of private investment that's coming from one of our best partners in the world, Canada. Canada is a great trading partner with America.

If the Keystone pipeline is built in America and we start partnering with and taking about 700,000 barrels a day of oil from Canada, that's oil that we don't have to get from Middle Eastern countries who don't like us. So look at the policy. First of all, if they do this, they have to comply with the environmental laws not only in the United States but in every State that it goes through. So the environmental issues don't exist that the President raises.

But what is at stake is whether or not we are going to get 20,000 American jobs and whether or not we're going to get oil from our friend Canada or are we going to get oil from Middle Eastern countries who don't like us. So that is what this debate is about.

Between now and February 21, the President has got to decide whether or not he's going to say yes to American jobs or is he going to side with his radical environmentalist friends who went over to the White House and threatened him and all of this kind of foolishness and said that they want to send that oil to China.

The good news is that the President doesn't really have to decide whether or not that's going to happen because he can just go look at what his own State Department said. The State Department said that they think those jobs should stay in America. But the President has got to decide whether he is going to side with the radical environmentalists or whether he's going to side with American families and workers who just want jobs and want American energy security.

And, frankly, if we've got a choice—because our demand for oil hasn't gone down—it's a question of whether or not we want oil from Canada who's a friend or from Middle Eastern countries who are not and if we want to create 20,000 American jobs. So that is what is at stake between now and February 21.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge, first of all, the President to side with America in the creation of 20,000 jobs and to approve the Keystone pipeline.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to go back to something that Mr. SCALISE said, which I think gets to the heart of the issues that we are talking about. And I would like to highlight this with our colleagues.

Mr. SCALISE, who knows this issue so very well because he is from Louisiana, he has constituents who work in this industry every day. He said, what the President had done was to choose, to make a conscious decision to push off making a definitive pronouncement on the Keystone pipeline. Mr. Speaker, I think that is so important. And what Mr. SCALISE is saying gets to the heart of this.

The President made that decision. Usually—and Mr. SCALISE can illuminate us on this issue a bit—but it is my understanding that, generally, a Presidential permit requires anywhere from 18 to 24 months to secure, and that currently the Keystone pipeline is in its 40th month of trying to get a permit from this administration, from the President; and that if the President has his way on this, he is going to push that, and it would be another 12 months.

Mr. SCALISE. The gentlelady from Tennessee is correct. In fact, when you look at the timeline for Keystone—as you said, it's been 40 months. And the thing here is that the State Department has done the review. The President right now is trying to give some indication that now February 21 might not be enough time for him when, in fact, he's had much longer than the normal process for any review. But he's also got the approval from the State Department because there is one other big factor here. There is also the fact that China is out there saying they want the oil. So as America, through President Obama, is saying that he doesn't want to do it or he wants to delay it until after the election, where Canada has indicated they can't wait until after the election in November, they've got to make a decision. And they want to send the oil to the United States of America because we're great trading partners.

But if President Obama keeps saying no, China right now is saying they want the oil. So we don't have an unlimited amount of time for the President to keep kowtowing to his radical environmentalist friends and try to kick the can down the road. A decision needs to be made; and February 21 is that date that's currently available, and we're trying to push the President to make that decision in the affirmative way and say yes to those 20,000 jobs that would be created here.

With that, I will be happy to yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. The gentleman's point, I think, is so important to make. The President has already taken twice as long as most Presidents would take to enter into this decision. So he has already had twice as much time. But he is asking for half again as much time to make this decision.

And while he can't make a decision—it's like voting "present" when you come to the floor to cast a vote, not being able to make a decision, being indecisive on this—while that is transpiring, the United States is looking at 20,000 direct American jobs and an additional 118,000 private sector jobs that would be linked to this project, if the information is correct that I have received. So you are talking about a total of 138,000 direct and indirect American jobs, good-paying jobs that are American products that will produce energy that is right here that we would be getting from Canada and bringing in about 700,000 barrels of oil a

day so that we could begin to break the ties that are existing with OPEC and Middle Eastern oil.

And I think that it's so important for us to look at this. This is not an issue of taking more time or additional time.

□ 1940

The time is now because we've already spent twice as much time as is generally needed to do the due diligence and to check the process and to make that decision that will move us toward energy independence.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee. I think it's been clear what's been laid out, the decision that should be made by President Obama. Unfortunately, he continues to drag his feet, tries to punt on this issue; but ultimately a decision's going to have to be made if we're going to be able to get those 20,000 jobs here in America or whether or not they're going to go to China, who's also asking for them.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The President has spent a lot of time during the last 3 months traveling around the country these many months demanding that Congress put aside party differences and pass the bill, referring to his \$447 billion so-called jobs bill. But if the President were to get off the campaign trail and focus on the facts, he would realize that House Republicans have been advancing a pro-growth agenda that creates jobs without expanding the Federal Government's role.

The House of Representatives has voted numerous times this year in the 112th Congress to increase American oil production, which would put Americans back to work, reduce our country's dependence upon foreign oil, and lower prices at the pump. And I ask you to think back to when the President took office. The average price for a gallon of gas in this country was \$1.83. We can only barely remember such a time. These are steps that we can take that can turn that around.

Those bills that we did pass out of the House would speed up the permitting process for drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct more offshore oil and gas leases, direct the Department of the Interior to proceed with exploration and production in the areas estimated to contain the most oil and gas, and eliminate this administration's bureaucratic delays that have stalled offshore energy production in the Outer Continental Shelf.

Further, the House has voted multiple times to push for a final decision on the Keystone XL pipeline. The Keystone XL pipeline application was filed

more than 3 years ago, and a final decision on whether to let the pipeline go forward is long, long overdue.

In his first term in office, the President has talked about the need for energy independence. Keystone XL could help provide the United States with the certainty of almost a million barrels of oil a day; and that oil comes from our friends and largest trading partner, Canada, not the Middle East.

At a time when the President has tasked three aircraft carriers and strike groups with protecting the Strait of Hormuz, wouldn't approving this new source of friendly oil be just good, plain common sense.

The President has struggled with turning the economy around since taking office 3 years ago, and his speeches often center on the subject of jobs. If approved today, the Keystone XL project would create 20,000 construction jobs and an estimated 100,000 indirect jobs during the life of its operation for Americans who desperately need them.

Look at these 20,000 jobs that are there that are held up. You know, I think back to my late father. His first job as a petroleum engineer was in Tinsley Field in Yazoo County, Mississippi. Those jobs matter to families. It's time to move forward and approve this.

Instead of issuing the necessary permits to begin construction of the pipeline and putting American families and Americans to work, the administration is in the third year, almost 4 years now, of dragging its feet through bureaucratic delays and indecision. It can only be for political reasons.

Pro-business groups like Americans for Prosperity and the Chamber of Commerce are supporting Keystone XL to give a much needed boost to the economy. Even pro-labor groups are supporting Keystone XL because they know it will create jobs. Americans across the country are asking this President to approve this project. They realize its importance, and they deserve to be answered.

The Keystone XL pipeline is just one example of how House Republicans have been working to promote job creation without the need for stimulus money. Today it is the most pressing. Every day that the President kicks the can down the road is another day without the jobs, and another day without the relief from Middle Eastern oil, and another day that Americans should be asking this administration and this White House, Where are the jobs?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to address the House on the issue of the Keystone XL pipeline.

There are pipe dreams and pipelines out there that people talk about. Ap-

parently, when it comes to jobs, maybe the pipeline is apparently a pipe dream.

We have an opportunity, in this country, to secure our energy future with North American energy, to create American jobs on a project that is a 1,700-mile-long pipeline.

You know, I hear all the time from constituents in Colorado about: Hey, what's the deal with this pipeline? Why can't we get forward moving creating jobs, American energy independence using North America's great resources to help our country create jobs and a more secure energy future? And the conversation then really revolves around commonsense ideas.

Here's a President who, the President has said in the past that we need to support shovel-ready projects, that the stimulus bill that passed in 2009 was all about shovel-ready projects. And if you go back to last summer, I believe the President had said, well, I guess shovel-ready wasn't as shovel-ready as we thought it was.

Well, here's a shovel-ready project. Here is a pipeline, a privately funded pipeline that's ready to be built, 1,700 miles, 20,000 American jobs. We could get started on that today.

It's been years since this pipeline was actually first—the permit process first started, and yet here we are waiting once again. This isn't a surprise to anybody. It shouldn't shock anybody that the issue of the pipeline came up.

The bill that we passed in December said you've got to make a decision. The President has said he would make a decision, and yet we still have no decision.

I find it difficult to understand what is really the tough part of this decision. We can create jobs right now with a truly shovel-ready project.

Earlier this year, back in February, actually, back in February of last year, we had testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee that talked about the development of the Alberta oil sands and what it would mean to jobs in the United States. Now, the Keystone pipeline is part of that. According to the testimony we received in that committee, between 2011 and 2015, 6,000 jobs could be created in Colorado, alone, because of the development of the Alberta oil sands.

The Fourth Congressional District of Colorado that I represent has two counties. When you look at the true unemployment rates, the unemployment rates that take into account people who have just given up work—who've given up looking for work, who have just decided that they can't find work so they've stopped looking, two counties in my district have over 19 percent unemployment when you look at it through the lens of people who have stopped looking for work.

A project like the Keystone pipeline, 20,000 direct jobs, 100,000 jobs indirectly created, development of the Alberta oil sands creating 6,000 jobs in Colorado over the next 3 years, next 4 years,

these are good-paying American jobs with North American energy that we could be putting to the benefit of this country.

We know there are willing partners out there. We know there are other people who have said: Go ahead, we'll take the business; we'll partner with you; we're not afraid. China has more than once said that this is something that they would look at.

Canada has made it very clear that they won't just stop if we say no. Shovel-ready projects. Here it is, our opportunity to create American jobs.

Three years ago the application was filed to build the pipeline. Most Americans at town meetings that I attend, they all know about this pipeline. They know where it's going. They know what's happening with it.

It's been our goal in this 112th Congress to look out for the economy, to advance projects that make sense when it comes to American energy and North American energy and American job creation.

□ 1950

That ought to be the goal of every single one of us in this Congress. Every action we take should be looked at through the same lens that we look at the Keystone pipeline—creating jobs.

I'm continuously awed at the energy resources that we have in North America and how simple it would be to advance policies that would make us more energy independent, and yet we still can't move forward because no decision has been made.

I'm baffled at how difficult this administration has made it when it comes to weaning ourselves off of overseas oil while at the same time creating more jobs right here at home.

The administration has done everything it can to stand in the way of a project that can help Americans get back to work, a \$7 billion private sector infrastructure project, when construction jobs around Colorado, around this country have been some of the hardest hit by the recession. This project provides a lifeline to thousands of construction workers seeking ways to get back on their feet.

But the inaction of this administration has led us down a path of insecurity and dependence on other countries that have great animosity towards us. It's simply unacceptable. Not only do we have the resources in our own backyard in North America, but we have the ability to utilize friendly and willing neighbors like Canada to import that oil.

Mr. Speaker, our unemployment rate as a Nation has hovered around 9 percent for far too long. There's no reason that the Federal Government should not be supporting a private sector solution done with private capital at a time like this. With rising gas prices, the threat of the Strait of Hormuz being blocked, and unemployment hovering so high, we simply cannot afford not to act.

Mr. Speaker, the President has had plenty of time to make a decision. The studies have been submitted. The conversations have taken place. The de-

bate has occurred. But what's winning this debate is the fact that the American people understand how many jobs would be created with the North American Energy Project.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time and thank you for the opportunity tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. POMPEO. In 36 days, the President will have an opportunity to do a great thing for America. He'll have an opportunity to allow private industry with private funds to build a pipeline to carry petroleum all across the country to lower the price for consumers driving their cars, for manufacturers who use these products, and to do so in a way that is environmentally friendly.

It is indeed my hope that the President will take this opportunity to do just that.

Today we've got oil at over \$100 a barrel. It was not all that long ago in the history of our country that we stared at North American energy production and wondered: Will we have enough natural gas, will we have enough oil here domestically so that we don't have to depend on the Middle East?

I remember when I was much younger sitting in a car with lines of cars waiting to get gasoline. We could only get gas on even days because that was the license plate that we had on our car.

Today, technology and innovation, American-style, has led us to a place where we have got an abundance of energy. All we're asking is that we permit a pipeline to carry their product safely all across the country so we can get that energy to the places we need it at prices Americans can afford.

We know, too, that we suffer much like we did back in the late 1970s. At the same time we had this perceived shortage of fossil fuels, we also had enormously high unemployment. We had a misery index in the low twenties. Today, we have a similar phenomenon. We've got far too many people out of work. Unemployment is officially at 8½ percent. But if you go around Kansas' Fourth Congressional District, you know that it's much higher in the place that matters, the place that folks would really rather work more hours, would rather work for higher pay, or, frankly, we've got a lot of folks who've just found the workplace so unappealing to them in terms of their job prospects that they've given up. Yet here we sit with a project that everyone agrees will create 20,000 jobs.

Most of those jobs are with trade unions—folks that are building and welding and riveting and who will make this pipeline safe and secure. And yet we've got a President that continues to reject this as an option for our country.

We need this capacity. We have found oil in North Dakota. We are finding oil in south central Kansas. We've got to make sure that this product can get to the markets, the places that it needs to be. This pipeline would do that.

Now, I can't figure out, for the life of me, why this pipeline has become the cause celebre of the left. We have tens of thousands of miles of pipelines all across this country. This product is transported safely. It is highly regulated. Indeed, this year, in a year when there was lots of bickering between the parties, we passed a piece of pipeline safety legislation which will continue to further improve the way we transport fossil fuels around our country. This pipeline can be done safely, too.

The objection that there are risks to groundwater and to environmental harm is greatly overblown. Industrial accidents certainly happen, but we know, to make America move forward, we've got to do it in a way that is responsible and safe. Everything about the way this pipeline has been engineered and developed meets that mark.

This President has shared this notion of energy independence as we all do. We see the need for it. Yet he's taken an approach that is so different from what we are trying to do with the Keystone XL pipeline. This approach has private citizens meeting real demand in the real marketplace, folks who want products.

The President's approach has been very different. He has spent hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer money trying to subsidize energy sources that America does not want. It's not that America wouldn't like solar energy or wind energy. It's simply that today they can't be provided in a cost-effective manner, so we force taxpayers to subsidize those energies to try and bring them to market. We've seen what happens when you do that. You get things that happen like Solyndra. We don't need to do that. The energy is available.

The risk will be taken by private industry. They'll provide the capital. They'll provide the hard work. They'll provide the innovation. They'll provide energy for America at a time we so desperately need it.

I just returned to Washington, D.C., today. I was in the airport in Wichita, Kansas. I talked with half a dozen folks. Each of them talked about jobs being the most pressing issue that they wanted me to take care of when I came back to Washington, D.C.

I spent a lot of time over the break, as well, talking with folks who provide energy. We have lots of independent drillers and E&P companies and folks who provide field services to the oil patch in Kansas and in Oklahoma and Nebraska, all around. We need these products. Consumers need these products. I hope that the President, 36 days from now, will decide that he agrees, affordable American energy coming from North America, provided safely, so that the Keystone XL pipeline can move forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. LANKFORD. I will tell you, living in Oklahoma City, and if you come through Oklahoma at all, you'll drive around and you'll see our beautiful land, and you'll drink our beautiful water and breath our beautiful air; but you'll also realize that there are thousands of miles of pipeline underneath your feet, because, you see, Oklahoma is the center of pipeline movement through a lot of the United States.

In fact, just north and east of my house in Oklahoma City is a small town called Cushing, Oklahoma. And if you know anything about pipeline and about oil, you know about Cushing, Oklahoma, because there's a large storage facility there for a lot of petroleum products, and it is the hub for everything that moves as far as oil and all pipelines running through the Midwest. Cushing, Oklahoma, is part of that connection for the Keystone pipeline.

When you talk to people in Oklahoma about pipelines, we're very familiar with what they are, how they move energy, and how important they are to our economy.

Let me just touch base on a couple of things, though.

While we're talking about Keystone, it's interesting to me in several ways. One is I'm 43 years old, and for my entire life, I've heard people say in politics we need to have a national energy policy. We need to be dependent on energy from our soil or from our nearest neighbors, Canada and Mexico. We need to have a North American focus of energy, and I would have to say I completely agree. But we've never had a time in our life when we are closer to that than right now.

The rising alternative of fuel options, whether it be solar and wind, and I hope all of them come to be, we're still decades away from them being able to be fully established and out there. We're very dependent on oil, gas, and coal.

□ 2000

But we're finding new reserves in North America of oil, gas, and coal that are solving a lot of the energy issues that we currently have right now. Many people don't know that in the last quarter of 2011, 58 percent of the oil consumed in the United States was found domestically in the United States—58 percent. You go back just 20 years ago, 60 percent of all oil was coming from overseas; now almost 60 percent of all oil is in the United States, coming from the United States.

We are making progress. Hydraulic fracturing, horizontal drilling, finding new well sites, great new technology in geology, all the ways that we're finding these new sources of energy, doing it cleaner and doing it less expensive than we've ever done it before. That's a good thing for us. We are now close to providing our own energy sources.

The second-largest reserve of oil in the world is now from this area where the Keystone Pipeline originates in Canada, the second-largest oil reserve

in the world. This is a key time for us now, getting better technology in the United States to be able to use our own energy to now partner up with Canada and continue drawing even more energy from Canada from this huge reserve that is there. We need to continue to draw from them in that sense.

Now you would think this would be a simple thing—focus on our own national security. Why wouldn't we continue to focus on it and say we are this close to being energy independent, and we are not dependent on energy from the Middle East. Why wouldn't we continue to take the steps on that?

In addition to that, why wouldn't we continue to expand on our pipelines? You see, this is not the first time for Keystone to do a pipeline coming from Canada to the United States—it was just a very few years ago. In fact, that Keystone that they did a few years ago took 24 months to permit. From the exact same area to the same area, 24 months for the total permitting process. That pipeline is functional and active and running right now.

They want to double up the capacity. So you would think this would be a slam dunk. Let's just add a second line there. They run through the permit process to the same system, but instead of 24 months this time, we're now at 42 months of permitting and still climbing.

Where the same pipeline crossing over the border, drawing oil from the exact same area, took 24 months a few years ago, now that pipeline takes 42 months and climbing. We're not sure how much longer it's going to take. In addition to that, Keystone is running there, that's one company.

There's also another company, Enbridge, which draws oil from that exact same area in Canada and takes it through the United States. That pipeline is also currently running and hasn't had any issues with permitting and through the process of construction that it did years ago.

You see, this is not some new oil discovery that's up there that we've never tapped into. The United States uses that oil and has used that oil for a long time. It is a reserve that is from a reliable neighbor next door in Canada that's consistent, that we're not having to deal with issues in the Strait of Hormuz and wondering about the flow of oil coming from the Middle East.

We're dealing with the United States, now 58 percent of our oil usage coming from our own home country, and we're dealing with reliable neighbors dealing with our pipelines, like Canada and Mexico. It's the right thing to do for our national security. It's the right thing to do for jobs. We're talking about immediately, private jobs. No government participation other than the permitting being finished. Private money begins to sink in the billions of dollars to be able to run almost 1,700 miles of pipeline.

We're talking pipefitters, which are based often in Oklahoma, by the way,

union jobs, right-to-work areas and other job areas. You're dealing with steel manufacturers for that pipe, pipe manufactured, most of it done in Arkansas. People digging the ditches, running the tractors, driving the trucks. All of the different areas that are attached to that, thousands of jobs that begin immediately across the entire central part of the United States and many manufacturing areas.

We need to be able to open that up and let those jobs run and let's get those going on that. And then the third thing on this, not only national security and jobs, but just basic common sense. That oil will be sold somewhere. It's not a matter that we can argue and complain about it and say that Canada is not going to use their own resources. When the second-largest discovery of oil in the world is underneath your feet, they're going to sell that oil.

So just shutting it down and saying Americans aren't going to take it, we're going to let them sell it off, and they'll send it west over into Asia, and that will make things a lot better, doesn't make common sense, number one.

Number two is we should provide as much national security as we can for this. That's basic common sense with reliable neighbors.

Number three in the common sense is this basic simple thing: It's new pipeline. Now we can argue about pipeline safety, and there are areas we need to work on pipeline safety, and we in this Congress as Republicans and Democrats together have passed pipeline safety initiatives, and we should do that. This will be the newest pipeline in the country. It will have the highest standards for safety, it will have the highest level of technology and of monitoring of any pipeline in the country. It is the best possible way to do it.

The alternative is to be able to put it on trucks and trains, which have a higher incidence for accidents. This is the safest way to be able to do this. And as I mentioned before, it's not as if we're not already drawing this oil already. This just increases our capacity and increases our ability to not be dependent on Venezuela and OPEC countries for our oil.

There are pipelines from Enbridge and Keystone running from that exact same area all the way down to the gulf already. We need to continue to increase our capacity so that we are providing for our own energy long term.

I would submit to this Congress, and I would submit to the President and ask for his prompt approval, even early would be great, of approval of this to be able to move forward and say let's get this off our back, let's get the jobs going, let's continue to move forward with our national security, providing for our own energy, and let's continue to work through this process so that we don't have to deal with issues like this again.

Far be it from us, in the days to come, that manufacturers would say I

don't want to do manufacturing and construction in the United States because I'm afraid the President will slow down a jobs project. I'm afraid Congress will slow down a jobs project. I'm afraid that that country is not open for business. We should do it better than the rest of the world. We can and we do.

This is a simple project. Approve the Keystone Pipeline. It's been approved through these States, and Nebraska is working through its system of its approval process. We need just to approve that 50 feet crossing the border from Canada to the United States, and let's get this project going.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it's good to be back and wishing you and all of our colleagues the best of this new year and happy new year, and I hope yours and the other 433 Members of this august body had a great holiday season.

For many Americans that was not the case, however. Unemployment remains high and, unfortunately, just before we broke for the Christmas holidays, we did pass a piece of legislation that extended the unemployment insurance, and that's really important, and also extended for 2 months the reduction in the payroll tax, and that put money into the pockets of working men and women around this Nation.

We have much work to do this year. We just heard a presentation on the Keystone Pipeline, which will add a few jobs, some 6,000 jobs, temporary, building the pipeline, and that's good. The rush to judgment on it, however, should be very cautiously approached. Pipelines can be dangerous. You only need to look in California, where a gas pipeline exploded and the recent Yellowstone contamination that was caused by a broken oil pipeline.

Haste can make waste, and it can cause problems, so I would urge us to be circumspect. I suspect someday this pipeline will be built, but it ought to be built properly and in the right locations.

But the subject of tonight's discourse is really about jobs. I'll be joined a little later by my friend PAUL TONKO from the great State of New York, and perhaps MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio will be here. But what we want to talk about is jobs, not just temporary jobs building a pipeline, but rather solid, American jobs in the manufacturing sector. For more than a year, we've been talking about making it in America, rebuilding the great American engine of wealth, the great American engine that created the biggest middle

class anywhere in the world, and the great American engine that over the last 20 years has seen an incredible decline, often caused by policy, governmental policy.

□ 2010

A couple of examples to give you: outsourcing. Outsourcing doesn't just happen. It happens because the economics of the situation have changed.

When I arrived here in November 2009, a debate was under way about how to rebuild the American economy. One of the things that we took up was the issue of taxes. It turns out that American corporations receive somewhere between \$12 billion and \$15 billion a year in tax reductions. That is you and I, all of us, get to pay corporations for doing, what, sending jobs offshore—offshoring American jobs.

Fortunately, in December of 2010, without any support at all from our Republican colleagues, we passed legislation that terminated \$12 billion of those subsidies, providing a positive encouragement—or eliminating a positive encouragement—for corporations to offshore jobs. We can do more, and that's what the Make It in America agenda is all about.

There are many, many pieces in this. Economists who look at the American economy and where we are today will note that we have seen significant growth in jobs. The unemployment rate is down to 8.5 percent, and that's a good thing; but it is still far too high. We have seen some 330,000 manufacturing jobs created just this last year; and that's good, but it's not enough. On the other hand, we have also seen layoffs.

The government sector, despite what you might hear, has actually seen a very significant decline in employment. State governments and local governments all across this Nation have been laying off people. In California, 42,000 teachers have lost their jobs in the last 2 years. An incredible statistic. At a time when we need a more highly educated workforce, to layoff teachers seems to be a real serious no-brainer. Why would we do that? Well, we did it. And we have layoffs like that occurring across this Nation. We need to turn that around, and we can. We need to turnaround the decline that occurred over the last 20 years in the manufacturing sector, and we have made a start.

But there is much more to be done. We have lost perhaps 45 percent of all of our manufacturing jobs, from some 19 million down to just over 11 million in the last 20 years. Coming back, 330,000 this year. More to be done.

Fortunately, we have an ally in the White House. That ally is President Barack Obama who, as he said just last week, wakes up every day thinking about how can we, Americans, solve this crisis in our economy. What can we do to put men and women back to work? How can families know they have a secure future?

Way back in September, President Obama proposed the American Jobs Act. It wasn't the first thing that was done to get Americans back to work, but it's a very, very important step. The first thing that was done by President Obama and the Democratic majority in this House way back in January of 2009 when the new administration took office was to create the American Recovery Act. Some people call it the stimulus. No matter what else you hear, the stimulus works; and it's working today.

In my district out in California, you can't go very far down a highway, across a bridge, see a levee, see a new manufacturing facility in place without knowing or seeing a sign that says the American Recovery Act. Bridges are being built. Highways have been repaired. The Caldecott Tunnel on the East Bay in the Oakland Hills has now been drilled through the mountain. It'll be completed, almost totally financed by local government and a larger majority of the money from the American Recovery Act. We can rebuild jobs in America. That was step one.

Along the way, we've seen tax policy changes. We've seen a tax policy that the President proposed and enacted by the Democrats with some Republican help in 2010 that actually gave companies a 100 percent write-off for every capital investment that they made. The result of that, some of the greatest capital investment in the last 20 years has been made just in 2011. We're putting people back to work. We have a long way to go. We're not nearly where we need to be.

And for employers, an incentive in the American Jobs Act that the President proposed last September has now become law, with both Democrat and Republican support, bipartisanship really does exist; and that proposal, now law, gives employers a tax reduction, a credit, for every returned veteran from America's wars. They can go all of the way back to the Vietnam war. An employer that takes a long-term unemployed veteran can get a \$2,500 reduction in their taxes for every veteran they keep on for a full year. For a disabled veteran, injured in the line of service, a \$9,600 reduction in the employer's taxes. That's a very, very powerful incentive to hire those veterans who have sacrificed so much for this Nation, for the very safety and the freedom we enjoy. That's one part of the American Jobs Act.

A couple of other pieces of the American Jobs Act still have to be put in place, and the one that I like is called the infrastructure bank. We know that we are not flush with cash. We know the Federal Government has a serious deficit, and we know that we need to solve that. We also know that we're not going to solve it unless we actually put people back to work. And the infrastructure bank is a very good way to deal with two problems simultaneously, putting people back to work,