

2012 one of the major debates in this Congress has been whether to restrict access to birth control, and now there are those in the House and Senate who have voted time and time again against enforcing equal pay for equal work.

It is time for this Congress to join the rest of us in the 21st century. Let's get the paycheck fairness bill on the floor, and let's vote "yes."

IN HONOR OF LANCE CORPORAL CODY EVANS

(Mr. FLEISCHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding young man from my district who I've recently had the pleasure of getting to know. Lance Corporal Cody Evans of Speedwell, Tennessee, serves in the United States Marine Corps as a combat engineer, one of the most dangerous jobs in the military.

While serving in Afghanistan, Lance Corporal Evans stepped on a pressure plate while sweeping for IEDs, nearly losing his life. He lost both legs and suffered numerous other injuries. I met Lance Corporal Evans in January of this year in a visit to Walter Reed. To say that I was impressed by this young man's spirit and resilience would be an understatement. Cody has the spirit of a fighter, a spirit that has led to his continued recovery.

No mention of Cody would be complete without mentioning his mother, Regina, who has been with him constantly. Her dedication to her son is incredible.

As a Nation, we must recognize those who serve, who have the character and commitment to risk their lives so that we may sleep peacefully at home. Cody Evans deserves this recognition, which is why it is my honor to ask that this poem penned by Albert Caswell be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I . . .
I Volunteered. . .
But, to do my very best. . .
As I so raised my hand like all of the rest!
Patriots, who over the years our nation have
so blessed!
As I so went off to war, but for the greater
good like all of the rest!
Men of steel, whose hearts so chose to crest!
As Cody, you so watched your brothers die!
While, holding them in your arms as you
began to cry. . .
And oh yes you Cody, you have so proudly
worn. . .
Those most magnificent shades of green,
that uniform!
Because, to be A United States Marine. . .
you were born!
For you'd much rather die for something,
than live for nothing at all!
As why Cody you so answered that most
noble of all calls!
That Call To Arms, That Call To War. . .
while standing tall!
As you almost died, oh yes a couple of
times. . .
While, there on the very edge of death you so
lie!
As you could have given up, but instead you
chose to rise. . .

As your newest mountain you were about to
climb!

Because, Cody you Volunteered for that
fight!

Yea Cody, because you're from Tennessee
where men with brave hearts ever burn
bright!

Who, In Strength In Honor do so believe!
Where them and their families are as strong
as Hickory trees!

And all in our Country Tis of Thee, they do
so believe!

This Volunteer from Tennessee!

As yes you have lost your two strong fine
legs, but you won't moan and you
won't beg!

Because, that's just The Volunteer all in
you!

In fact Andrew Jackson Cody, would be so
proud of you!

All because of what upon the battlefield of
honor, into what you so grew. . .

For surely Cody you had one of the toughest
jobs of that war. . .

As a Combat Engineer, where every new step
meant but death for sure!

Something that so demanded such faith and
nerves of steel!

As you and your brothers so fought and died
for was right and what was real!

And still somehow on this very day, your
strength and will to so come back from
the dead so impresses me!

To So Teach Us All!

To So Beseech Us All!

To So Reach Us All!

To This Our Nation To So Bless!

For you are but The Toast of Tennessee!

But, in Heaven you need not arms or even
legs!

And that is where you are going Cody one
fine day!

And if ever I had a son!

I wish he could but shine just half as bright,
as this great one!

This United States Marine!

Who embodies the very heart of Tennessee!

Who so Volunteered, all for this our Country
Tis of Thee!

As you so Volunteered to make America Safe
and Free!

I could do a million great things, but such
light to this our world I could never
bring!

As you are a most magnificent United States
Marine!

All in what your fine life has said, and so
means!

Moments are all we have to so make a dif-
ference in all we have!

To bring our light, to fight the bad!

Cody, to be an American. . . you make me so
proud to be!

For you are one of her greatest of all sons,
Ooh. . . Rah, a Shining Son of Ten-
nessee. . .

If it were not for Heroes like you and Volun-
teers, where would this nation be?

—By Albert Carey Caswell.

ENERGY ISSUES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Tonight, I and other Members of the House are going to talk about energy issues in the United States.

Probably a timely thing to start with are the recent comments by one of the individuals who works for the Environ-

mental Protection Agency, the EPA. The more we learn about the EPA, the more we learn that they are hostile to real American energy for various reasons. Let me give you some historical perspective that makes this continuous assault on the oil and gas industry make sense to us now in 2012.

It seems that back in 2010, 2 years ago, EPA Region 6 Administrator Al Armendariz stood up on his bureaucratic pedestal of power and spelled out the true intentions that he had and the goals of the EPA. He declared that the EPA—and he declared this from his marble palace here in Washington, D.C.—that the EPA would target the oil and gas industry, calling it an "enforcement priority" as if, Madam Speaker, the oil and gas industry were made up of criminals.

He went on:

I was in a meeting once, and I gave an analogy to my staff about my philosophy of enforcement, and I think it was probably a little crude and maybe not appropriate for the meeting, but I'll go ahead and tell you what I said.

And here is what he said, Madam Speaker:

It was kind of like how the Romans used to do—you know, conquer villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere. They'd find the first five guys they saw, and they'd crucify them.

That's right—they would crucify them—as if he is advocating crucifying the oil and gas industry. What a thing to say from somebody who works for the Federal Government.

He said he would make examples out of the people in the oil and gas industry. Probably unknown to him, his speech was all caught on videotape that recently surfaced. In fact, it was on the Internet YouTube last night; but today, mysteriously, it seems to have disappeared and is no longer on YouTube. That was in 2010.

These comments help us to understand the EPA's belligerent attitude against energy—American energy—against the oil and gas industry. What came after was one of the most aggressive assaults on the oil and gas industry we've ever seen. As a Wall Street Journal editorial once said, the EPA is at war with Texas. I think the EPA probably should change their name to the War Department because they are at war with America's energy. They certainly aren't concerned as much about the environment as they are about putting American energy out of business.

The oil and gas industry supports 9.2 million jobs in the United States. I wonder how many of those workers Mr. Armendariz wants to crucify all in the name of his political agenda.

Madam Speaker, we need a fair EPA, one that brings a balanced approach to the environment and to our energy industry. An attack on the energy industry is an attack, really, on the American people and American jobs. Mr. Armendariz seems to be at war with America. He does not want to really

help the oil and gas industry become environmentally safe. It seems to me he wants to kill it, and the effort will kill American jobs, kill our energy, and kill our national security.

The video also shows he is not concerned about real science, not about true environmental science or, really, the facts. He just hates the oil and gas industry. So, Madam Speaker, he needs to go. He needs to be replaced with someone who cares more about the environment than personal crusades against industry.

□ 1910

Madam Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the Forbes article that was published today regarding the EPA official that I just mentioned.

[From Forbes, Apr. 26, 2012]

EPA OFFICIAL NOT ONLY TOUTED
'CRUCIFYING' OIL COMPANIES, HE TRIED IT

Confirming what many in the industry long suspected, a video surfaced Wednesday in which Al Armendariz, an official at the Environmental Protection Agency, promotes the idea of crucifying oil companies. Armendariz heads up the EPA's region 6 office, which is based in Dallas and responsible for oversight of Texas and surrounding states. The former professor at Southern Methodist University was appointed by President Obama in November 2009.

In a talk to colleagues about methods of EPA enforcement, Armendariz can be seen saying, "The Romans used to conquer little villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere, they'd find the first five guys they saw and they would crucify them. And then you know that town was really easy to manage for the next few years."

Range was among the first to discover the potential of the Marcellus Shale gas field of Pennsylvania—the biggest gas field in America and one of the biggest in the world. Armendariz's office declared in an emergency order that Range's drilling activity had contaminated groundwater in Parker County, Texas. Armendariz's office insisted that Range's hydraulic fracking activity had caused the pollution and ordered Range to remediate the water. The EPA's case against Range was catnip for the environmental fracktivists who insist with religious zealotry that fracking is evil. Range insisted from the beginning that there was no substance to the allegations.

The Armendariz video (which appears to have been taken off YouTube late last night) was shot around the same time he was preparing the action against Range. Here's the highlights of what he said.

The Romans used to conquer little villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere, they'd find the first five guys they saw and they would crucify them. And then you know that town was really easy to manage for the next few years.

And so you make examples out of people who are in this case not compliant with the law. Find people who are not compliant with the law, and you hit them as hard as you can and you make examples out of them, and there is a deterrent effect there. And, companies that are smart see that, they don't want to play that game, and they decide at that point that it's time to clean up.

And, that won't happen unless you have somebody out there making examples of people. So you go out, you look at an industry, you find people violating the law, you go aggressively after them. And we do have some pretty effective enforcement tools. Compliance can get very high, very, very quickly.

That's what these companies respond to is both their public image but also financial pressure. So you put some financial pressure on a company, you get other people in that industry to clean up very quickly.

The former professor at Southern Methodist University is a diehard environmentalist, having grown up in El Paso near a copper smelter that reportedly belched arsenic-laced clouds into the air. (Here's a profile of him in the Dallas Observer.) Texas Monthly called him one of the 25 most powerful Texans, while the Houston Chronicle said he's "the most feared environmentalist in the state."

Never mind that he couldn't prove jack against Range. For a year and a half EPA bickered over the issue, both with Range and with the Texas Railroad Commission, which regulates oil and gas drilling and did its own scientific study of Range's wells and found no evidence that they polluted anything. In recent months a federal judge slapped the EPA, decreeing that the agency was required to actually do some scientific investigation of wells before penalizing the companies that drilled them. Finally in March the EPA withdrew its emergency order and a federal court dismissed the EPA's case.

David Porter, a commissioner on the Texas Railroad Commission, wasn't impressed. "Today the EPA finally made a decision based on science and fact versus playing politics with the Texas economy. The EPA's withdrawal of the emergency order against Range Resources upholds the Railroad Commission Final Order that I signed concluding that Range is not responsible for any water contamination in Parker County. Al Armendariz and the EPA's Region Six office are guilty of fear mongering, gross negligence and severe mishandling of this case. I hope to see drastic changes made in the way the regional office conducts business in the future—starting with the termination of Al Armendariz."

After an outcry emerged over the video on Wednesday, Armendariz apologized for his statements Wednesday night, reportedly saying: "I apologize to those I have offended and regret my poor choice of words. It was an offensive and inaccurate way to portray our efforts to address potential violations of our nation's environmental laws. I am and have always been committed to fair and vigorous enforcement of those laws."

He ought to resign as well. His comments in the video are proof that facts and science don't matter to him, that he's already made up his mind that the industry he has regulatory power over is evil. When you lose faith in the impartiality of regulators every action they take is tainted. He's the boy who cried wolf.

I want to continue my comments about America's energy by talking a little bit about gasoline and gasoline prices.

I ask Members, people back in Texas, in southeast Texas where I live, how rising gasoline prices have affected them personally, and I want to give the House the benefit of some of those statements made by American people about the high cost of gasoline and maybe some things that we can do about the high cost of gasoline.

Here's what they've said, and I'll take them one at a time.

One individual from southeast Texas says:

I spend more money on gasoline than I do on groceries.

Another:

Living in Texas requires driving greater distances to get anything. We have no choice

but to purchase gas, and it definitely cuts into our food budget.

You see, Madam Speaker, west of the Mississippi there are vast places, as the Speaker knows, where people roam and live in the rural areas, and it takes them a long time to get from point A to point B, especially when they're going to work sometimes, whether they work on the ranch or whether they work in small towns in America.

So, because of that greater distance, a lot of Americans don't realize that the only mode of transportation for some Americans is to drive a vehicle. That's how they get to work. They don't drive subways. They don't ride bicycles. They don't have the opportunity to walk to work because they live in the vastness of the West.

I'll continue:

Seventy percent of all business requires people to have discretionary income that's being siphoned off by higher gas, taxes, fees, and it's only getting worse because of high gasoline prices.

Another says:

As a retiree, high gasoline prices affects everything I do. Travel, possible vacation plans are no longer being discussed in our family. Anything I do is planned well so as to cut down on how much I drive. What I buy, because it is priced so high in the stores. The price in stores has tripled because stores are having to pay higher fuel prices to get their products to market.

Another one says:

I drive for a living, and it hurts.

Another Texan has written me and said:

I drive 175 miles round trip to work every day. I work for the Corps of Engineers, and the government doesn't give me one red cent for gasoline. It costs me \$900 a month for gasoline that I used to could use somewhere else.

Amazing number: \$900. In some cases, that's how much people pay on the rent on their house or an apartment. Yet we have one American doing his job working for the people of this country spending that much money just on gasoline.

Another individual wrote me and he said:

I can't afford to commute. But by my long hours as a businessowner, it makes it impossible to take mass transit or a carpool. So I have no alternative since I have no carpool, no mass transit, but I have to drive to get to work because I'm a businessowner, and the gasoline is driving me out of business.

Another one has said:

I drive 75 miles a day round trip for work, plus I pay \$7 in tolls. Yeah, it's hurting. I love my job, but it's getting to the point that what money I make is going straight back into the gas tank.

Another citizen has said:

I drive a 2000 Ford F-150 as my work vehicle. It's draining my wallet, but I need a full-size truck for my job.

Once again, in the West, a lot of folks drive pickup trucks. They don't only just drive them to work. That is their work vehicle. They use that in their job. It is their office. They don't have the luxury as some do to work in tall

skyscrapers and an office, as we consider an office. Their truck is their vehicle, and the F-150 is the standard-operating vehicle, at least in Texas and other parts of the country. By the way, it's the number one selling vehicle in the United States.

But Americans need to understand, and the government needs to understand, that's what Americans drive. That is their work vehicle in many cases. High gasoline prices affect their quality of life, and maybe we, as a body, ought to do something about gasoline that is now \$4 a gallon.

Another citizen told me:

Last month I spent \$600 on gas for my truck versus just \$300 a few years ago. Customers don't understand that the materials are going up due to the rising costs and the suppliers are raising the price to recoup the loss due to fuel prices skyrocketing.

What we pay at the grocery store or at any store where we do business, for a product, part of the cost of that product is getting it to market so Americans can buy it. It's costing more to get goods and services to market because of gasoline prices, and, of course, gasoline prices affect the price of goods, and therefore that is passed on to the consumer, to people in America who live here.

Another one says:

Where do I begin? I hated it, but I had to go from a 4Runner to a Corolla to handle my commute to work every day.

Another one said:

Since 2010, my food bill has gone from \$95 a week for a full cart to \$130 per week for half a cart of groceries. We are making more but keeping less. High gasoline prices affect my quality of life.

Another one says:

I have spent less on food so I could fill up three times a week at approximately \$75 to \$80 a tank.

Another citizen wrote me his concerns:

I had to find another job closer to home because it's getting ridiculous, the cost of gasoline.

An individual who uses his truck in his business said this:

I drive a hot-shot delivery truck, and I have to pay my own fuel. We do get a fuel surcharge, but it does not even come close to paying for the fuel. I spend \$200 to \$250 a week on fuel over what the surcharge pays me, and it's killing me.

That's what Americans are saying about gasoline prices. These are people who work every day, support their families. Yet gasoline affects them in personal ways.

Another individual wrote me about his religion is being affected, his religious commitment is being affected by the cost of gasoline. Here's what he says:

Because the church my family and I attend is 30 minutes away, we've chosen to attend Wednesday night church services closer to home. Also, we've had to give up two church service meetings during the week. It's upsetting for my fellow members to ask me on Sundays if I've left the church. It's also harder to maintain those close ties not seeing fellow members but once a week, and it's all due to high gasoline prices.

Another southeast Texan writes this comment to me:

We certainly have less "disposable income," as the phrase goes, and that means less money to spend in various businesses in our city because of the high cost it costs my family to buy gasoline.

Another one says this:

I've cut out everything extra, dine out less, fewer trips, stay at home for entertainment, prices of food have tripled, and I stretch leftovers as far as possible because of gas prices.

Another citizen and neighbor says:

I only drive where I have to. I shop at Kroger to get extra cents off of gas.

The Kroger grocery store gives people the deduction if they buy gasoline from Kroger, and they have the little Kroger card:

We just stay at home more than ever.

And a fisherman says this:

I am a commercial fisherman. Gas prices hurt at the pump and it has in turn driven up the prices for supplies. It's even driven up the price and cost of bait.

Another one lastly makes this comment:

It's just hard to make it these days.

So gasoline prices, which we're not talking a whole lot about now, some Americans have just accepted it as the new normal. I refuse to do that. I refuse to accept high gasoline prices.

□ 1920

I'm old enough to remember when gasoline cost—I don't want to shock the Speaker, because you're a whole lot younger than I am. I remember when I could fill up my Chevy II Super Sport in the early seventies for 26 cents a gallon. I know that shocks you, but gasoline prices have gone up. Of course in my generation, as Mr. BURTON from Indiana knows, when gasoline hit 30 cents a gallon, we all were shocked about it. Now we're paying \$4 a gallon.

We don't have to accept that. The reason we don't have to accept it is because sitting over here are America's natural resources, our God-given natural resources, just waiting to be developed. But as I mentioned earlier, we've got these bureaucrats down the street in their marble palaces called the EPA, and they regulate more than just light bulbs. They're regulating the oil and gas industry out of business, and I think it's a personal vendetta that they have for some reason.

There are things we should do, things we can do, and it's important that we discuss those. And we'll continue to discuss those tonight with my colleagues.

I do want to yield to my friend and colleague, Mr. BURTON from Indiana, for as much time as he wishes to consume.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, I want to thank my good friend Congressman POE of Texas for putting a face on the problem of high energy prices and high gasoline prices.

I listened to all of the things that you were reading there from your constituents about not being able to go to

work or buying huge amounts of gas two or three times a week, and it just breaks your heart. You know, I went to the store the other night and I bought two oranges. They were on sale at a dollar a piece. Two oranges for a dollar a piece. The reason for that is not just because they're growing them and it's costing more; it's because the transportation by diesel trucks and gasoline-powered trucks has gone up so much that they have to pass that onto the consumers with higher prices. If you talk to any man or woman who goes to the store, they'll tell you that they're feeling it when they buy their groceries, as well as at the gas pump.

I'd like to tell you a little story real quickly. You'll find this humorous because you talked about gasoline being 20-some cents when you were a little bit younger. I presume it was a little bit younger.

We were on a trip with some friends of ours, and we went to an island down off the coast of Florida in the Caribbean. This friend of mine and I, we rented two little motor scooters to go out to the corner of the island. Gasoline on the island was very high; it was 50 cents a gallon. He says, I'm not paying 50 cents a gallon for gasoline. So we took what we had in the cycles and we rode out there, and he ran out the gasoline. We had to get a coffee can and turn one cycle upside down to get enough gas in his cycle to get back. Well, we couldn't get my cycle turned back on. So he tried to pull me and my motorcycle, with my wife on the back, with a string back to the hotel room where we were staying, and we couldn't do it. It about broke my finger off.

So they left me at a Portuguese gasoline station where nobody spoke English, and they didn't understand a thing I was saying. My face was burned to a pulp from the sun, and I ended up not getting back until late that night with an almost third-degree burn because he wouldn't pay 50 cents for a gallon of gas. Imagine what he would think today at having to pay \$4 for a gallon of gas. The poor guy would just die.

Let me just look at this chart. My colleague was talking just a moment ago—and I wish all of the people in America, if I could talk to them, could see this chart. It shows that back in the early part of the Obama administration, gasoline was about \$2.68 a gallon, and now in some parts of the country it is over \$4 a gallon. It's killing the economy, it's killing people who have to go to work, as Congressman POE said, and we have the resources to deal with it.

The thing I wanted to talk about real quickly was—and I talked to Congressman POE about this—Interior Secretary Salazar, as well as the head of the EPA and the Energy Department, are having an all-out assault on Members of Congress who are pointing out that we have energy in this country that can be tapped to lower the price of

energy. They're attacking us, saying that we're just raising red herrings and not dealing with the problems as we should. I want to read this to you. Mr. Salazar, the head of the Interior Department says:

It's in this imagined energy world where we see this growing and continued divide in the energy debate in America. But the divide is not among ordinary Americans; it is between some people here in Washington, D.C.

I guess they mean you and me, Congressman POE.

He said:

It's a divide between the real energy world that we work on every day and the imagined, fairytale world.

And the President of the United States has said on a number of occasions that we're doing more drilling right now than we ever have and that the American people are being misled.

In addition to the chart I have on gasoline prices, I brought this chart down. This chart, Congressman POE, shows the number of applications for permits to drill and how they've been affected since the Obama administration has taken place. So I just want to go through these facts. If the President were paying attention, and if I were talking to him—but I know I can't—if I were talking to him, I would say, Mr. President, these are the facts. And I don't know who's giving you these facts down there at the White House, but, Mr. President, you ought to take a look at these facts because they're accurate.

First of all, according to the American Petroleum Institute, the number of new permits to drill issued by the Bureau of Land Management is down by 40 percent, from an average of over 6,400 permits in 2007 and 2008 to an average of 3,962 in 2009 to 2010. That's down by almost 40 percent. We're not drilling where we can. They're not issuing the permits.

During this same period, the number of new wells drilled on Federal land have declined. The number of oil wells have gone down by 40 percent, and the number of new Federal oil and gas leases issued by the Bureau of Land Management is down by almost 50 percent. Is it any wonder we're not going after our resources, we're depending on the Saudis, the people in South America and Venezuela, many of whom don't like us very much? As a result, we're paying more and more and more at the pump.

President Obama says that oil production is at an all-time high during his administration. However, the fact is oil production on Federal land fell by 11 percent last year, and oil production on private and State-owned land—where they couldn't touch it—did go up a little bit. That's what he's talking about. Where the government has control over permits, they're not letting us drill.

Federal lands hold an estimated 116 billion barrels of recoverable oil, enough to produce gasoline for 65 billion cars and fuel oil for 3.2 million

households for 60 years. Western oil shale deposits alone are estimated to contain up to five times the amount of Saudi oil reserves. Seventy percent of this oil shale is on Federal land, and we can't get to it because the President and his administration will not let us.

According to a recent CRS report, there are over 21.6 million acres of land leased by the Federal Government that are not currently producing oil or that have not been approved for exploration. Returning to the levels of 2007 and 2008, when the administration started, Federal leasing and permitting levels would have projected an increase of 7 million to 13 million barrels per year of domestic oil production, but they cut it back.

According to the American Petroleum Institute, an estimated 12,000 to 30,000 American jobs would be created in energy producing Western States over the next 4 years if we just went back to where we were drilling in 2007 and 2008. Furthermore, the Keystone XL pipeline, which the President has stopped dead, would bring to our economy thousands of new jobs and transport 830,000 barrels of oil to American refineries, which would be converted into oil and gasoline that would help this economy and lower gas prices.

With gas prices, as my colleague said, very, very high at over \$4 a gallon—and in some places here in Washington, it was up to \$5 a gallon not too long ago. With gas prices that high and affecting every American, it's clear that the United States needs to become more energy independent and signal to the world that the U.S. is open to production. If we started drilling where we can and exploring where we can, make no mistake, the people who sell oil to us will lower the price because they want to be competitive and they don't want to lose market share.

Whether it's the administration dragging its heels on approving permits for offshore drilling or drilling on Federal land, not opening up land for exploration, or not approving the Keystone pipeline, the Obama administration's policies are failing everyday Americans and costing millions in potential government revenue and thousands of new jobs.

□ 1930

So no matter what the administration people are saying, like Mr. Salazar or the EPA or the Energy Department, the fact is we have enough energy in this country to move toward energy independence over the next 5 to 10 years. But this administration wants to go to new sources of energy like windmills and solar panels and geothermal and nuclear. And all those things are important, but while we're starting to transition to new sources of energy, we need to use the energy that we have, which would lower the cost of energy to the average citizen and lower the price of gasoline so people, as Mr. POE has said, could get to work and live a competent, fair, friendly life.

With that, Mr. POE, thank you so much for giving me this time. I'm a big admirer of yours.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Mr. BURTON, for your comments. I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana.

Several comments about what you said are important. The administration, the government, says drilling is up in the United States. That is true. But drilling on Federal lands is not up.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Down 11 percent.

Mr. POE of Texas. The drilling is taking place on State-owned property or private property, but other lands other than Federal lands. If it wasn't for that, drilling would be down in the United States. If we go back to the Gulf of Mexico, the same situation we have in the Gulf of Mexico has been ever since the BP incident.

Permitting is taking too long. It takes a record amount of days, sometimes months, to issue a permit in the deep water and in the shallow water. The shallow water guys operate with a very small amount of capital. They can't stay and wait around for the government to make a decision on a permit or not, so they aren't able to drill. In the deep water, those deepwater wells, those rigs, they cost \$100,000 a day whether they're operating or they're sitting there, and that's why some of them have left the Gulf of Mexico to never return. They've gone down to South America; they've gone to off the coast of Africa, to drill where countries are friendlier to the drilling safely off of their coast.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might, we sent \$3 billion of American taxpayers' money to Brazil at a time when we have almost a \$16 trillion national debt, and they're drilling in deepwater areas like we would be drilling in off the coast of Mexico. But we can't drill there because of the oil spill and because we can't get permits, so we're sending our taxpayers' dollars down to Brazil so they can do what we can't.

Mr. POE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, we're not only sending money down there to develop their oil industry, when they develop it, we're going to buy their oil back. So we're paying them twice.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That's right.

Mr. POE of Texas. Which doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

Now, I don't know and I don't really suspect that drilling would be the only answer for raising or lowering the gasoline prices, but it's one factor because of supply and demand. It's not the only factor, but it's one of those. It just seems to me that the United States is the only major power in the world that has an energy policy that is: We're not going to drill in the United States for all these reasons, but we want you to drill in your country your natural resources and we'll buy them from you. It seems a little bit arrogant on our part as a Nation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that Sarah Palin, whom everybody

in this country knows, she will tell you, and she's told people all across the country when she speaks, that they have a huge amount of oil in the ANWR and other parts of Alaska, and because of the radical environmentalist groups in this country, they can't drill up there.

Now, I've been up there. I was up there with DON YOUNG. We saw the oil pipeline. If you look at the ANWR, there's nothing up there. You're not going to hurt any of the animals. There's a lot of bugs. There's a lot of vermin up there. But you're not going to hurt the animals by drilling up there, and it's certainly not going to hurt the environment. But it would help if we could bring that oil—millions of barrels of oil—down to the lower 48 States. It would have a tremendous impact, in my opinion, as well as you've said, off the Gulf of Mexico and off the Continental Shelf. We could really move toward energy independence over a period of the next 5 to 10 years. Like you said, it wouldn't happen immediately, but it would be a giant step in the right direction.

Mr. POE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, as you mentioned about ANWR in Alaska, years ago we came up with this idea of a pipeline from Alaska bringing crude oil into the United States, and the same people that opposed that pipeline still exist today and are opposing the Keystone Pipeline. It took years for the vetting of the environmental lobby to finally be put to rest. They were concerned about the caribou. Of course, I think the caribou are doing quite well now. Finally, Congress decided not to wait on that administration and go ahead and make an approval. But Congress went ahead and approved the Alaska pipeline on its own, which became law in spite of the administration. It didn't wait for its approval. And now we know the rest of the story—it's a success 25 years later. And that's what Congress needs to do with the Keystone Pipeline.

No one has ever accused Canada of being environmentally insensitive. Their regulations are as tough as the EPA's—or even stronger. But yet they've developed a way that they can bring crude oil through a pipeline down to southeast Texas—Port Arthur, my district—in a safe, environmental way, and also one of the newest and finest pipelines. But the administration says, Not so fast. And it's unfortunate because the jobs will stay in America. Create that pipeline. Canada is not a Middle Eastern dictatorship. They're kind of a normal country.

We should approve that as soon as possible. I understand the concern in Nebraska. I'm glad to see the folks in Nebraska are working with Trans-Canada to reroute that 60 miles so there are no environmental issues and get this pipeline approved and start shipping that crude oil down to southeast Texas so we can use it in the United States.

It would seem to me that the United States should maybe think about this

type of energy policy: we should drill safely in the United States for oil and natural gas. And I say "safely" because that is important. But we should also partner with the countries next to us—the Canadians to the north, who have natural resources, and the Mexicans to the south, who have an abundance of natural resources—and the three of us work together on a North American OPEC-type philosophy and be energy independent. Not just energy independent, but it will help out our national security.

And if we do that, if we work with Canada, Mexico, drill in the United States, where it's safe, we can make the Middle East irrelevant. We can make that little fellow from the desert, Ahmadinejad, and his threats about closing the Strait of Hormuz, we can make him irrelevant. We don't care what he does. We don't need to continue to send our money to other nations over there that don't like us. So maybe that's something we need to do in the United States.

Lastly, and then I'll yield to the gentleman, because of American technology, because of those folks that know how to drill safely for oil and natural gas, the United States now suddenly is becoming an abundant Nation with natural gas. And we could, if we developed it the way that we can, the United States—primarily Texas, but other States—we could become the Saudi Arabia of natural gas. We could export natural gas, we have so much of it, and bring that money into the United States, rather than constantly sending money throughout the world, all because we don't take care of what we have and use what we have.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, T. Boone Pickens said—and everybody knows he's one of the big advocates of natural gas, which is a very clean-burning fuel. He said, if we would convert the tractor-trailer units that bring commerce to all of us, we could lower the cost for all those tractor-trailer units, as far as energy consumption is concerned, by 50 percent—cut it in two—and that would have a dramatic impact on things that are transported by tractor-trailer units.

I would just like to say that the President, when he took office—and I'll conclude with this, because you've done such a good job tonight. You've covered it very well. When the President took office, he said that his energy policies would, of necessity, cause energy costs to skyrocket. Well, as Ronald Reagan would say, "Well, he did, and energy prices have skyrocketed," and we've got to do something about it.

The American people don't want to pay \$4 or \$5 a gallon for gasoline. They can't live that way. It's causing a deterioration in their standard of living.

So if I were talking to the President—and I know I can't, Madam Speaker. But if I were talking to him, I would say, Mr. President, why don't you get with the program. The Amer-

ican people really need your help. And if you don't pay attention to them regarding the energy policies, it's my humble opinion that there may be a big change in administrations next year. So for political survivability alone, you ought to take another look at what you're doing.

And with that, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

□ 1940

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the United States can make some decisions and solve some of our own problems. We can start with finding people in the EPA that do not have their own personal vendetta against the oil and gas industry, replace those individuals like Armendariz and get some fair and balanced bureaucrats to make sure we have a clean environment to work with our energy companies rather than against them, and stop the war against the energy companies in the U.S.

We can work and bring down the price of energy in the United States. One way, not the only way, is to make sure that we have a supply. A greater supply, as we all know, of anything, does help reduce the cost of energy, so that people in southeast Texas who have a hard time getting to work and who are paying more for products that they have to buy, just like Americans throughout our Nation are having tough times because of high gasoline prices, we owe it to them to do that, to take care of ourselves and to work with Canada and to work with Mexico so that the three countries can be a strong ally, not just politically, but that we can be strong allies with our energy economy.

With that, I'll yield back to the Chair.

And that's just the way it is.

MADE IN CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 25 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, as I was shopping for some family items recently, I noted how difficult it is to find items that are made in America. While American manufacturing is, encouragingly enough, on the rebound, products ranging from hairbrushes to iPods still carry that "Made in China" label. All the while, many questions about China and its economic policies, foreign policies, and human rights records are left largely unexamined.

For the good of our economy, it is essential that we thoroughly understand China's record and their intentions as a country. Our nations have a complicated and lopsided economic relationship. Americans buy great quantities of Chinese-made products. China finances a great portion of America's