

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to address the Chamber tonight to discuss a very important issue, the issue of job creation, the issue of energy independence, and what we are doing in the 112th Congress, the Republican majority, to make sure that we're creating jobs and opportunities for the American people.

According to the Canadian government, Mr. Speaker, over 143,000 jobs in Colorado depend on our trade relationship with Canada. And whether people want to admit it or not, crude petroleum is Colorado's top import from Canada. But we're not unique in that aspect. Colorado is by no means unique. Many of our jobs and much of our energy depends on our good relationship with our friendly neighbor to the north. When it comes to the Keystone pipeline, though, it's been 3 years since an application was first filed. America knows the Keystone pipeline, a 1,700-mile energy project from our neighbors to the north to the Gulf of Mexico, one that could create as many as 20,000 direct jobs and 100,000 indirect jobs. The United States as a whole would benefit both economically and from a national security standpoint if this country were to be able to move forward with the Keystone pipeline.

And tonight, we have Members of Congress from across this country, and Members from the East and the West, the North and the South who will talk about the importance of energy security and the importance of creating jobs.

So many of the debates we have heard on the Chamber floor, not only today but in the past few months, have been revolving around the notion of creating jobs and what we're going to do to get this economy turned around, an economy that already has over 14 million Americans unemployed and 46 million Americans living in poverty, a chance to get people to work and a chance to create jobs.

I will frame this debate tonight with some information that we've just received. People across this country want the Keystone pipeline to be built. If you look at the numbers we have here, supporters of the Keystone pipeline, you can see the support. It's not just Republicans. It's not just the majority of Democrats. Every sector that we have talked about in this poll supports the Keystone pipeline overwhelmingly, 64 percent when you take into account the opinions of Republicans and Democrats. They know that this project will create opportunity, opportunity that hasn't existed for far too long.

For over 36 months now, we've seen the unemployment rate in this Nation exceed 8 percent. It's unacceptable. And the fact that this administration

has decided to punt on jobs is shameful. It's been said before, a year ago, 2 years ago when the President was talking about shovel-ready projects, well now apparently the only thing that the President is willing to use his shovel for is to bury jobs. And that's why tonight I'm excited for the discussion we will have with the American people.

So at this time I would like to yield to some of my colleagues who have joined me on the floor for their take and perspective on the Keystone pipeline, beginning with my good friend from Alabama, MARTHA ROBY.

Mrs. ROBY. I very much thank the gentleman from Colorado. I appreciate you holding this very important leadership hour tonight. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme disappointment over President Obama's decision to block the Keystone pipeline by rejecting an application to build and operate the oil pipeline across the U.S. and Canada border.

□ 2020

I think every American should be aware of the consequences. More than 100,000 jobs could be created over the life of the project, including an estimated 20,000 immediate American jobs in construction and manufacturing.

Oil accounts for 37 percent of U.S. energy demand with 71 percent directed to fuels used in transportation. That is equally true of a mother who drives her children to school as it is the businessowner who operates a fleet of delivery vehicles. When the price of gasoline increases, Americans hurt. And the price of gasoline increased 81 cents per gallon in 2011 alone.

I support an all-of-the-above approach to energy, which includes opening up new areas for American energy exploration, transitioning to renewable and alternative energy, and using more clean and reliable nuclear power.

In his State of the Union address, the President stated, "This country needs an all out, all-of-the-above strategy that develops every available source of American energy, a strategy that's cleaner, cheaper and full of new jobs." In my opinion, his decision on the Keystone pipeline is blatantly inconsistent with this very statement.

The door is now open for this Canadian oil to go to China. Canada's Prime Minister announced his "profound disappointment with the news." While the Chinese Government has ensured its future supply of oil and other energy resources, the United States has rejected a new source of energy that was laid at our doorstep. Mr. Speaker, I ask, how does the fact that China could receive this energy supply not serve our national interests? Mr. Speaker, I consider President Obama's decision a grave mistake. And on behalf of the American people who want secure oil and new manufacturing jobs, I hope that the Congress will continue to push him to reconsider this error in judgment.

Again, thank you to my friend from Colorado for holding this important

hour tonight on this very important topic to the American people for job creation.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for being here tonight and discussing the impact on her district with the Keystone pipeline. She brings up a good point when it comes to the price of gas. Reports that we have say that the discovery of the Canadian oil sands has the potential to change the current gas-price dynamic. Bringing a massive amount of oil to market from a politically and economically secure source can restore market confidence and bring down gas prices.

With that, I would recognize the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank my colleague for yielding, and it's great to be here with so many of them who also believe in not only the Keystone pipeline but that America can attain energy independence and security.

When the President came into office, gasoline at the pumps was about \$1.68 a gallon. Today, it's approaching \$3.40, and in some places even higher than that. We face a dichotomy of leadership here in Washington, D.C. You just heard our colleague from Alabama talk about the President's State of the Union address, and he talked about an all-of-the-above approach to energy. Well, the administration's actions and their words simply don't match.

And there's no more striking example of this than the President's rejection of the Keystone pipeline, a project that would have created 20,000 immediate jobs, bipartisan support, even the unions are supportive of that project, upwards of 100,000 jobs as it trickled down through the life cycle of that project; and yet the President rejected it. Hardworking taxpayers across America, particularly those in my district along eastern and southeastern Ohio, are very tired of Washington taking more and giving less. They want real leadership, they want real solutions, and they want a return to American exceptionalism.

I remember, and I know many of you do, a time when we grasped the concept of American exceptionalism. President Kennedy told us back in the '60s, he said, We're going to go to the Moon in 10 years. We didn't make it in 10 years; we made it in 7 because he engaged every fabric of our society—academia, our industrial base, our economic base, our political will, and even our military was behind this idea of getting to the Moon. We saw industries crop up around space exploration. We saw millions of jobs created. We saw young people lining up to get into institutions where they could major in disciplines that would prepare them for careers in space exploration.

Think about what would happen if we really had an all-of-the-above approach to energy similar to that. Think about what would happen if America had an energy policy that said, starting today, we're going to draw a line in the sand, and over the next decade, we're going

to set a goal to become energy independent and secure in the United States. We're no longer going to sit on the sidelines. We're going to go after the 3 trillion barrels of oil that we already own. We're going to go after the natural gas we own because we're sitting on the world's largest deposits of it. We're going to continue to mine coal; and because we're going to invest in it, we're going to learn how to use it more environmentally soundly.

We're going to expand our nuclear footprint because guess what? It's the cleanest, safest form of energy on the planet. We're even going to look at wind and solar and find out where they fit into the energy profile. We know they can't solve all the problems, but they have a niche where they can. But we're not going to sit idly by and do nothing, and we're going to start by telling our regulatory agencies to become partners in progress with American businesses, to become rather than the department of "no," the department of "let's move the ball forward" and get over throwing up arbitrary barriers that are keeping America from going after its own natural resources.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we had that kind of all-of-the-above energy policy that had action behind the words, you would again see America believe in American exceptionalism. You would see young people lining up to get into institutions to major in disciplines to prepare them for advances in energy production, distribution, and even usage. And at the end of the day, we would see and we would find out that we would learn how to produce, store, and use energy in ways that we've never even imagined.

Do you know why? Because I do believe in American exceptionalism, and I know that my colleagues believe in American exceptionalism. I just don't think that our leaders in Washington and in the White House and in this administration believe in American exceptionalism.

It was a striking example back last March, last spring, when the Prime Minister of Australia stood in this very Chamber and gave a presentation. We were all here. She related a story, and she said, I remember being a young girl sitting in front of my television and watching Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin land on the Moon thinking to myself, wow, Americans can do anything.

She went on to talk about the history of America and Australia and how we worked together to address the world's problems and how America had stood by Australia during World War II. She gave many examples. At the end of her speech, she said, I'm not that young girl today. I'm the Prime Minister of our country, and I've got a lot more experience under my belt, but I still believe that Americans can do anything.

I was sitting right over there, and I remember I could feel a cleansing breath take place in the House Cham-

ber. You could have heard a pin drop in here. We heard something from a leader of another nation that we so desperately want to hear from our own leaders.

Mr. Speaker, America is the exception. We are gifted with the ability to innovate, compete, and solve the world's problems; and we've been doing it for over 230 years.

□ 2030

We can become energy independent and secure in this country. We can return the idea of American exceptionalism to this country. We can put the American Dream back into play to the over 14 million Americans that are out of work and the 40-plus million Americans that are underemployed.

I ask the President and the Senate today to begin to work with us in the House of Representatives to advance the idea of a real, no-kidding, all-of-the-above energy policy, one that puts America first above politics and above campaigning.

I want to thank my colleagues for being here again tonight. Thanks for giving me an opportunity to share.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

And I'm sure you'd be interested to know this—and I'm sure you already know this, in fact—that according to testimony that was given before the Energy and Commerce Committee hearing last year on energy issues, the impact of Alberta oil sands development on the U.S. State economy, in your great State of Ohio, 13,200 new jobs could be created between 2011 and 2015 as the development of the Alberta oil sands moves forward. And the Keystone pipeline is an important part of that. So, as I know there are many visits going on to Ohio by this President, perhaps he can explain to the people who may be unemployed in your district, 13,200 new jobs good to be created by the development of the Alberta oil sands, why the Keystone pipeline was vetoed.

So I thank the gentleman for being here today.

And with that, I would yield to the gentleman from Arizona for his perspective.

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Colorado, for yielding.

Back home in Phoenix, Arizona, in my home district, one of the big things that we worry about is the cost of gasoline. I went to the pump the other day and it was about \$3.60. It's about twice as much as it would cost back before President Obama was elected. And if you look at the statistics, in 2011, the average American household spent a record \$4,155 at the pump. This is equal to 8.4 percent of the median family income. So this is a huge issue, that we need to continue to find stable sources of oil so that we can have a secure source of oil and we can make sure that we have more supply of oil so that

we can start to bring the prices down for gas at the pump.

Back before the President made his decision, I would go around and talk to people around my district and I would say, What if I told you that with the swipe of a pen the President and his administration could create 20,000 immediate jobs and over 100,000 jobs over the long term and there wouldn't be any taxpayer dollars put at risk or expended; what do you think we should do? Every single one of the people that I talked to said this President should sign that as soon as possible and let's get to work making sure that the Keystone pipeline gets put into effect and get people back to work.

And then something funny happened. The administration decided to placate the radical fringe element of their party, and the President punted to 2013—didn't even make the decision whether a yes or no, just pushed it down the road. But House Republicans decided that we were going to give the President a second chance, a second opportunity to do the right thing, an opportunity to realize that the State Department had already done an environmental impact study that showed that there was very little chance for any environmental damage to some of the sensitive areas where the pipeline would be going. Maybe we could have the President realize that this is not the time to play politics; this is the time to get American people back to work. And that's exactly what the Keystone pipeline would do. And yet, once again, the President punted.

Now, we can't give him too many more chances. We've already given two chances for this one already. But when we all sat here at the State of the Union and we heard him say that we were going to adopt the all-of-the-above approach, as some of my colleagues mentioned earlier, we actually realized that that's not really the case, because it seems as if there are only favored sectors that actually get some attention from this administration. You have companies like Solyndra.

Solyndra received a \$535 million loan guarantee from the government as well as nearly \$15 million in severance money for its employees when that company went bankrupt. A total of nearly 550 million taxpayer dollars were squandered. This is a risk that the American taxpayer should never have taken. And there is very little chance we're going to get any of that back because our rights were actually put lower than people who were giving loans after the American taxpayers.

Now, then, we have another company, Ener1, received \$118.5 million in stimulus grants before going belly up just a few moments ago.

According to The Washington Post, Obama's \$38.6 billion green job loan guarantee program has created just 3,545 permanent jobs. That's a cost of \$5 million per job, \$5 million per job in a favored sector. You know how many taxpayer dollars would be spent to create hundreds of thousands of jobs for

the Keystone pipeline? Zero. And yet the President couldn't sign a simple sheet of paper to get this done. This is a no-brainer, as many people have said.

So I hope that the President will reconsider. I hope that the House Republicans will continue to push this issue because this is something that we can do right away. It is shovel ready, to borrow a phrase, and this is something that will make sure that we are looking towards the future for our energy security.

And I thank the gentleman from Colorado for addressing this important issue and for starting this conversation tonight.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Arizona brings up a great point about Solyndra and the Keystone pipeline. And I think there is a real question about what kind of an economy we want in this country. Do we have a Solyndra economy that relies on government funding, government financing, and then rips off the American taxpayers? Or do we rely on a Keystone economy that creates private sector jobs, 100,000 private sector jobs?

The Arizona Republic said in an article, an editorial that they wrote on January 20 of this year, just a couple days ago:

A lack of urgency regarding energy independence is only one of the reasons President Obama is being shellacked this week by Republicans and Democrats alike for his disappointing decision regarding the Keystone XL transcontinental oil pipeline. The foot-dragging runs counter to the recommendations of the President's own Council on Jobs and Competitiveness. President Obama's choice is a bad one. He needs to reconsider.

That was an editorial, again, from The Arizona Republic.

And with that, I would yield to my colleague and good friend from the State of New York (Mr. REED), somebody who has been very active in natural gas production and certainly a leader in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Well, I thank my colleague from Colorado for hosting this Special Order tonight and for truly engaging in a conversation we need to have with America.

And I would like to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Ohio, when Mr. JOHNSON spoke so eloquently about the need for a comprehensive energy policy, an all-of-the-above approach to getting us off of foreign sources of energy once and for all. I think Mr. JOHNSON really hit the nail on the head with his description of the American Dream, or exceptionalism, and the ability that in America we develop a plan; when we have a vision, we can accomplish anything.

And I don't know if you noticed, Mr. GARDNER, I'm over here on the other side of the Chamber tonight. You know, I'm an individual who is proud to be a member of the Republican Party, and many of the times I'm

standing on that side of the Chamber. But I am willing to come over on this side of the Chamber to speak tonight to say to my fellow colleagues across the aisle that my hand is open for us to join together on this issue and many issues that face Americans back at home, and this issue in particular because it impacts all of us, all 300 million people across America; because when we can commit ourselves, as the President did at the State of the Union, to developing a comprehensive energy policy of all of the above, I am confident that we can achieve that energy independence.

And tonight's discussion on the Keystone pipeline is an example of an administration and of folks engaging in old-school politics rather than focusing on good, sound policy that is going to achieve that dream of energy independence because, as my colleagues have articulated, this project has been fully vetted, years of environmental studies and reviews. The primary agency, FERC, who had the responsibility to oversee the project, came to the conclusion that there were no significant environmental impacts that were associated with this project.

□ 2040

And it was on the verge of approval at the Department of State whose, if I remember correctly, primary mission is to deal with diplomatic issues. Because this pipe crosses an international border, the President used the final act from an agency who is focused on diplomatic issues to reach in and, for political purposes, say no.

I applaud the gentleman from Arizona, and I associate myself with his words, that we have given another chance to the President to do what is right in our and my opinion. This is a project that is ready to go. It will put 20,000 people back to work, and that's what we've been talking about here for months is improving this economy: jobs, jobs, jobs. And with the stroke of a pen, the President said no to 20,000 jobs and 100,000 jobs on top of that. And he put an obstacle in the barrier of his own State of the Union message that we are going to accomplish energy independence with an all-of-the-above approach by taking action a week before and saying, for political purposes, we're not going to be able to achieve that goal.

That has to stop, ladies and gentlemen. I'm proud to be part of this freshman class that has come in November 2010, and I fundamentally believe that we are changing the conversation in Washington to focusing on policy over politics. And this is an example, under this pipeline project, that is going to be directly related to that change in conversation in Washington because it's a commonsense type of approach to the job.

It's about focusing on people, getting them back to work, committing ourselves to a vision of energy independence, which is so critical to our future,

and also so critical to our future in the manufacturing sector, because if we can get energy from domestic supplies here, and we can secure those energy sources long term, we're going to have lower utility rates, manufacturers are going to invest in America again, and we're going to start building things again. That has to be the cornerstone of what we're talking about. And the Keystone pipeline is but an example of that.

One last point I would like to address. We here in Washington can impact people every day, and this is an example of that impact in a positive way, because if we put the Keystone pipeline online, every time an American goes to the pump to fill up his gas tank or her gas tank, you will see the immediate results of it in a lower price, unless we continue down the policy that the President has committed us to in not constructing this pipeline. Every penny counts in this economy.

So I'm proud to be down here on the floor tonight to talk about this key issue and also the bigger issue of making sure that we stay focused on the American Dream of energy independence.

And with that, I wholeheartedly join my colleagues tonight.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from New York and, again, thank you for your constant leadership on our national energy security. And we do harken back to the time just a few weeks ago when the President gave his State of the Union address, addressed this Chamber, the joint session of Congress. And it reminded me when he said, I'm for an all-of-the-above energy policy, and then vetoed, basically with the stroke of a pen, as you said, the Keystone pipeline. It reminded me of something that Yogi Berra might say. Yogi Berra might say, I'm for all-of-the-above energy as long as it's not all of the above. That seems to be what we're hearing. And with the killing, with one single signing, of 100,000 jobs, I think it shows where the real intent in terms of job creation some people would have this Chamber try to follow.

You mentioned the Department of State. A week ago, last week, we had Kerri-Ann Jones, Assistant Secretary of State from the Department of State, testify before the Energy and Commerce Committee and admitted that when it comes to the EIS, the no-pipeline alternative, there was an alternative considered under the EIS, the Environmental Impact Statement. One of the options they considered was no pipeline, no pipeline at all. In testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee, it was admitted that that was not the preferable alternative. That was not the preferable alternative under the Environmental Impact Statement. So even the Department of State admits that the EIS on the pipeline envisions the construction of a pipeline. And yet the President said no.

And so I thank the gentleman from New York and the thousands of people

that could be employed by the development of the Alberta oil sands. And I know the next gentleman, Mr. CONAWAY from Texas, that will be addressing the Chamber, I don't know if he has this statistic right in front of him, but according to testimony, again, before committee, 170 firms supply the Canadian oil sands from Texas, 170 firms that supply the Canadian old sands.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for allowing me to join in; and although I'm not a part of the freshman class, I hope they won't toss me out of the Chamber as a result of that indiscretion.

I wanted to walk us through kind of the process by which TransCanada has gone through trying to laboriously apply and comply with all of the rules, regulations, and hoops that anybody who tries to do a project of this scope has to go through.

They began in September of 2008 when they filed their application for a permit to build this pipeline. As has been mentioned, the State Department would not be involved in this at all except for the fact that this pipeline crosses an international border. If this were just within the United States, the State Department and the President would be out of the loop in this instance. But because this is an international problem, then the State Department gets a whack at this deal.

In April 2010, the State Department issued their draft Environmental Impact Study. Then, a couple of months later, in June of 2010, EPA weighed in with the results of their technical review and said that the draft Environmental Impact Study was deficient and didn't provide the scope and the detail, if necessary, for decision-makers to make their mind up. Bureaucratic nonsense for stopping things from going forward, so that it allows one group of folks in the administration to brag on how hard we're pushing on this issue, while all the time they've got a backstop at the EPA that knows that they're not going to move anything forward.

And then October 2010, State Department issued a supplemental draft Environmental Impact Study. Only in America can you come up with these kinds of titles to simply laying a pipeline across this country. Again the EPA weighed in and said, no, no, no, this supplemental one is deficient, and you've got to continue to give us information; although, when asked a little later on that month, Secretary of State Clinton was asked at a press conference, kind of where are we with respect to the pipeline approval process, she commented that we're inclined to say "yes" to the pipeline.

And then in April 2011, the EPA again said in a filing that the supplemental draft Environmental Impact Study was deficient.

Finally, by August of 2011, the State Department issued its final Environ-

mental Impact Study, allowing for a 30-day public comment and a 90-day agency comment. And of course it was during this agency comment period that the State Department decided that a new route was necessary, that the original route that was planned and the alternatives going across the Ogallala, the 13 alternatives that were assessed, that this one really was the best, that somehow a new route was necessary and that gave rise to the charade that we saw played out where the President decided he was going to wait until after the election, and then Congress weighed in and said, no, you need to make that decision sooner.

The State Department's decision to go or no go on it has to be based on a finding that the pipeline is not in our national interest. Transporting this oil of almost 1.4 million barrels of crude and bitumen across this country to U.S. refineries would have to not be in the United States' best interest. And, in fact, that's what the State Department found. After we passed the law requiring the President to make a decision, the State Department suddenly decided that building this pipeline was no longer in the national interest and allowed the President then to say what he said. The President's wrongheadedness on this issue couldn't be more self-evident on its face.

I want to talk real quickly about the safety issue. You hear a lot about that. I come from west Texas—Midland, Odessa, San Angelo. There are thousands and thousands of miles of pipeline crisscrossing my part of the State. In fact, there are three oil pipelines that run through the front yards of the people who live across the street from me. And we've lived there for almost 15 years now, not a bit of trouble with the pipelines. And they're inspected all the time, both inside and out and observed from the air, and this type of stuff. So pipeline safety is not an issue.

□ 2050

Drilling safety, by the way, I just wanted to pitch this in real quickly. When I left my home yesterday morning at 5:45 to come here, as I was closing the garage door, I could see the lights on the crown of a drilling rig less than a half mile from my house that's in operation. It's been in operation for about 4 or 5 months now drilling wells that are actually that close to my house, and it's being drilled inside the city limits of Midland, Texas.

So when we talk about not in my backyard or all of the other kinds of reasons why people don't want oil and gas production around them, I come from a part of the State where it's a badge of honor, and, in fact, it's helpful on the 20th of the month each month when the royalty checks show up. So this industry has a great record of being able to operate soundly not only in the drilling and exploration phases, but also in the production and transportation issues across.

Let me give you one quick thing, and I'll close. The Wall Street Journal, on

the 19th, had made a pretty good statement. It said:

The central conflict of the Obama Presidency has been between the jobs and growth crisis he inherited and the President's hell-for-leather pursuit of his larger social policy ambitions. The tragedy is that the economic recovery has been so lackluster because the second impulse keeps winning. Yesterday came proof positive with the White House's repudiation of the Keystone XL pipeline, TransCanada's \$7 billion shovel-ready project that will support tens of thousands of jobs if only it could get the requisite U.S. permits. Those jobs, apparently, can wait.

And a couple of paragraphs later, very succinctly, said, "This is, to put it politely, a crock."

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I will show a map. Mr. CONAWAY, the gentleman from Texas, referred to a pipeline. The only reason we had the Department of State involved is because it crosses a national boundary. So you can see the pipeline right here where it extends. I already have some pipelines, and I know the gentleman, PETE OLSON from Texas, will be addressing the Chamber shortly and share even more about this route and the different pipelines that we're dealing with.

But again, here it is. Right here. That's the only reason the State Department is involved. The only reason that they had a hook to get involved, and, as you can see, the hook was yanked and jobs were killed.

I would like to follow up as well with an editorial from The Detroit News, The Detroit News on the 20th of January. Detroit, Michigan, particularly hard hit by economic tough times over the past several years. This is the editorial:

President Barack Obama is willing to wait and wait and wait for 20,000 desperately needed jobs. For someone whose operating slogan is "We can't wait," it's curious that President Obama is willing to wait and wait and wait for the Keystone XL pipeline project and the 20,000 desperately needed jobs it promises. If the "can't wait" President keeps dragging his feet, he will hand the Chinese yet one more competitive advantage over the United States.

That's the Detroit News, January 20. Again, just a couple weeks ago.

I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) has been very involved in the Energy and Commerce Committee. He's been standing up for his State, energy security jobs that would be created. And I'm sure he knew this already, but in Texas alone, the development of the Alberta oil sands could create as many as 27,000 jobs over the next 4 years.

With that, I would yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from Colorado and my brother on the Energy and Commerce Committee. They say that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. I've got the same chart that you have.

I want to focus my discussion tonight on national security. I want to make sure that the American public understands the truth. I mean, there's been

many, many, many misstatements from the administration about the safety, national security implications, jobs of the Keystone XL pipeline.

While every American can have their own opinion, no American can have their own version of the facts. That's why we're here tonight, to give the American people the facts.

This is the Keystone pipeline, as my colleague alluded to. There are actually two Keystone pipelines. The first one, the little orange line here, that's the Keystone pipeline, the plain Keystone pipeline. Actually, oil is flowing through that pipeline right now, the Steel City, Kansas-Nebraska border into St. Louis and into Patoka, Illinois. That is happening right now as we speak today.

The thing that's been controversial is the dotted line, the Keystone XL pipeline, which follows a similar path, ends up in the Gulf States, in my home area of Houston, Texas, the Port of Houston, and the Port of Beaumont and the Port of Port Arthur.

The real problem, as I follow my colleagues, I want to point out three points:

Little slivers right there, no one knows what it is. It's just an imaginary line. Those two cross these points. Those pipelines cross from Canada into the United States. That's the only reason why the State Department is involved in this process. Some imaginary line between our two countries, and the State Department has the approval authority.

Again, I talked about the two ports down there in the gulf coast in Texas. Those refineries on those ports are the safest, most advanced, most efficient refineries in the entire world. That oil will be processed quickly, efficiently, in an environmentally friendly manner. We've just got to get it there.

This part right here, the State of Nebraska is the problem. I will go into that a little bit further.

As the American people can see, this is a map of the central part of the United States where the Keystone pipeline comes through; and just to get you oriented here, the yellow line that's hard to see, that's the Keystone pipeline, the one that's existing right now, the one that actually oil is flowing to Illinois as we speak.

The dark green line here is a proposed path for the Keystone XL pipeline. And the reason the administration has given for not approving this pipeline is because of this big pink area, and that's the Ogallala Aquifer that runs through most of Nebraska and, as you can see, goes into my home State of Texas.

All of these other lines here, all of these little arteries, all of these little spinoffs, these dark lines, you know what those are? Those are pipelines, pipelines that go in all through that aquifer.

The Keystone XL pipeline is designed to be the safest pipeline in the entire world, much safer than all of these

other pipelines that may have been there for 50 years. The Keystone XL pipeline is going to be put in deeper so it doesn't have the risk of some of the things most pipelines have where the integrity gets compromised because somebody on the surface drills into it. They're putting the pipeline down deeper to avoid that. It's got all of these modern systems that monitor the pipeline's status at a fixed interval so if there is some sort of problem on it, it will shut down almost automatically and prevent further spills into the Nebraska aquifer.

All of these pipelines are there. Keystone is the safest one, and yet the administration didn't approve it.

We all know the numbers: 20,000 shovel-ready jobs right now; 830,000 barrels of oil flowing a day down the port in the southeast Texas ports; energy security, national security.

Now I'm going to turn to focus a little bit on national security.

As the American people know, the Middle East is as unstable as it has been in most of our lifetime. Egypt, Libya, Tunisia all have new governments. Syria is on the verge of collapse; Yemen, as well. On top of all of that, we have Iran. Iran that is actively pursuing a nuclear weapon.

The world seems to be growing in its appreciation of the threat that a nuclear power in Iran has to our whole world security. We in Congress here passed a bill imposing sanctions on the Iran national bank. The European Union passed sanctions on Iran just this past week preventing them from purchasing any oil from Iran. But the Iranians responded in just the way we thought—with lots of swagger, with lots of bravado. What'd they do? They talked about shutting down the Strait of Hormuz.

□ 2100

The Iranians shut down this waterway. This choke point is a very real threat to our world's economic stability and growth.

I may be the only Member of Congress who has flown missions as a pilot in the United States Navy, as a naval aviator, through the Strait of Hormuz. It's narrow. It's about 25 miles at its narrowest point. In my hometown, that's basically the distance between Houston and Galveston. It's shallow, 200 feet. A football field is longer than the Strait of Hormuz is deep.

As you can see, the sea links, where the tankers all cruise through, are very close to Iran. They're not out in the middle of the strait. This little island over here, Abu Musa, is an Iranian island, so all of the traffic going through that strait has to pass basically through Iran on one side and Iran on the other side.

I'm not worried about my Navy having access through those straits. They can handle any situation the Iranians throw up. What I fear and am concerned about is all the tanker traffic that is currently going through those

straits. Thirty percent of the world's oil goes through those straits to Europe, to our country, to Asia. If those straits are shut down for any given period of time, our world will go into an economic collapse.

We've seen this in the past. When I was a young man and started driving in the late seventies—16 years old—it was this country, again, that was the problem. The Shah of Iran fell. The Mullahs, who are in power right now, took over. We supported the Shah, and all the Arab nations involved in OPEC put an embargo on the United States. Overnight, we lost all this oil flowing through the strait.

What happened?

My colleague from Colorado talked about gas prices going up. They doubled in about a week's period. I mean, I remember because my job as the new guy with a license—and I loved doing it because I was driving, man—was to get in the car and go down. It depended on what the last digit was on your license plate. If it were an odd or even day, you could go get in the gas line. On some days it was 30 minutes, and on some days an hour and a half. But my job was to get in that line and sit there and wait until I got up there and could pump gas in the car.

Again, gas prices went from 25 cents a gallon, which we can't imagine today, to 50 cents overnight. If those straits were to shut down tomorrow with gas prices going up as they are right now, which is approaching \$4 all the way across the country, we could see almost \$10 a gallon overnight—\$10 a gallon. So we can't diminish this threat that the straits will shut down.

How do we fix this? How do we address it?

It's simple. We develop energy sources right here in North America. The administration and State Department have proven in the past that they will approve a pipeline based on the considerations I talked about. Let me give you an example of that.

There are lots of pipelines coming from Canada to our country. Just to get the listeners oriented again, the dark blue line here is the Keystone XL pipeline. Well, actually, the dotted line is the Keystone XL coming down here. The blue line is the Keystone XL pipeline. The pipeline I want to talk about is the Alberta Clipper pipeline. The Alberta Clipper pipeline is the yellow one coming here, right here to the point there, which I believe is Lake Superior, but it's right there in the northern part of Minnesota. When that was approved a couple of years ago, here is what the State Department said. This is their Record of Decision and National Interest Determination:

The Department of State has determined, through a review of the Alberta Clipper project application, that the Alberta Clipper project would serve the national interests in a time of considerable political tension in other major oil-producing regions and countries by providing additional access to an approximate, stable, secure supply of

crude oil with minimum transportation requirements from a reliable ally and trading partner of the United States with which we have free trade agreements and further augments the security of this energy supply.

If that were true 3 years ago for this pipeline, isn't it more true today for the Keystone XL pipeline? Why doesn't the President approve the pipeline immediately and give our country energy security and more national security?

I know why the President did it. It's very clear. I mean, when it first started coming out, all the wings of the administration were saying, Well, we can't make a decision until sometime in 2013. The American people know what happens between now and 2013. There is a Presidential election. The American people need a leader. They need someone who will step up and do what's right for the country and do what's right for our security.

I would like to close by using a quote from the Father of the United States Navy—my Navy—Admiral John Paul Jones. He was in a battle with the British ship *Superior*, with more speed, more guns. His ship was getting blown up pretty good.

The British captain, the guy with those little megaphones, yelled over to Admiral John Paul Jones and asked, "Sir, will you surrender?"

Admiral John Paul Jones said those immortal words that every sailor knows. He yelled back, "Sir, I have not yet begun to fight."

The American people should know that House Republicans have not yet begun to fight for the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for his leadership tonight.

Before he leaves the Chamber and before I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, I think it's, again, important to talk about something that you mentioned in the very beginning of your comments. The only reason the State Department was involved is that it crossed the border. The only reason they were allowed to kill 100,000 American jobs is because it crossed the border.

If the pipeline were built from Fargo, North Dakota, to Houston, Texas, would they have been involved?

Mr. OLSON. No, sir.

Mr. GARDNER. Again, to the American people, we've heard asked often by Members of this body: Where are the jobs? I think we need to start asking: Why not these jobs?

I thank the gentleman from Texas.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, who has been very active in the fight for jobs in his home State and across this country.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado for allowing me to have a little time to talk about this.

Canada is our largest and best trading partner. A good friend of mine was an ambassador to Canada, and I had the opportunity up there to talk with

him about this issue and why it's important to the United States. Why Keystone XL pipeline? How about the refining capacity we've got in the gulf? How about the refining jobs that would be provided in a very hard-hit, post-Horizon gulf State economy?

The gentleman from Texas was very clear. They understand in Texas, as they do in North Dakota, that energy is a segue to job creation. If you look at the unemployment rate in Texas or in North Dakota, North Dakota has 3 percent unemployment. If you're looking for a job in this country, America, go to North Dakota. There are good-paying energy jobs right there today, and if we can get Keystone XL pipeline to be a reality, we'll have good-paying, long-term jobs in the refineries in Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and in all the places that we're going.

What I would like to talk about are the President's own words. He said in his statement—and this is from the White House's Web site—that the rushed and arbitrary deadline insisted on by congressional Republicans prevented a full assessment of the pipeline's impact.

Now, how long has this been going on that they've been doing the environmental impact assessment that you talked so brilliantly about? I came to Congress last year. This was going on well before I came here. A rushed assessment? Under the Obama administration, with an \$800 billion stimulus package and an unprecedented growth in government, don't you think that we had the personnel in the Department of Energy to deal with this and to do the assessment in a timely manner in order to approve a pipeline that would provide, not only American energy independence, but North American energy independence? This would be buying oil and natural gas from our largest and best trading partner, our friends in Canada, and providing good-paying jobs in America.

I want America to listen to what the President also said in his own statement. He said that he was disappointed that Republicans focused on this decision. We should focus on this decision. This is about American energy independence, and it's about jobs. Yet he goes on to say, But it does not change my mind, and this administration's commitment to American-made energy that creates jobs—and listen closely—and reduces our dependence on oil. Period. It's not reducing our dependence on foreign oil; it's not reducing our dependence on Middle Eastern oil and on oil from countries that oftentimes don't like us very much. It's the lessening of our dependence on oil. Period.

That is the dynamic that is driving this administration's policies, and America needs to know that. These resources don't belong to President Obama. They belong to the American people, and it's time we step up to the plate and we use energy as a segue to job creation in this country. We trade with trading partners that like us,

friendly trading partners within our own hemisphere. It's North American energy independence, and the Keystone XL pipeline is the answer to putting Americans back to work.

□ 2110

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, the gentleman from South Carolina, getting to the passion which so many Members have tonight throughout this fight to create American jobs.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) who has also been a leader when it comes to energy security and American energy production.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Thank you very much. I appreciate these few minutes to speak.

You know, I have been sitting here listening to everybody speak, and very, very good points have been made by so many of the speakers. And it does come down to a couple, simple things. It was a tough decision for the President, not because he didn't have the ability to make that decision, and not because he didn't have the ability and the materials to make that decision. As you know, in our hearing last week Congressman LEE TERRY brought in stacks and stacks of studies that have been done on this pipeline.

But I think of it in terms of my daughter, Abby, who's a sixth-grader back home. Abby doesn't like to do her homework. She would much rather be talking to her friends or watching TV.

President Obama apparently doesn't like to do his homework either. He would much rather be speaking to friends that tell him how great he is or being on TV.

The bottom line is the same: I have to tell Abby from time to time, Abby, go do your homework. Read your materials.

The American people need to tell President Obama on Keystone pipeline, why can't you read the materials? It's all there for you. Quit making speeches about jobs and take action after you have done your homework. Do it and do it now, and bring us the jobs you keep talking about. Get off the telephone, get off the speaking circuit, and put your nose to the grindstone and get the job done.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for his time tonight, and again, as we wrap up our discussion, we will just highlight the support the Keystone pipeline has across this country. Again, you can see the people who believe that job creation, American energy security matters. It matters because we can create jobs now. We have an opportunity to develop our North American resources, to reduce our reliance on overseas oil.

The question that these supporters ought to be asking tonight is whether or not they want to give up this project to China. I don't think they want China to win. And yet that's the decision this administration has made—100,000 jobs, American energy security.

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

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL
WILLIAM G. BOYKIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TURNER of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

ENERGY

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be here before you tonight. There's so much going on in this country, so many threats to our national security, and energy is one of them.

I am so proud to be a Member of Congress with the freshmen that I have heard here tonight. They make the rest of us look good, and I'm so grateful for their discussion about energy.

It doesn't make any sense to have more energy overall than any country in the world and then to pay billions, and hundreds of billions of dollars, to people, many who don't like us. They want to bring down this Nation, and yet we're enriching them, actually engorging them on our money.

And then we have a solution. One little part of this solution is the Keystone pipeline, more oil coming from our friends in Canada, who actually are friends. They don't want to see this country taken down. They don't want to see this country attacked again like it was on 9/11. Then we had a hearing today on energy in our Natural Resources Committee, and we're trying, we were trying to pass legislation out of committee that would allow us to provide more of our own energy.

But the wrong-headed approach of this administration and some people on the other side of the aisle that is forcing us to pay billions of dollars to companies that have no good plan for producing energy, but a great plan for bilking, sucking the money out of this administration, ready to throw it on any whim that they can say somehow is a green job. Well, it seems to be more brown in color from where I come from.

But anyway we voted today in Natural Resources to once again allow drilling in this tiny area out of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. I know that there are some people, even from this body, who have been taken up by so-called environmental groups and taken to areas of ANWR that are beautiful and are certainly worth keeping pristine, not taken within 100 miles of the little area that we passed today to allow drilling in.

It's a tiny part of the area that Jimmy Carter as President set aside back in the 1970s to allow drilling because there's nothing there. There's not a tree, a bush, anything that's living in that area in the way of wildlife. They can't stay because there's nothing to sustain them. They have to go out of there and go to the pristine areas. That's why Jimmy Carter set it aside as someplace we could drill.

Yet the wrong-headed approach of this administration is to continue to

put off limits our own natural resources. But that's only one aspect of things that are going wrong in this country with this administration.

LIEUTENANT GENERAL WILLIAM G. BOYKIN

So tonight I want to pay tribute to a great American hero who has been demeaned, a man who has spent most of his life as an American hero fighting for Americans to have freedom of speech, and yet being condemned and disallowed the opportunity to have the freedom of speech he repeatedly, over and over, laid down his life or was willing to lay down his life to provide for the rest of us, that is Lieutenant General William G. Boykin, retired.

He's a former commander of the United States Army, Special Forces. He was a founding member of the Delta Force. He's also known for his devotion to the Christian faith, which at one time in this country, in fact, for 99.9 percent of this country's history, it was considered a good thing to be a person of faith and devoted particularly to a Christian faith.

Jerry Boykin, Lieutenant General Boykin, graduated from Virginia Tech in 1971 and received his Army commission. By 1980, he was the Delta Force operations officer on the April 24–25 Iranian hostage rescue attempt.

Now, I talked to General Boykin about that before and consider him to be a friend. Something that I had heard back during my days in the service was something that General Boykin said was above his grade back then, 1979–1980. It would be interesting to hear someone from the Carter administration actually provide documentation of the actual decision to reduce the number of helicopters that would be utilized to go into Iran to a staging area hundreds of miles inside Iran, meet up with C-130s—other equipment, rather, that was there in the staging area, and then from there stage the rescue effort that would go into Tehran and get our hostages.

□ 2120

The story I would love to see documentation on, the thing that I heard as a member of the U.S. Army years ago, was that the original plan had at least 12 helicopters that were going to be utilized to go into the staging area, but the Carter administration believed that it might look too much like an invasion. So the word was back then that we heard, the Carter administration ordered the 12 helicopters reduced to eight so it wouldn't look like an invasion, and that there were those who were engaged in the planning who said, you know what, we need 12 because the mission must have six helicopters to go forward from the staging area. These turbine engines will cross hundreds of miles of sand, and we have to count on perhaps a 50 percent loss of helicopters coming to the staging area. Since we know we need six, we want to start out with 12 so we have a better chance of getting six to the staging area.

We knew where the hostages were, and yet people in the administration,

ultimate responsibility resting with the President, decided let's take more of a chance with the people we are putting at risk, sending in as the Delta Force. Let's put them even more at risk making them go in with fewer helicopters.

And as though Delta Force at the time knew, all they knew apparently was they get to the staging area, if they don't have six helicopters, then the mission will be aborted, and they'll have to turn around and go back. And since they were ordered to come in with eight instead of 12 or more, they got to the staging area with five. These American heroes who were not given adequate resources to go in and rescue our hostages in Iran by an administration you would have thought understood and appreciated the military, but apparently did not adequately. Even though President Carter had been in the military, you would have thought he understood. They get to the staging area, there are five helicopters, and the mission is aborted.

One explanation was when one helicopter pilot was trying to lift off, once they knew it was aborted, everyone was anxious to get out. A helicopter started up. Obviously, the sand swirls and it's easy to get vertigo and lose sense of direction, and the helicopter went sideways, cut into a C-130, and we left heroic Americans on the desert floor in Iran, a terrible embarrassment. And to this former soldier, I didn't think it was an embarrassment to the Delta Force that was sent in. They were ready to fight and die, but their orders were to go in. They were sent in without adequate helicopters; and when the mission did not go forward, people lost their lives.

But as we know from the old poem:

Theirs was not to reason why

Theirs was but to do and die.

Some of them did.

I would have hoped over the years the lesson learned from Vietnam would have been not that that was not a winnable war, as our colleague here, SAM JOHNSON, could tell. After 2 weeks of carpet bombing after North Vietnam had left the negotiation table, 2 weeks of carpet bombing, they came back. And as the Hanoi Hilton prisoners were taken away, Sam said the meanest, one of the meanest officers, at the Hanoi Hilton was laughing and said: You stupid Americans. If you'd bombed us for one more week, we would have had to surrender unconditionally.

Instead of being done in the seventies, that could have been done early in the sixties. The lesson of Vietnam should have been we don't send our military, men and women, anywhere in the world on our behalf unless we give them the equipment to do the job, unless we give them the order to go win whatever it costs. Win and come home. That should have been the lesson, but it wasn't learned in Vietnam.

And it apparently wasn't learned during the failed rescue attempt under the Carter administration. But these were