

liberty of the employee that must be protected. The liberty of the church must be protected in its churchly function and in its function as a religious institution. In its function as an employer, the liberty belongs to the employees. And that is the distinction that is made here. It is the proper distinction.

Imagine if some other church that thinks that it is wrong to give transfusions to people, blood transfusions, ran a hospital. We would not permit them to let people die in that hospital for lack of transfusions because it's not up to them to decide medical practice by their religious doctrine. If the person wants to refuse treatment because his religious doctrine says, I don't want a transfusion, that's his liberty. But we must not confuse the religious liberty of the church to propagate its views and to conduct its religious affairs as it sees fit with the liberty of employees in a secular institution affiliated with the church to have the normal protections against discrimination and the normal rights that we afford all people.

That is why the administration's decision to say that contraceptives are scientifically a necessary health care service which must be provided by health insurance is right, and any attempt by a religious institution to say that they should be exempt from having employees allowed to get contraceptives paid for is wrong, and I applaud the administration for making the proper distinction to protect the liberty of the employees and the religious liberty of the church both.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from New York.

This is an important subject. As previous speakers have made clear, birth control is fundamental to women's health, just like cholesterol testing and any number of other things. And decades of evidence show that planned births produce healthier babies and healthier mothers. Anyone who is working as a health care aide or a nurse or working in a religiously affiliated social service agency would want health care provided to them that is not discriminatory, and that includes the range of services that provide for good health.

Purely religious organizations would be, are, have been and will be exempt. But when an institution, even if affiliated with religion, chooses to provide public services and accept public money, they must follow public fair employment practices and not discriminate in hiring or salary or benefits. And now, under the Affordable Care Act, they also may not discriminate against women and women's services in providing health care benefits.

That's what we're talking about here. It's really quite straightforward. Expanding the religious exemption to religious institutions that employ people of all faiths would take preventive

services away from millions of Americans, would result in substandard health care for far too many women in our country, and it would allow religious institutions to be able to discriminate against employees of different faiths.

It's only fair. It's only what has become recognized by the courts, by the public, and by general public mores as the right thing to do. And now under the health care act, it would be institutionalized for all agencies except purely religious agencies that hire only in one faith.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think there's been a lot of misinformation about this. I hope tonight's discussion has helped to clarify the matter.

With that, I am pleased to yield back to my friend from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize, again, that the Institute of Medicine found that contraceptives save lives. There are numerous studies that have shown that contraceptives lower the risk of developing ovarian cancer, help prevent unintended pregnancies, improve outcomes for children, and reduce abortions. So, my friends, it's hard to believe that in the year 2012, we are having a debate about whether or not insurance plans should cover contraceptives.

Let's remember that for many women in this country, of the 98 percent of women that are using contraception at some point in their lives, let's remember that for many women, \$1,000 a year is money that they can't afford. So let's support the administrative position recommended by the Institute of Medicine.

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

HOUSE ENERGY ACTION TEAM HOUR

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. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to address the House tonight on American energy. Tonight's gathering again brings together people from across the country to talk about energy policies, rising energy costs, and what it means not only to American families but what it means to the American economy.

Tonight's organization is brought to us by the House Energy Action Team. It's a group of people throughout the United States elected to Congress who are committed to doing everything that we can to solve our Nation's great energy crisis, to make sure that we are addressing the price of gas at the pump and to make sure that we are taking advantage of all of the great resources that this country has to offer, whether they are traditional energy resources,

be it natural gas and coal, or whether it's renewable energy and the opportunities we have around this great country.

This country faces a significant challenge. We all know the situation. Unemployment stands at over 8 percent, just as it has for the last 36 months in a row. Along with high unemployment, the American people have a new worry now: rising gas prices. The average price for a gallon of regular gasoline has risen to \$3.45. That's up from 11 cents from just 1 month ago, 33 cents from 1 year, and up a full \$1.66 since President Obama took office.

We cannot allow these high gas prices and energy prices to continue to stymie our economic recovery, and the American people cannot afford to continue to pay these unnecessary costs. Just yesterday, in fact, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke testified in the Senate, "a major disruption that sent oil prices up very substantially could stop the recovery." This is a serious matter we're facing. The Federal Reserve chairman has recognized that if gas prices, if energy prices escalate, if they spike, that disruption that sent oil prices up very substantially could stop the recovery that this Nation so desperately needs.

The chairman went on to note that price spikes feed inflation and act as a tax on American consumers. The government can approach this problem in a very direct way. We can take steps to increase domestic oil production and refining. Unfortunately, fighting high gas prices doesn't seem to be a high priority for this administration. Offshore leasing has fallen behind previous projections. Other administration policies have also curtailed onshore production.

In 2007, the United States Energy Information Administration projected the total 2010 U.S. oil production on Federal lands to be 850 million barrels. Actual production was 16 percent beneath that. About a year ago, the Energy and Commerce Committee had an opportunity to hear from Secretary Chu, the Department of Energy secretary. As he was testifying before the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I asked a very simple question: What is the administration's plan to address the rising price of gasoline to help relieve the pain at the pump for millions of Americans who are trying to get to work and help their families make ends meet? After a lot of hemming and hawing the answer was, well, in 10 years from now—and I stopped him, I interrupted, and I said, the administration's plan to address high gasoline prices is something that we can count on in 10 years from now? As we have seen with gas prices that have already risen \$1.66 since the President took office, their plan is still not in effect.

□ 1830

Permitting agencies across the Federal Government need to work to

streamline, speed up, and improve the permitting process in order to close that production gap on Federal lands.

Energy exploration can lower energy costs while driving the economic recovery. Economic recovery and job creation is the number one priority of this Congress, and it is time that the President and our friends in the Senate get on board.

Creating jobs and getting people back to work is not a partisan issue. It is past time that we get some wins in the fight against high unemployment and economic stagnation. For instance, it's been 3 years since the application was filed to build the Keystone XL pipeline, which would create a pipeline stretching from the oil sands in Alberta, Canada, to the gulf coast, bringing significant oil supplies to the United States.

The Alberta oil sands development would create 6,000 jobs in Colorado. It's estimated that it would create 6,000 jobs between 2011 and 2015. The Keystone pipeline is an important part of that development. These are good-paying, solid, reliable jobs—20,000 direct jobs, 100,000 indirect jobs—and yet this President has vetoed the Keystone XL pipeline. He has said “no” to jobs, “no” to North American energy.

I'd just like to show a recent survey that was taken a couple of weeks ago. The American people support construction of the Keystone pipeline. You can see right here the number of Americans from across the political spectrum, Republicans and Democrats, a variety of income levels, a variety of age levels, all people, the majority of whom support the Keystone XL pipeline because they know in this economy we can't say “no” to jobs. We should be saying “yes” to jobs. They know that if we say “no” to the Keystone pipeline, we're saying “yes” to sending our jobs to China. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the American public wants China to win our energy race. I think they want to make sure that we are doing everything we can for energy security in our own backyards.

We need pro-growth solutions to create jobs, but there's only so much that Congress can do to directly create those jobs. Real job creation comes from the private sector, from small businesses and private employers. Unfortunately, our government has a regulatory climate that makes it incredibly hard for businesses around this country to do what they do best: to innovate, to excel, to expand, and to hire.

The EPA and other Federal agencies have been writing new job-killing regulations at record pace. These agencies are actively working against the number one priority of the American public, to create jobs—job creation.

At a hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee in April of last year, an EPA assistant administrator, Matthew Stanislaus, admitted to me that the agency doesn't directly consider job losses when analyzing a new rule, when coming forward with an economic analysis. Not only is that just unac-

ceptable, it's shameful that an agency would create rules, issue rules without taking into account the impact, in an economic analysis, that regulation would have on jobs.

Under this administration, the Obama EPA has proposed unnecessary and costly new rules on cement manufacturers, industrial boilers, farmers, power plants, energy providers, along with general ozone rules that will affect every sector to the economy with no thought as to what the consequence will be on the American job creator.

To be clear, the regulatory killing field is not the only problem. In the financial sector, Federal regulators are forcing banks to hoard capital, prohibiting community banks from effectively working with their borrowers. Businesses are struggling to operate in the face of damaging overregulation, and the financial sector is not there to support them because of even more damaging regulations. It's no wonder that unemployment is still above 8 percent. It's no wonder this is the longest stretch of unemployment exceeding 8 percent since the Great Depression.

We have government agencies saying they don't care about jobs, and we have an administration and a Senate that aren't doing anything about it.

With that, I'm joined by my colleagues from around the country. I would yield to my good friend and colleague, somebody who has championed job creation, who has sponsored legislation to create jobs, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership on this issue, not only on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, but also as a leader on the House Energy Action Team, someone that understands that there is no national security without energy security. It's been said many times by not only Members of Congress but by leaders from all across the administration, this administration and past, and so it's something I firmly believe in.

Let me remind the American people that just recently the President of the United States decided that he was going to kill the Keystone XL pipeline, a pipeline that would come from our friends to the north in Canada, where technology has allowed them to harvest the oil from the oil sands in Alberta and bring that crude oil down to refining capacity that we have here in this country. That's why the Keystone XL pipeline was so crucial. Not only would we be buying oil from a country that likes us, our largest and best trading partner, Canada, but we would also be bringing oil to the refineries in the Gulf States, the refineries in Oklahoma, the refineries in Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas that have the capacity due to the policy of this administration creating a moratorium on expanded offshore drilling in the United States and the moratorium and poor policies that have kept us from harvesting American resources to meet American energy needs.

I believe in American energy security and American energy independence and lessening our dependence on foreign sources of oil, lessening our dependence on Middle Eastern oil, a lot of times from countries that don't like us very much; but let me read you the President's own words when he decided that he was going to kill the Keystone XL pipeline, when he was going to kill the hundreds of thousands of jobs that would have been saved and created—true—not only shovel-ready jobs, Mr. Speaker, but jobs that exist today in the refineries in the Gulf Coast States; so not only kill those jobs, but hurt American energy independence.

Outside of having American energy independence, why not North American energy independence? Why not trade with Canada? But this is the President's own words. He said: I'm disappointed that Republicans in Congress forced this decision, but it does not change my administration's commitment to American-made energy that creates jobs and reduces our dependence on oil. Not reduces our dependence on foreign oil, not reduces our dependence on Middle Eastern oil, but listen clearly, the President said: lessen our dependence on oil. That is the policy of this administration, to end our dependence on oil and promote green energy; to throw your tax dollars at companies like Solyndra instead of relying on the free market to pick the winners and the losers, allowing what works to work and what doesn't to fall by the wayside and allow American ingenuity and American entrepreneurship to chase the things that work and throw their investment dollars, personal investment dollars, into the technologies that they believe in, the free market, the investors believe in.

Instead of doing that, he took your tax dollars, America. He decided that he was going to pick winners for you and he was going to invest those dollars in companies like Solyndra and many others. As the weeks unfold, we'll realize that your tax dollars were invested in companies that you wouldn't have invested in yourselves because you would have made smart decisions. America can make smart decisions. That's what makes us great. But his own words said that he wants to reduce our dependence on oil.

I go back to Secretary Chu, the Secretary of the Department of Energy, in his own words, that he thinks we ought to be paying the same for gasoline as those in Europe are paying, \$8-, \$9-a-gallon gasoline. And trust me, we're headed there. Last month was the most expensive January ever for retail gasoline as prices averaged out at \$3.37 a gallon, according to the Oil Price Information Service in New Jersey. That's compared with the previous record average for the month of January that was \$3.09½ cents a gallon, and that was set last year. In 2010, January gasoline prices averaged just \$2.71 a gallon.

It's the policies of this administration and its moratorium on us harvesting American resources. We're not talking just about offshore oil in the deep waters off the Gulf of Mexico or off the coast of Alaska. We're not talking about just ANWR and it being off limits. We're talking about the Bakken oil fields. We're talking about oil reserves on Federal lands that are currently off-limits from American energy development and American energy production.

But guess what? That same Bakken oil field spills over into North Dakota. That Bakken oil field is on State-owned and private-owned property. And you know what? North Dakota has a 3 percent or less unemployment rate. It's an energy economy that is booming because it's on State and Federal land. And they said, hey, come harvest our oil resources.

□ 1840

North Dakota is thriving on an energy economy, and you'll hear from the gentleman from Texas momentarily. They will show you in Texas and Oklahoma and other States that had energy that you're seeing an energy economy thrive.

But that's not the policies of this administration. The policy of this administration is to chase green energy jobs, to chase wind power and solar power and promote it in areas that really it shouldn't be promoted. So, let me just say one other thing, that President Obama is definitely being misleading when he's talking about that 75 percent of our offshore resources are open. The real number should be in acres.

Listen to this: of the 1.76 billion acres on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf, only 38 million acres, or a mere 2.16 percent, is actually leased for energy development. North America possesses 1.79 trillion barrels in recoverable resources, enough oil to fuel every passenger car in the United States for 430 years; more than six times approved reserves in Saudi Arabia. In the last 30 years we produced over 150 percent of our approved resources.

But let me talk just quickly about jobs, because when the attack from the administration is on Big Oil and on the oil industry and natural gas industry that's trying to help with American energy independence, the attack's just not on big oil companies that are harvesting and exploring and producing oil offshore in the western Gulf of Mexico. That image may be conjured up as we talk about that.

But it's the attack on the jobs. If you think about an oil platform that's out there drilling for oil, you're thinking about an oil production platform that's out there producing the oil after the oil well's drilled. And we put a moratorium in place, and we say we're not going to do anymore of that; we're going to cancel all the lease sales, and keep in mind, it takes years to plan the next lease sale.

I was on the 5-year planning subcommittee that dealt with that, and I

know that it's a multi-year process before the first lease sale happens; and when that lease sale happens, oil companies have to drag those rigs out there. They've got to first figure out where that oil might be on that grid square that they just leased, and then they've got to bring the drilling platform out there and they've got to drill that well, oftentimes going many miles down into the Earth's surface to find the oil, and to decide whether it's recoverable, whether there's enough resources there for them to plant a platform and start producing that oil. That's a multi-year process.

But set that aside a minute. When we have a moratorium on that process, here's what happens. It's not just Big Oil and the oil companies that are penalized in that. It's the guys that work on those drilling rigs out there in the Gulf of Mexico. It's also the guys that take them supplies, their diesel fuel to run their generators, their food, to transfer the men back and forth that are doing the work from on shore out there to those facilities. It's the companies that manufacture the pipe and the casing that support that industry.

And as JEFF LANDRY will tell you, Louisiana's economy is hurting. It's hurting not because of Big Oil hurting; it's hurting because of the little guys back home that don't get to supply that pipe. They don't get to thread that pipe and fit that pipe. They don't get to weld, and they don't get to service that industry. They don't get the opportunity to go out there and work on those rigs. They don't get to take that drilling mud out there.

You know, it takes a lot of effort to go out into the Gulf of Mexico and actually start harvesting those natural resources. And it's the little guy back home that is now bankrupt because his small company that provided the welding necessary for the piping, he doesn't have that work now.

And so the Gulf Coast States, due to the President's moratorium out there, not only lost the revenue that they would get from the royalties of offshore drilling that other States would benefit from as well. As a side note, if we allowed more drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf on the eastern coast and off the coast of Alaska. But it's the little guy. Louisiana is not getting the revenue.

And then the guys that are being put out of work that are providing the welding and the pipe fitting and the pipe itself and the offshore industries, they're not able to work either. And so they're drawing unemployment benefits, which further cramps the strained budgets of the Gulf Coast States. So they're drawing unemployment benefits. They're not paying taxes, so the State revenues in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas are strained because they're not receiving those tax revenues.

They're not receiving the corporate revenues from thriving energy-based companies that are providing jobs and

payroll and paying into unemployment and providing corporate tax returns. It is a tremendous trickle-down effect when we stop harvesting resources. It's a tremendous trickle-down effect to those gulf states' economies.

But I will tell you, in South Carolina, when my constituents have to pay more and more of their hard-earned dollars to put fuel in their vehicles, whether it's gasoline or diesel fuel in their vehicle to go to work, and they've got to think about that first hour that they're working just went to pay the gas that it took them to get there; when they're digging deeper into that wallet to take out money to buy more and more gasoline just to go earn the money that they're going to turn around and use to buy the gasoline, it's a vicious cycle.

We've got the ability, gentleman from Colorado, we've got the ability to lower gas prices in this country. And I simply look at natural gas, and the prices have come down in natural gas because we found an abundance of it in this country. We found new technology that allows us to harvest those natural gas resources, as you'll hear from the gentleman from New York later, when he talks about the Marcellus gas shelf and harvesting natural gas in New York and Pennsylvania.

But we also talk about Oklahoma and natural gas there. We have an abundance of natural gas. We've seen the price go down. Even in an adverse regulatory climate, even in an adverse tax climate that we've got in this economy under this administration, natural gas prices have gone down because there's two factors that affect pricing of any commodity: supply and demand.

Now, world demand is down. World demand is down on a lot of things because we have a bad economy. But the number one driver for natural gas in this country is supply. The supply is going out the roof. We're an exporter of natural gas. America is sitting on the reserves to be energy independent and to provide other parts of the world with the natural resources that we've been blessed with here in this country.

So America needs to realize that the policies of this administration are keeping this country from harvesting its resources and being truly energy independent and providing the good-paying, long-term energy-sector jobs.

And if you're looking for a job, America, I recommend you go to one of these energy-producing States, whether it's Oklahoma or Texas or even to North Dakota, where the unemployment rate is 3 percent or less, where you can earn up to \$70,000 a year driving a water truck, if that's any indication of the good-paying jobs that are out there.

Energy as a segue to job creation is the answer to get us out of this economy.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And he touched on a great point, the fact that it's not just energy creation itself, energy development itself that creates

the jobs that this country so desperately needs. But it's all the indirect benefits. It's the economic cycle of energy production.

If you have abundant, affordable, cheap energy, you're going to have a successful economy because people are able to afford their gas. They're able to use their natural gas in manufacturing at an affordable price.

But it's also the businesses that benefit from the production itself. Our family, my dad owns a farm equipment dealership. I grew up working at the farm implement dealership, selling parts to farmers and ranchers. Over the past several years we've seen a boom in natural gas development. We see those same people coming in off the rigs into the dealership looking for hydraulic hose, looking for filters for their pickups, looking for work for their maintainers, the work they're doing on their road, the excavators, all of which benefits a rural economy, when they go into the car dealership, when they go into the restaurants. Talk about economic benefit and the ability to grow our economy. Energy production is key.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Texas, just a couple of quotes to hear it directly from President Obama and directly from Energy Secretary Steven Chu. These are just two quotes. If you want to know where they stand on energy policy, I think these two quotes really define where they have been over the past several years.

President Obama in January of 2008: Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.

Energy Secretary Steven Chu, December of 2008, and I quote: Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.

Now, that doesn't sound like a recipe for economic success to me. That sounds like a recipe for economic disaster.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

□ 1850

I would just let the Chamber know and our colleagues know that Mr. FLORES is someone who has great experience in job creation, putting people to work and certainly helping make America more energy secure.

Mr. FLORES. I thank my friend from Colorado, and you're exactly right. I do have extensive experience in the oil and gas business and also in the energy service business. So I know firsthand the impact on jobs and American energy security that having a robust supply of domestic oil and gas can have.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight another missed opportunity by the Obama administration to address rising gasoline prices, to promote American job creation, and to provide for American energy security. While the President may claim his administration supports an all-in approach to en-

ergy, the facts, however, tell a different story.

Here are four examples of rhetoric versus reality:

Example number one, last November, the Department of the Interior released a draft 5-year plan that fails to open any new areas to new energy production in the Outer Continental Shelf through 2017. This proposal will send American jobs overseas, forfeit new revenue to the Federal Government, cause higher gasoline prices, and will deny access to American energy resources that would reduce our dependence on unstable and unfriendly Middle Eastern sources of oil.

Yesterday, I helped spearhead a joint bipartisan letter with 182 signatures from this House, which we sent to Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, expressing strong support in the House for the consideration of new and expanded access offshore for the production of oil and gas.

The vast offshore areas of the United States serve as a potential source of the Nation's energy supply containing significant quantities of valuable taxpayer-owned resources in yet-to-be discovered fields. Opening up access to new areas of the OCS will bring new jobs, new energy, and new revenues to the Federal treasury and all at a time when economists expect gas prices to soon skyrocket. Our country desperately needs these benefits now, not at some far-off date in the future.

In addition, new access to American resources will help reduce our reliance on unfriendly and unstable Middle Eastern sources of energy. For these reasons, it is vital that our country have in place a plan that maximizes the opportunity to assess all of these resources that we have available so that we can make informed decisions regarding the appropriate shape and scope of future domestic offshore activities.

Unfortunately, despite the overwhelming support of the American people for offshore drilling, the Obama administration's 5-year draft plan released last November severely limits the outstanding resource potential of America's offshore areas, and it neglects our Nation's vital energy needs. That is why the Obama administration should listen to the strong bipartisan message that the House has sent supporting increased access that would allow us to extend offshore energy production.

Example number two, the President buried the Keystone pipeline and the thousands of jobs and the energy security that it would have helped provide. In light of the fact that his administration approved a similar Canadian oil sands pipeline, the Clipper pipeline, in 2009, it is obvious to the American people that the Keystone XL pipeline was sacrificed solely for political gain.

Example number three, the Obama administration has directed numerous Federal agencies to attempt to regulate and reduce the use of hydraulic

fracturing. This is the technology that makes our current abundant supply of cheap natural gas available to us today. Restricting fracking will reduce natural gas, hurt jobs, and hurt American energy security.

Example number four, this iPad costs about the same amount of money, \$600, as six barrels of oil. In terms of profit, however, Apple makes many more times the profit margin on this one iPad than the American oil and gas industry makes on that same six barrels of oil, yet the Obama administration wants to raise taxes on oil companies. This doesn't make sense. How can we expect American energy producers to produce more oil and gas at a lower cost when we raise the taxes on them?

The American people have more common sense than this. The American people know that if you raise the taxes on Apple computer, Apple can't make more of these available at a cheaper cost. Yet, for some reason, the President thinks that we're going to have more domestic energy if we go and attack the oil companies with higher taxes.

Access to affordable energy will always be central to our Nation's prosperity. But with new technologies, today's strengthened environmental review, and updated safety standards, there's never been a better time to develop energy responsibly. But without the option to even look, we deny ourselves an incredible opportunity for energy security and the promised economic benefits that domestic energy production entails to the American people.

The American people want us to get this right. They want Washington to get it right. And they overwhelmingly support an all-of-the-above energy approach for American energy, increased offshore drilling, and they approve overwhelmingly the Keystone XL pipeline.

This is important. Just yesterday, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned: "A major disruption that sent foreign oil prices up substantially could stop the recovery."

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have a plan to wean our economy away from unstable Middle Eastern oil. If we want an America built to last like the President referred to in his State of the Union address, then we must have access to safe and affordable American energy to build that economy, to build that America built to last, and to power that America that's built to last.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support and pass H.R. 7, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act, so we can work together to grow the economy, to create American jobs, to facilitate lower gasoline prices, and to provide energy security that this country needs, not only for our current generation, but for future generations of American children and grandchildren.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

He talked a little bit about the Keystone pipeline. I would point out that the development of the Alberta oil sands for the State of Texas—and this was a statement that was given to the Energy and Commerce Committee early last year by the Alberta representative in Washington. In the State of Texas, the development of the Alberta oil sands could mean as many as 27,000 jobs in 2011–2015, 27,000 jobs that could be created as a result of the development of the Alberta oil sands, and the Keystone Pipeline is a critical component of that. That's also not to mention the fact that there are numerous firms that do business with suppliers and the contractors that would be building the pipeline and the people who would be working throughout the Alberta oil sands as they develop it. So 170 firms in Texas would benefit from the development of the Alberta oil sands.

With that, I would yield to another gentleman from Texas who serves with me on the Energy and Commerce Committee, a great colleague, somebody who has championed energy development and certainly has been a strong advocate for American energy security, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. I thank my good friend from Colorado and my brother in arms on the Energy and Commerce Committee fighting for U.S. domestic production of energy.

I'm going to start my comments tonight by focusing on gas prices.

We all know that gas prices have risen dramatically under the current administration. This chart here shows exactly what's happens in America. Our President took office right here about February of 2009 and gas prices were just over about \$1.90 a gallon. You can see it spiked up to almost \$2.70 a gallon, and last summer almost \$4 a gallon. It's come back down. So it's over doubled in price since President Obama took office.

These gas prices are a hardship on American families and American small businesses, families that have to take the kids to school, families that have to drive the kids to practice, families who have to go to the grocery store, families that have to go to church. No one is immune to these price increases.

I'm privileged to represent part of the energy capital of the world, a suburb of Houston, Texas, and we're not immune to these price increases. These are articles from a local online paper over the past month. I'll read them to you, just selected portions of them.

□ 1900

On January 10, 2012, Fort Bend gas prices jumped more than 11 cents.

On January 17, 2012, one week later, gas prices in Fort Bend have risen another 2.2 cents in the past week.

One week later—there is a theme here—in Fort Bend County, Fort Bend's gas prices have risen another 8.3 cents in the past week.

That's 3 weeks with a 25-cent per gallon increase in prices in my home

county of Fort Bend County. Again, families and small businesses are struggling to survive with these incredibly high gas prices. Why is this happening? Uncertainty. Uncertainty in one particular region of the world. The uncertainty is coming from one country, Iran, and its threats to disrupt traffic through the Strait of Hormuz.

I've had a unique opportunity here in Congress. I served in the United States Navy for 10 years. I was a naval aviator, not necessarily a naval pilot, but I've actually flown missions right through the Strait of Hormuz. Iran is threatening to shut down the straits because the United States and the European Union have put sanctions against Iran because of its threat to build a nuclear weapon, which is a direct threat to our security. Most importantly, it's a direct threat to the security of our best ally and friend in the world, the great country of Israel. We have to take Iran's threats very seriously.

Let me tell you a little bit about the Strait of Hormuz. As you can see, it's a very narrow body of water, about 30 miles wide. If you've been to southeast Texas, do you know where the Johnson Space Center is? Drive 30 miles south, and you'll be on Galveston Beach. It's a very, very narrow body of water. It's shallow—200 feet, two-thirds the length of a football field.

As you can see, the transit lanes for the ships are close to Iran. There are all sorts of little islands out here that they cannot maneuver through. They've got to go close to Iran, again posing a greater threat to them. Right here is Abu Musa. That is an Iranian base, a military base, so all the tanker traffic flowing through there—all our military ships—have to pass right through Iran, right through Abu Musa.

Let me tell you what Iran has there as a threat to the Strait of Hormuz. This is the Persian Gulf here. All along here, in Abu Musa, there are missiles—surface-to-ship missiles aimed at our ships and aimed at our tankers—going through every single day. I know this because when I flew my plane through there, we were tracked by Iranian fire control radar. That's just the way the business works there in that part of the world.

They've also got mines, mines that can lay anywhere here throughout the straits—again, a very narrow body of water where ships have little room to maneuver. These mines, you don't have to run into them. They're modern mines. They can detect some sort of a change in pressure or some sort of sounds from an engine of a ship coming through and then blow up when the ship gets close. That's a big threat.

There is another big threat, too. This is the most lethal threat the Iranians have in the Strait of Hormuz and the biggest reason for the uncertainty. This is the Iranian Kilo class submarine. It was sold to the Iranians by the Russians in the early 1990s. I actually flew over the second one. We

caught it up on the surface just like that when I was deployed in the region in 1994. The reason this submarine is so lethal is that it's a diesel-powered boat, meaning, right now, it's on the surface and it's running on diesel engines, but when it submerges, because it can't get atmosphere necessary to run internal combustion engines, it runs on batteries, quiet, quiet batteries. It is the quietest submarine in the world, but it can't stay submerged forever. It has to recharge its batteries at specific intervals.

Look at all this traffic in the Persian Gulf, and that's just an example. There are all sorts of fishing boats all over there that have diesel engines. This little thing here is called a snorkel. This guy could come up, and he can push that up just above the surface of the water and get the air he needs to run his diesel engines to recharge his battery. While he does that in the mix of all of these boats with their diesel engines, it is very, very difficult to find him.

In fact, the only way you can find him is with your eyeballs. It's very much a challenge, and, actually, he can go down and sit on the bottom if he wants to while waiting for the proper traffic—whoever he wants to target—to come through. This is a very real threat. This creates uncertainty in the markets. This is why gasoline prices are spiking.

What's the solution? And House Republicans have one: it's the Keystone XL pipeline.

Very briefly, the orange line there is the Keystone pipeline, the singular Keystone pipeline. This pipeline is already up and running. As you can see, it's coming from Hardisty, Alberta, Canada, all the way down to the Midwest United States—Steele City, going to Cushing, Oklahoma, and going across Patoka, Illinois, to St. Louis. Oil is already flowing through that pipeline. The Keystone XL pipeline starts at the same place and comes down a little bit west of the Keystone line. It intersects at Steele City. Then it goes down to Cushing. As you can see, it goes right down to the energy capital of the world, where my district is, in the greater Houston area in Port Arthur, Texas.

As we know, the administration and our President have delayed or canceled the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline because radical environmentalists and Hollywood elites disapprove of the pipeline.

What has that done to our economy? There are 20,000 shovel-ready jobs that are in jeopardy. Over 800,000 barrels a day flowing from that pipeline to southeast Texas to these most up-to-date, technologically advanced refineries in the entire world, that's not happening.

Energy security. National security. We don't have to worry about what's happening in the Persian Gulf. We don't have to worry about Hugo Chavez. Just this single pipeline with

800,000 barrels a day replaces what we're getting in from Venezuela right now.

What are the solutions? The Trans Alaska pipeline.

The American people may get confused. They hear about the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge and the Trans Alaska pipeline. Here is just an example of what it is just to show you. ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, is the light green area right here in the northeast corner of Alaska. As the listeners know, this is the great State of Alaska, and it's about half of the mainland of the United States. Basically all of Wyoming, almost to the Mississippi River, that's the size of Alaska. Do you see this little, little, tiny point up here? That is where the drilling to support the Trans Alaska pipeline is being done. It's one little spot. Do you see the point?

We have some problems. Just to let you know, let's talk a little bit about the Trans Alaska pipeline. It was designed to be built in 1973 right after the OPEC embargo on our country. OPEC shut the valves off for all of their oil—again, all that oil flowing through the Persian Gulf, through the Strait of Hormuz. Why? Because we sided with our good friend and ally, Israel, in the Yom Kippur War. Because of that, we realized that we needed to develop American sources of energy and that we should not be dependent upon the Middle East for our oil, and we built the Trans Alaska pipeline, with all the hoopla and all the conflicts with the environmental groups. It finally came online in the mid-seventies.

At the time before that, Alaska had the highest State income tax in the country—14.5 percent. Because of the Trans Alaska pipeline, Alaska now is the most tax-free State in America. With one pipeline, taxes go away. Here are the numbers: 2.1 million barrels a day were flowing through the pipeline in 1988. Today, 671,000 barrels a day are flowing through the pipeline. That's 17 percent of our U.S. domestic crude production.

As you can see, though, there has been almost a 75 percent decrease in the oil that's flowing through the pipeline, and that is a huge problem because if the pipeline doesn't have a minimum amount of oil flowing through it in that extreme environment, in the extreme cold, it is going to crack and break. It will not be able to be used again. But there is a solution for that, too, and it's happening in the Energy and Commerce Committee with the leadership of my good friend from Colorado.

I yield to him to talk about Shell Oil and the Chukchi Sea up there and all the reserves that we have available in that part of the country, offshore Alaska.

□ 1910

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for his comments on our resources in Alaska and the little poster

that you have there on drilling in ANWR. You can see that little tiny dot—it's almost difficult for me to see from here. It is just a little tiny pinpoint within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I've heard it described many times as having a footprint similar to a postage stamp on a football field, and that's the area that you're talking about that would be used to help revitalize our energy resources with American-made, American-produced energy.

But you are exactly right. Earlier last year, the House Energy and Commerce Committee passed H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act. It would help do a great deal to spur development of areas that have already been approved for resource development, areas like the Beaufort and Chukchi Sea areas. This isn't opening up new areas. This is actually an area that's already been approved for leasing, and leases have been sold. They've already said, Hey, this is an area where we can have the energy production take place. So we're just trying to make sure that that energy doesn't get stopped and bogged down by bureaucratic and regulatory processes.

What we did in the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act is pass a bill which had great bipartisan support on the floor of the House. It has now been introduced in the Senate by a bipartisan group of Senators who say that, look, you can't use an Environmental Appeals Board that was bureaucratically created to hang up a permit for 5 years, as in the case with one particular project in the Beaufort and Chukchi Sea area of Alaska. The end result of this project could be as many as 1 million barrels of oil a day and nearly 50,000 jobs being created across the country. As witnesses said before the committee, it would help reduce the price at the pump. And I think when you are talking about energy prices that have risen \$1.66 since President Obama took office, we've got to do everything we can to lower the price of gasoline and help American families make ends meet.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for the opportunity and yield back to him for further comments.

Mr. OLSON. I will just follow up on my friend's comments: So 1 million barrels a day is the estimate, 50,000 jobs? Basically if we do the Keystone XL pipeline, we would get rid of Venezuela. This would get rid of Saudi Arabia?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes. We are taking nearly 1 million barrels of oil a day. That's almost enough to replace our imports from Saudi Arabia. So between the two, the Keystone pipeline and the Beaufort Chukchi Sea development, I mean, we're talking significant—as much as 2 million barrels of oil a day, significant resources for this country, made in our own backyard.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir. And I thank my colleague again for his leadership in getting this bill through the House. Unfortunately, it's a jobs bill. That

means it's over there sitting in the majority leader's inbox over on the other side of the Hill.

But also, tying this into the Trans Alaska Pipeline—I understand that the development plan also includes the construction of four offshore production platforms, offshore pipelines that go across the National Petroleum Reserve to Alaska and link it to the Trans Alaska system. So that oil that's in the Beaufort Sea, the Chukchi Sea is actually going to go on the Trans Alaska Pipeline, build up the mass flowing through there, and give that the heat, the integrity it needs to use it for another 10 years. Is that true?

Mr. GARDNER. That's true. And one of the biggest challenges we face, as you mentioned, is the possibility that we could lose out on one of this Nation's great works, the Trans Alaska Pipeline, if we don't properly take care of it and make sure that we are actually utilizing it to its fullest extent. So you are exactly correct.

Mr. OLSON. If my friend could confirm this, but for almost 4 years now, Shell has spent almost \$3.5 billion trying to get that permit to drill offshore, shallow water. As my colleague knows, they have a very limited opportunity to drill. It is a very tough environment, very cold. So they've waited. They've put in almost \$4 billion just to get these permits done because they want to give American sources of energy to our country.

Mr. GARDNER. And not only were you talking about millions and billions of dollars that were spent on trying to go forward to produce energy in an area that was already approved to produce energy, but they were blocked by the bureaucratic process.

They went around the world. The number is staggering. It's around 400 wells that they've drilled around the world in the amount of time that it's taken this administration to approve the one permit that they are trying to get. So 400 wells around the world, thousands of jobs created overseas, thousands of barrels of oil being produced around the world, but not a drop right here. So that's the shame of it all when it comes to the bureaucratic mess that we're in.

Mr. OLSON. Well, I thank my colleague for his leadership on this issue. The people of Colorado should be very proud. Leaders lead. My colleague from Colorado is a leader.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. One last chart to close. And this is a plea to our President. This is a pitch for the Trans Alaska Pipeline.

Unlike the Keystone XL pipeline, because of the difficulty building a pipeline in the ground, it's been built above the ground. And these are caribou, wild caribou that are hovering around the pipeline.

Mr. President, it's time to stop codding the Hollywood elites and the radical environmental groups. It's time to

listen to the American people. And the caribou enjoy the warmth of the Trans Alaska Pipeline, because if these caribou could speak, they would say respectfully, Mr. President, drill, baby, drill.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank our colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee for his comments.

I know you were in the Chamber during the State of the Union address when you heard not too far from where you stand the President discuss his desire for an all-of-the-above energy policy. Just recently, though, when he talks about an all-of-the-above energy policy, he forgets to talk about the fact that he nixed the Keystone XL pipeline and so many other challenges that his administration has put forward when it comes to energy development and our Federal resources. Thank you for your leadership on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I look forward to our further discussions.

Our colleague from Texas mentioned that there were a number of bills that the House of Representatives had passed that were stacking up in the United States Senate. We've got an incredible plan for America's job creators. There are 30-some odd bills that are awaiting action in the U.S. Senate.

And I'll just give you a few more bills than the ones you mentioned that are all related to energy in some way or another: The Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny that would take a look at regulations that impact our economy; take a look at the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, H.R. 2273, something that, if it's not passed, we could lose a number of jobs throughout this country because of a regulatory process that has run amok. The EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011, H.R. 2250. The Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation Act. This is something that takes a look at the impact of higher energy prices, rising energy prices, what will it mean to our Nation's manufacturers, and how much more it would cost our Nation's manufacturers. The North American-Made Energy Security Act; Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act; Jobs and Energy Permitting Act; Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act; Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act; the Energy Tax Prevention Act. These are all bills that have been introduced in the House and have passed, many with very strong bipartisan support; and they're awaiting action in the Senate.

Somebody else in this Chamber, who has done a tremendous job of fighting for natural gas development, making sure that those jobs are created in his backyard, Mr. REED from New York, the gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Texas for coming down to the floor tonight. I am honored to join you tonight to have this conversation about devel-

oping a comprehensive American energy plan that will lead to energy independence for America, but in the short term, put many Americans back to work.

We've all been talking about it for months now. This Congress is focused on jobs, jobs, jobs. And right here, right now, today, tonight, we have before us—be it the Keystone pipeline, 20,000 jobs. Here the gentleman from Colorado is talking about another project with 50,000 jobs immediately available to be put back into place. I just do not understand why we have not been able to come together and have a President that says, You know what, I'm not going to bow to the political pressure. I'm going to lead. But yet he bowed to the Hollywood elite, to the folks when it came to the Keystone pipeline, and rejected the Keystone pipeline, with 20,000 people, families, American families who are ready to go to work. And he said "no."

I appreciate the effort that you are putting together here because, as you know and as you have indicated—and in my area of the United States, up in upstate New York, we're dealing with the issue of natural gas development. In particular, Marcellus shale natural gas development.

I did listen to the President's State of the Union. I listened to it intently. And I heard his commitment to producing our natural gas, because he had come to the conclusion that natural gas is a safe, domestic source of energy for today, tomorrow, and for all of America. To me, I hope the President was sincere in that statement because I joined him in that sentiment in that we have, in our shale formations in America, an amount of natural gas equal to 100 years of supply for America.

□ 1920

People have described it as if we are the Saudi Arabia, the United States of America will be the Saudi Arabia of natural gas supply for the world.

That type of resource is a game changer. And we are talking about thousands of jobs. We are talking about the ability to create an energy platform that allows our manufacturers to come back to America. That is one thing I think we have joined on both sides of the aisle to be committed to is to build things in America again.

And why does a natural gas platform of energy lead to building in America again?

It's simple. It's simple, and I know my colleagues know it. Because if you can drive down utility costs, if you can stabilize them in the long term, 40, 50 years, manufacturers will look at America and say: You know what? What we make up by going overseas to China because of the labor difference—the wage difference that they achieve by going over there and tapping into those labor pools they will make up by coming back to America because the utility costs will be stable. They'll be

cheaper, and they will be able to build things again in America because they want to build here, because the American worker is the best worker in the world. The quality of work and products that come from the American worker are the best by far. And the logistics that they don't have to deal with by having manufacturing items over in China and other areas of the world are gone because we're manufacturing in our backyard.

So this energy policy all relates to not only energy independence, but it relates to the manufacturing sector of America and bringing America back to the forefront of being the leading manufacturer in the world.

That is why I am so committed to the issue of developing natural gas. Now we have to do it safely. We have to do it responsibly. The President has conceded that point. Many scientists, the data and the information that is out there, have come to the conclusion we can do it safely and responsibly, but we need to lead and formulate a comprehensive approach to tapping that resource and bringing people back to work through the development of that resource in a responsible manner.

One last point I wanted to bring up, and I so appreciate all of the comments you've made here. Right today we have before us in this Chamber, or will soon have before us in this Chamber, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act, and what a commonsense piece of legislation that I think this bill represents.

What it is essentially saying is we're going to take our natural resources in America and we're going to use the dollars that come from developing those natural resources on our public lands to rebuild the infrastructure of America. That, to me, is commonsense policy coming from Washington, taking our natural resources from the ground and putting it into our bridges, our highways, our roads, so that generations of people will have the infrastructure in place with its water, sewer, roads, bridges, in order to have the manufacturing of tomorrow, to have generations of people working.

With that, I have come here tonight to show my support to you on the issue of developing American energy. And I haven't even touched on the national security issues, and I haven't even touched on the final point that I will make.

My final point is that I have gone all over this Nation and I have gone all over my district and I've gone all over the northern tier of Pennsylvania where Marcellus Shale is being developed, and I have talked to so many people. We have spent so many taxpayer dollars here in Washington to try to educate people and bring them out of poverty.

You know, Mr. GARDNER, from my conversations with the people in the northern tier of Pennsylvania, I have heard repeatedly because of this resource development, this natural gas

that we're developing in a safe and reliable manner, I'm able to put my kids through college. I'm able to maybe go out and venture into a business that otherwise I wouldn't be able to do because I didn't have the cash to do it. That is going to empower generations of American families for many generations to take them out of poverty and get them an education; and it's all being done on private capital, capital not coming from taxpayers but coming from good old-fashioned American business, coming out of the free enterprise system, utilizing those natural resources that are owned by those individuals that are empowering people for generations. And it's not being done on the taxpayer dollar.

To me, we should be joining hands and applauding that type of development of natural resource and commit ourselves to this comprehensive policy.

Mr. OLSON. If my friend from Pennsylvania would stay a minute longer, would you talk a little bit about the Marcellus Shale plate and how it has impacted your State?

Mr. REED. Well, I tell you, being from New York, being down in the northern tier of Pennsylvania, right now New York is in the process of finalizing its regulations to make sure that it can be done safely and responsibly, but I have the honor of representing the 29th Congressional District, which is right along the Pennsylvania border.

What we have seen is we have seen the spillover effect from the economic opportunities and economic development that is going on in the State of Pennsylvania from the development of the Marcellus Shale. One of the counties in my district, Chemung County, is leading the State in sales tax revenue numbers because of the economic impact coming across the border for our hotels, our restaurants, all of the activities we have talked about.

I've heard from retailers and I've heard from a dry cleaning outfit in my hometown of Corning, New York, that was raising an additional \$6,000 a month by cleaning the overalls and the uniforms from the Marcellus Shale workers that are performing work in the State of Pennsylvania. Do you know what that means? That means he was able to give his employees a bonus for the first time in years. He was able to hire more people in our home area. I mean, this development touches so many lives and so many people, from the actual pulling of the natural gas out, and all of the indirect benefits and everything else that's out there.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from New York for those comments. As you know, shale formations do not know State boundaries.

Mr. REED. Amen.

Mr. OLSON. So the Marcellus plate runs from Pennsylvania all of way down through West Virginia.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to thank both of my colleagues from New York and Texas for joining us tonight. We are

out of time, but I appreciate the opportunity to address the House with your expertise and your leadership and know that we are fighting for the American people, to do everything we can for American energy independence and American energy security.

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

OUR FRIEND IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight deeply troubled about the situation in the Middle East, as so many people are, and also about the response of this country to our dear friend, Israel. It has been quite interesting to see as Iran comes ever closer to having nuclear weapons, just how much of a friend this administration has, at least from its viewpoint in Israel.

In recent days, we've seen the story, a number of news services provided one story, a reporter from The Washington Post, David Ignatius, traveling with Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, and this article from Fox News says:

Traveling with the Defense Secretary in Brussels to cover his meeting with NATO defense ministers, Ignatius writes, "Panetta believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May, or June."

That's awfully specific. There are some in Iran who have believed that we're a paper tiger and so is Israel, and we will prevent Israel from ever striking at all. And that if there were to be some kind of a strike, it would be much later in the year.

There's an article from last October about Defense Secretary Panetta. This one is from the AP, October 2 of last year:

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta warned Sunday that Israel is becoming increasingly isolated in the Middle East, and said Israeli leaders must restart negotiations with the Palestinians and work to restore relations with Egypt and Turkey.

□ 1930

It's really interesting because it was my impression that it was not Israel that had withdrawn from close relations, that it was Turkey that had actually allowed the flotilla to go challenge a legal and appropriate blockade of the Gaza Strip from which Israel was being bombarded on a constant basis. So they had a legal and legitimate interest in ensuring that more rockets did not flow into the Gaza Strip that would continue to be shot in an effort to kill Israelis.

The reason that the rockets were flying from the Gaza Strip was because the Israelis had had really a rather amazing group of towns there. People were making a living. There were beautiful homes and greenhouses, providing a way in which people could provide for themselves and to grow their own food. These were just well-run communities.

But the thought that the Israeli leaders had, apparently, was that if we will show this unilateral offer of goodwill to people who, in the last 40 years, have come to be called Palestinians—they obviously weren't for most of the history of mankind—but if they would do this amazingly gracious unilateral act, that it would be rewarded. And what Israel has found is that it has been rewarded with rockets flying into Israel in an effort to try to terrorize and kill Israelis.

Previously, years before that, Israel had made an offer and did provide land from which it had been attacked, which it had acquired in southern Lebanon. Lo and behold, they were rewarded by being attacked from southern Lebanon and having soldiers kidnapped from southern Lebanon. So it's interesting to hear this administration and people from this administration in the top positions talk about how Israel needs to restart negotiations, that Israel is becoming increasingly isolated, how Israel must reach out more, when it seems that each time Israel reaches out its hand, its hand gets shot at and efforts are made to chop it off.

This article from the AP from back in October quotes Secretary Panetta as saying:

"It's pretty clear that at this dramatic time in the Middle East, when there have been so many changes, that it is not a good situation for Israel to become increasingly isolated. And that's what's happening," he said.

Panetta said the most important thing now is for Israel and its neighbors "to try to develop better relationships so in the very least they can communicate with each other rather than taking these issues to the streets."

The Palestinians, meanwhile, have said they won't return to talks unless Israel freezes settlement building and accepts the pre-1967 war frontier as a baseline for talks.

This is somewhat akin to saying, well, if Mexico were to be launching rockets or doing things to terrorize American citizens, that if we'll just go back to where we were before the U.S.-Mexican War, then everything will be just fine. The United States went to war because of the same kind of unfairnesses that were seen by the Founders of this land. Dennis Miller put it this way: the Founders were willing to go to war when the British simply put a tax on their breakfast drink. So in all likelihood, they would be standing up firmly for a taking of liberties more so than we do sometimes today.

In fact, if we stood firmly on the liberties of the United States citizens and efforts by others in the world to destroy us, efforts by others in the world who have said they will destroy our way of life and they want to destroy our country, then perhaps we would be a little safer today.

I have a resolution that was filed—I've got lots of cosponsors—it was filed in May of last year, and I'm still in hopes that we can bring this to the