

be treated with respect. And when we have sexual harassment and sexual assault happening in the workplace, in particular in our military, and when we have someone report and say, Hey, this is happening, and then they are retaliated against either because coworkers are afraid to be around them or because higher-ups make an example of them in some way, we have to say enough is enough.

I think the time to pass this bill is now, and I want to thank the gentlelady, the Hoosier across the way, for working in such a bipartisan manner to get this done. I know there are so many in the Congress who feel very strongly that the sooner we protect the workplace, the better off this Nation is.

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would like to say that H.R. 1864 is a long overdue solution. It's the place to start, a foundation on which to build.

I'm grateful to my colleague, LORETTA SANCHEZ, for partnering with me, for her multiyear commitment to this issue. We worked closely with the HASC staff and the Department of Defense to craft this legislation. The bill was included along with many other good provisions addressing military sexual assault in the House-passed NDAA a few weeks ago. With over 110 bipartisan cosponsors, the House has shown that it can come together on serious issues and get things done.

Senator KLOBUCHAR has also introduced companion legislation in the Senate. Too many victims have already suffered. These assaults are happening every day. There's no reason to wait even longer for the NDAA to become law when we have a solution today.

Congress must act with a sense of urgency to approve thoughtful reforms combating sexual assault in the military. I'm hopeful that this measure passes, the Senate quickly takes it up, and we can send it to the President for his signature. I'm asking my colleagues to act today and pass this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1864, which addresses sexual assault in our armed forces. This bill amends the Military Whistleblower Protection Act to strengthen protections for those reporting rape or sexual assault.

Enacting this legislation is a critical step towards combating rape and sexual assault in the military for two reasons.

It will immediately require an investigation into allegations of whistleblower retaliation in an attempt to encourage victims to come forward. It also seeks to help remove some of the fears and stigmas associated with reporting sexual assault.

In the long term, it is part of a cultural change in how the military addresses sex crimes. Sexual assault will not be tolerated, perpetrators will be punished, and victims will not be ignored or harassed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1864. I stand today in support

of women. I stand today in support of the armed forces, and in support of veterans, both male and female, all throughout this great country. As our armed forces fight everyday to protect us, serve us, and guarantee our safety, it is, in turn, our duty to do all that we can to protect them.

That is why I stand in support of H.R. 1864, and implore my colleagues to do the same. This bill not only ensures protection for whistle blowers and deters retaliation from complaints, but it also serves as an important step in guaranteeing the safety of those who protect us.

The Pentagon reported this spring that an estimated 26,000 troops experienced sexual assault last year. This number is an estimate because only 3,374 of the assaults were reported. Out of 26,000 assaults, only 3,000 were reported. That means that about 89% of all assaults went unreported. And that's only half the battle. Out of the more than 3,000 assaults reported, less than 10% of the suspects involved were convicted. Further, a report publicized by the San Antonio Express-News, detailed an investigation in May that found that half of the convicted offenders were allowed to stay in the military. This is outrageous. It is proof of a broken system, one that is doing our service women a complete disservice. It is a compound injury; beginning with assault, ending with underreporting.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be missing the point. Senator MCCAIN would discourage women from enlisting until the military can clean up its act. Senator CHAMBLISS attributes the problem to natural hormone levels in males, saying during a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on sexual assaults in the military that: "The young folks that are coming into each of your services are anywhere from 17 to 22–23. Gee whiz—the hormone level created by nature sets in place the possibility for these types of things to occur."

This is not just a classic case of "boys will be boys" as Senator CHAMBLISS suggests, this goes beyond a "hook-up mentality", and discouraging women from joining the armed forces is NOT the answer, as Senator MCCAIN would suggest. The system is broken. And our service women are suffering as a result. This is a structural problem, and as such, requires a structural solution. By approving H.R. 1864, we begin to change the structure of the legal processes surrounding sexual assault.

The number of sexual assault victims in the military is intolerable, as is the rate of underreporting. Victims lack confidence in the military justice system, with good reason, and do not come forward because they fear that reporting a fellow service member will result in negative unintended consequences. This legislation strengthens existing protections and ensures victims do not suffer reprisal for reporting acts of sexual assault. It is important that we create the proper avenues for victims of sexual assault to avoid re-victimization through the legal process. This is the very least we can do for the service men and women who serve us 24/7,365.

I urge all members of the House to join me in voting to protect our protectors by voting "aye" on H.R. 1864.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1864.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1450

BUILDING AMERICA'S ENERGY SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity for the next hour to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and to the American people some very important issues pertaining to America's potential to be energy secure.

This is an interesting week that we would have this discussion. This is a week when the House Committee on Natural Resources is bringing forward two bills for consideration that will tear down some of the barriers and remove some of the regulations that have gotten in the way of tapping into the vast resources of oil and gas off our shores.

We know that there's been growth in oil and gas development in our country, but not offshore. And yet we know there are vast resources that would be very, very important to America's energy security.

At the same time, this week we also have our President, who made official his declaration of war against coal, stating, once again, that fossil fuels are the bad guy somehow. At a time when we're looking to create jobs, create wealth, create opportunity, he puts up yet more barriers to the development of these vast resources of fossil fuels.

Since coming to Congress 6 months ago, I have heard our President and his allies in this Chamber often reference the fact that since Barack Obama was elected President, America's oil and gas production have actually increased. They brag about this increased production and the jobs that it creates as though they had something to do with it.

Well, on behalf of the citizens of my State of North Dakota, let me just say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, you're welcome because the fact of the matter is that, yes, production of oil and gas in this country is up. It is up, except where the Federal Government is the landlord, because the large reserves under Federal lands and offshore resources are going untapped because of Democratic opposition to using the incredible opportunity that

new technologies have created to get us more jobs, more opportunity, and more energy secure.

I want to illustrate a point today by reading one sentence from a recently released State Personal Income Growth Analysis put out by the United States Department of Commerce. Here's the sentence. It's very profound:

State personal income growth ranged from a -.2 percent in South Dakota to 12.4 percent in North Dakota.

That's right. Two rectangles in the center of the North American map, two Dakotas, side by side, two States that basically have the same size and land mass, the same size in population, the same climate, same cultures, they grow vast amounts of food to feed a hungry world.

We're similar in nearly every way. And yet the Dakotas differ in one significant way, and that is my State of North Dakota has fossil fuels that South Dakota does not have.

I point to this distinction because I believe it represents the possibilities of America. It represents what can be done in much of our Nation if the Federal Government would just get out of the way and allow the unleashing of American ingenuity and the development of American energy.

Instead, what we get from our President is more restrictions on the use of fossil fuels and more fantasizing about unproven, uneconomical, unreliable alternatives. And while billions of tax dollars get wasted experimenting on whimsical dreams of a carbonless future, American job opportunities are lost and our debt rises.

Our President continues to pursue an energy policy based on an old model, an old model of resource scarcity, rather than on the new reality of resource abundance.

According to the Institute of Energy Research, underneath Federal land and offshore, that is to say, Federal oil and gas reserves, at today's prices, the United States taxpayer has \$128 trillion worth of fossil fuels that we're not tapping into.

Resource abundance: abundance based on the application of new technologies is transforming our economy and has us on the path to security. And North Dakota is evidence of what can be done in our country.

But there are a lot of speakers today that have a lot to offer in this discussion and this debate, and right now I'd like to yield to my good friend from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota. And I'm excited about the opportunity that we have in this country in a bright energy future. I can think of few areas that have held so much promise for job creation, for a new opportunity to impact so many areas of our economy as energy. And it really is energy policies that we're discussing this week that could create over a million jobs around the country, and the policies that we continue to pursue in committee meet-

ings, through legislation and the work that we do to help bring a brighter energy future to this country.

And I'm pleased that the gentleman from North Dakota is leading today's discussion on energy. You know, I've actually seen in my district the benefits of the Bakken Development in Colorado.

Sixty miles away from my hometown is a brand-new business that located in Colorado because of so much activity in North Dakota. They were actually seeing so many people working in North Dakota that they moved to Colorado to expand their operation because they couldn't find enough people to work in North Dakota.

So they moved to my district to create jobs, and they're hiring. They're manufacturing. They've bought a manufacturing business because of energy development in North Dakota.

But the energy success in Colorado isn't reliant on other States around us because we have it in our State as well. In my district, the Fourth Congressional District, it is truly an all-of-the-above energy district. Not only do we have a coal mine in the Fourth Congressional District, but we have wind manufacturing, we have wind turbine manufacturing, wind blade manufacturing, we have solar manufacturing. We have biofuels and are home to one of the Nation's premier oil and gas plays anywhere in the world, the Niobrara shale play.

In fact, in Colorado, over 100,000 people are directly employed or indirectly employed by the oil and gas industry. The average pay of a worker in the oil and gas fields of Colorado is almost \$100,000 a year. Average pay of almost \$100,000 a year, with benefits. People are able to stay in their home towns to have jobs that they never thought were possible just a decade ago.

I come from a very small town in eastern Colorado; 3,000 people, 67 kids graduated in my high school class. And I can tell you, when I graduated there are only two or three of us that stayed there to work in our hometown. Everybody else moved away to find work elsewhere because they couldn't find work in that small, eastern plains community.

But thanks to natural gas development, thanks to the development that's taken place around the State, they're moving back, they're bringing their families back. They're actually finding those high-paying jobs with good health care benefits, and they're building our communities and making stronger places to live for themselves and their families; \$10.2 billion in labor contributions, and contribution to the labor force as a result of oil and gas development in Colorado alone.

In Weld County, we've seen the impacts firsthand of what it means to have an all-of-the-above energy policy. Just two of the over-30 oil and gas companies that are operating in Weld County, just last month paid their 2011 property taxes. These two companies

paid a combined property tax to Weld County alone of \$150 million. Two checks, \$150 million to one county; 40 percent of that \$150 million went to the school districts and the community college. That's money that we're investing into the next generation of workforce in this country. That's money that is building a stronger education future for our children.

But it's also developing affordable energy opportunities for this country; and so I hope that as people participate in this discussion around the United States, that they go to Twitter and send their suggestions on energy affordability with the #affordable energy, #affordable energy to participate in a discussion about the future of energy in our country.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think the opportunity that we have, really, today is to join a discussion about what we're going to look like as a Nation, how to encourage manufacturing, how to encourage new job creation, how to bring companies back to the United States who've left because of the cost of doing business. They can now afford to do business here because of our energy production and energy opportunity.

So join us at #affordable energy on Twitter, and I just appreciate your leadership and the opportunity to be here with you today.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you for sharing that, and for the invitation. I very much appreciate your referencing the cost of energy. Affordable energy, after all, really is a driving factor in many other investment decisions and job opportunities. And I think we'll have much more on that as we work through this important hour of discussion.

With that, I would like to yield some time to my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHFUS.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this important discussion on energy and jobs.

And it's not just the folks out west who are excited about energy. We in Pennsylvania are very excited.

In fact, I'm from the southwestern part of Pennsylvania, and yesterday I was driving through the city of Pittsburgh around the same time that President Obama was renewing his war on coal from behind a podium in Washington, D.C.

Our coal miners and steel workers built Pittsburgh. However, if the regime that President Obama and the unelected bureaucrats at the EPA, that regime that they're planning for the next 20 years, if that regime had been in place in the 19th century, Pittsburgh might not have become the great American city that it is today.

The regulations introduced yesterday by President Obama are only the latest salvo in his war on low-cost American energy. These new regulations will result in more shuttered coal mines, power plants, and more lost jobs.

□ 1500

When our coal miners and power plant workers lose their jobs, we lose people vital to our communities and we lose wages and tax revenues critical for supporting local small businesses and schools. These new regulations will also raise energy prices and significantly impact moms and dads sitting around the kitchen table paying their monthly utility bills.

Long story short, this war on coal is a war on the livelihoods of millions of hardworking middle class men and women in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation. It's a war on good-paying American jobs, a war on American opportunity, and a war on American prosperity. And it must end.

President Obama and unelected Federal elites must be held accountable for the negative impact these regulations will inflict on hardworking moms and dads. The REINS Act, which I support, would hold them accountable by requiring that any regulation with an annual economic impact of \$100 million or more must be approved by Congress. Any regulation that has that much impact on our country should be voted for in Congress.

Low-cost American energy is a major factor in economic growth and job creation. Every business and family uses fuel and electricity. The Federal Government needs a commonsense, straightforward, all-of-the-above energy policy to spur growth and get our economy booming again. The House Energy Action Team is a great group of Members dedicated to that goal. Coal, wind, natural gas, solar, nuclear, thermal, hydro, and oil must all play a part in powering our economy. Western Pennsylvania offers unparalleled opportunities and is benefiting economically, thanks to the development of our plentiful energy resources.

The economic benefits are not limited to the energy sector. Lower energy prices resulting from increased domestic production would benefit the entire economy. For each new energy job, three or more additional new jobs are created across the economy. These are good-paying American jobs.

This week, the House will consider legislation that would create over 1 million new good-paying American jobs, bring more domestic energy to the market, reducing costs for families and businesses, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. President Obama and the Senate need to get serious about an all-of-the-above energy approach to domestic energy exploration and development so that we can grow these jobs. By safely and responsibly developing all of our Nation's natural resources, we can re-light our economy, add jobs, and move towards North American energy independence. In short, this will improve the quality of life for western Pennsylvania and all Americans.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I appreciate his raising the point of the war on coal

and talking about the economic benefits of coal in Pennsylvania.

I don't know if anybody noticed, but deep in that 21-page declaration of war on coal, or the climate change document, the President actually talks about another important fossil fuel that Pennsylvania is tapping into—and that's gas—in the attack on methane. So those that think perhaps natural gas will be the next great fuel to replace coal ought to think again, because as soon as they have their way shutting down every coal plant, they'll be after the gas plants as well. We truly need an all-of-the-above.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for yielding and bringing this important issue to us today to have a conversation on.

I am a firm believer in the all-of-the-above approach to our energy needs of America. Making energy in America domestically will lead to us being energy secure. It's about energy independence. It is about developing our resources, both fossil fuels in the short term and mid term, but always keeping an eye on the alternatives and renewables for the long term so that we create a portfolio of an all-of-the-above that will ensure that America's national security is taken care of when it comes to our energy needs.

Being from New York, I spent a lot of time dealing with the issue of natural gas development and the Marcellus Shale and Utica Shale formations. I can share with you many stories from farmers as I went through the northern tier of Pennsylvania, which is just over the border from my district in Corning, New York. And I remember one story in particular. I went to a family farm that I was invited to go to by an individual in my district who was opposed to natural gas development. However, when I arrived at that farm, I met with her father, and I sat at her father's living room table and had a conversation about what this meant to that family farmer.

I can tell you what I heard really resonated with me. Because what I heard was, I know that my daughter is opposed to this. She's concerned about the impacts on our farm and that type of thing. But I can assure you I've owned this farm for generations, and I'm going to make sure that my land is protected and it's done right and it's done safely. But what I'm also doing is I'm taking the royalty payment, the cash payment from that resource, and I'm putting her daughter through college.

Think about that, ladies and gentlemen across America. We have spent trillions of dollars on the war on poverty and hardworking taxpayer dollars to try to get people out of poverty—most of the time by educating them. And here you have a gentleman who is going to use a resource that he owned, a property right that he owned, and was empowering the next generation

with a college education that that individual did not have to pay for and didn't come out of college with \$50,000, \$70,000 worth of debt. That's a game-changer when it comes to the war on poverty, in my opinion.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments from before. Because when we talk about this issue, we also have to look at it from many different aspects. And it's not just about being an economic resource in regards to the resource itself but being a resource that re-powers America, as I cochair the Manufacturing Caucus here in Washington, D.C., that gives us the power to start building things here in America again and selling it overseas. That's the America I want to stand for.

If we're going to melt steel, if we're going to have that industrial revolution of the 21st century that I believe we can have, we're going to need power sources to do that. And you can't melt steel, in my opinion, with just wind-mills and geothermal and solar panels. They have a role in our energy portfolio but you need those fossil fuels that we have been blessed with to come online to provide the power, the utility, and the energy to do what needs to be done in order to build it here and sell it there. So I appreciate the gentleman bringing this issue to the forefront.

And one last point I will stress. As I represent the 23rd Congressional District in New York, we are going through the process of seeing two main coal-fired plants be shut down. And I'm hopeful. We're doing our work in Dunkirk, New York, and Lansing, New York, on the other side of the district, to stand for repowering those power generation facilities with natural gas, as the applications are pending in Albany.

With this war on coal that just came out yesterday from the White House, if you shut down those plants, what I'm concerned about is my taxpayers that I care about in Dunkirk and Tompkins County and Lansing are going to see their real property tax bill go up anywhere from 50 to 60 percent. Those are hardworking Americans that are already under the burden of a tax burden that comes out of Washington, D.C., by way of income taxes. But there are also tax burdens in our States. And one of those primary tax burdens is the real property tax bill.

I'm hearing from seniors, I'm hearing from people across the district who say, Tom, I can't afford it anymore. And you shut down a power plant, and you take away that tax base from my people, the remaining taxpayers, who most of the time have been there for generations, will see their real property tax bill go up 60 percent. That's thousands of dollars. And in this day and age when people are struggling, why would we commit ourselves as a Nation to a policy that would put a higher burden on their back? I don't get it.

I think we should have an open conversation about doing all of the above,

recognize where those energy sources are in the portfolios, and then we join hands, we come together, and we develop that comprehensive energy policy that we say, This is good for America, both short term, mid term, and long term. And let's get it done. And that's where those of us on this side beg our colleagues on the other side to join us in this effort. And we want to do it safely, we want to do it responsibly. We respect our environment. But we're going to do it in a commonsense way, looking at it from the perspective of hardworking taxpayers of America, not through the lens of bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

With that, I appreciate the leadership that the good man from North Dakota has exhibited on these issues.

□ 1510

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you so much. Thanks for your stories. I think they illustrate so beautifully the importance of an all-of-the-above energy policy that keeps prices rolling.

You know, one of the things I thought about as you were talking about jobs and this cascading impact of this war on coal and war on fossil fuels, there is a survey every year that's taken by an area development magazine, it's called Site Selector Survey. It asks site selectors, What are the characteristics, what are the factors that you look at when making a determination of where to put a manufacturing facility or some other business?

When I was an economic development director 15 years ago, the cost of available energy was somewhere between 15th and 20th on the list. It's moved up to the top five. Our competitive advances in the global marketplace rest with our ability to keep energy costs low.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who has provided real leadership on some of the issues we are going to be taking up this week.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I have stood on the floor many times in my short service in the United States Congress to talk about this very topic, and that's American energy independence.

We hear terms like all-of-the-above energy approach and energy policy. I like to think about an all-American energy policy where we utilize American resources to meet our energy needs in this country.

I applaud the House Republicans, and specifically the House Energy Action Team, for focusing on three things—jobs, energy security, and national security. And they go hand in hand.

By pursuing an all-American energy policy, we're putting Americans to work. Whether you're talking about voting the Keystone pipeline or talking about offshore drilling, putting Americans to work is what's important.

I think about North Dakota and an energy-driven economy in North Da-

kota, your great State. They give you a job when you get off an airplane up there whether you need one or not; that's how many jobs they have available. If you're looking for work, America, go to North Dakota. But let me tell you, that's a microcosm of what we could be in this great Nation if we truly pursued an energy policy utilizing American resources, putting Americans to work. That's really what it's about. And that's one thing that I think the House Energy Action Team is focused on.

The second thing is energy security: lessening our dependence on foreign sources of energy, utilizing the resources that we have in this country. God blessed the United States of America with the resources that we have here: oil, natural gas and coal.

We heard just this week that the Obama administration is going to wage a war on coal—not that they haven't already been waging a war on coal. But I think they're waging a war on American energy independence. Because by utilizing the resources that we have in this country, we could lessen our dependence on foreign sources and make certain parts of the world that seem hostile to American interests not so important. So American energy independence is the second thing.

The third thing segues right into that, and that's national security. In fact, I think it was Admiral Mullen that said there is no national security without energy security. Think about that for a minute. Energy security means that we do have national security, that we can meet our energy needs, not just to drive our economy and the engines of our economy, but also fuel the engines of our United States defense. Putting those airplanes in the air and the ships in the oceans and the tanks in the desert or in the forest, that takes energy. If we can meet our needs through American resources, then we do have true American independence. An all-American energy strategy is the right thing for this country.

Just this week, we're going to take up two very, very important bills. One of them deals with opening up all of the Outer Continental Shelf areas that are currently off-limits under the Obama administration moratorium—the moratorium that George Bush lifted. He said, you know what, we need to be energy independent; we're going to lift the moratorium for offshore drilling, and we're going to open up those areas for more utilization. And so we're going to do that.

Off the coast of my State, South Carolina, and Virginia and other places, we're going to go after those resources that we believe to be there. We're going to allow exploration. We're going to allow production. And we're also going to allow revenue-sharing back to those States whose economies are struggling now just like the U.S. economy when we're \$17 trillion in debt.

Our State economies are struggling as well. But we can utilize and bring back revenue to the States through revenue-sharing. An example is Wyoming gets \$1 billion a year in revenue-sharing for production on Federal lands. The Gulf Coast States get revenue back to those States. South Carolina would love to benefit from that as well.

The second thing—and I'll end with this—is a bill that I have on the floor that I authored that would implement an agreement that was signed by the Obama administration. Hillary Clinton—Secretary Clinton at the time—entered into this agreement with Foreign Minister Espinosa of Mexico that said, you know what, we have a maritime border, a border between the United States and Mexico. Out in the Gulf of Mexico in the water is a maritime border and, guess what, there are resources underneath that border. Who owns those? Does Mexico own those resources? Do we own those resources? They're shared resources.

So they entered into this agreement and said we're going to go after those in the Western Gap, not over near Cuba, but closer to the western side of the gulf. We're going to go after those resources, and we're going to allow exploration of those resources, production of those resources. And we're going to share those revenues with each country because we are co-owners of those resources.

They got this one right with this agreement. We're going to implement that because we waited a year on Ken Salazar with the Department of the Interior to send us the implementing language so that we can go forward with a lease in that area of the Western Gap, but he failed to do that. So we took the bull by the horns in the United States Congress, and we authored this legislation and said we think this is important to American energy security; we think this is important to national security; and we're going to work with our southern neighbor in Mexico, and we're going to develop those resources in that transboundary area with a hydrocarbon agreement, and we're going to go forward with implementing that. That's what this bill does.

America understands that we've got the resources. America understands we can work with Mexico and safely and soundly harvest those resources using American safety standards and regulation standards. It is the right thing for America, and that's H.R. 1613. I look forward to passage of that.

I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his leadership on the House Energy Action Team.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his leadership today and his leadership on this important legislation coming out of the Natural Resources Committee.

I would like to speak specifically to some more economic opportunity as illustrated from my home State of North Dakota just to get a sense of it.

North Dakota's gross domestic product increased from \$34 billion in 2011 to \$38.7 billion in 2012. That's a 13.4 percent increase, representing the most significant growth of any State in the country last year. Texas is second with a growth rate of 4.8 percent, where the national average during the same time was 2.5 percent.

So it can happen. It happened in my State because the vast majority of the oil and gas in North Dakota is not under Federal land. The vast majority—like over 90 percent—is under private land, where the only landowner is the guy that farms and ranches the land, the person whose sustainability demands good stewardship. We can show the way in how to do it around the country as well as offshore if you just unleash American ingenuity.

I suspect that my good friend from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) might have a thing or two to say about this week's declaration of war on coal, and so I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the opportunity to address the President's Climate Action Plan that he unveiled yesterday and what this really means to my fellow Kentuckians and my fellow Americans all around this country.

As you see from the exhibit right here, this is the quote from the President's climate adviser:

A war on coal is exactly what's needed.

While Kentuckians and Americans all around this country are suffering from high unemployment—in large part due to the 5,700 coal jobs lost over the past 2 years—yesterday, the President of the United States re-declared the war on coal.

We know that 1 year ago, the President, through his New Source Performance Standards regulation, imposed an effective moratorium on coal-fired power plants coming online in the future. Yesterday, the President said that he wants to apply that moratorium to the existing coal-fired fleet.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow Americans, the President's Climate Action Plan reveals a leader of our country who is woefully out of touch with the economic realities facing the American working family. Unemployment is still at 7.6 percent across this country; 5 consecutive years of unemployment higher than 7.5 percent. Five years in a row where the workforce participation rate—where the percentage of Americans who are of working age population are actually in the workforce—is only 58 percent. Fifty-eight percent of all working-age people in this country have jobs. That's all. That's 5 percent below the historic average of 63 percent.

□ 1520

Twelve million Americans struggling to find work, wages falling for 5 consecutive years, three-quarters of Americans' paychecks are insufficient to get them by each and every week—they're

living paycheck to paycheck. What does this President do? He declares a war, not just on coal, but the working families of America. And worse, he's doing it by making an end run around Congress. His own Democrat-controlled Congress in 2009 refused to pass his radical energy rationing scheme, cap-and-trade, through legislation. So now this President says, Well, Congress doesn't matter, and so I'm going to impose this on the American people through bureaucrats in the executive branch.

Mr. President, you are not king. The Congress of the United States is the law-making body, and the unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats in the executive branch cannot do this without proper statutory authorization. That's why we need the REINS Act. That's why we need to rein in burdensome regulations. That's why we need to make sure that unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the executive branch don't seek to impose by fiat a regulatory apparatus that commands and controls the American energy future.

This is a question about American energy freedom, a top-down command and control approach versus American energy diversity. The President wants to impose energy rationing, and we say let the American people decide what their energy sources should be.

Half of all energy production in the United States in 2008 came from coal. Ninety percent of all electricity in my home State of Kentucky comes from coal. In 2012, however, only 37 percent of our electricity came from coal. This President wants to take that number down to 0 percent. So when the President's climate adviser says that he wants a war on coal, he means it.

This is what I want to conclude with. This is not just about statistics about coal jobs lost or energy freedom or the fact that we've lost nine power units, coal-fired power units, in Kentucky in the last several years. This is about human beings. This is about people who have lost their jobs. This is about the President of the United States attacking a way of life.

President Obama and his administration display a stunning lack of compassion. Not once in his remarks yesterday did we hear any recognition, any understanding of the suffering the administration's new proposals will inflict in the communities of central Appalachia, in the suffering of the communities that have already endured a disproportionate share of pain during the last few years. The President's climate action plan substitutes numbers and theories for flesh and blood. It presents climate change as a perpetual crisis justifying one regulation on top of another without any consideration of the cost to real people.

How much is enough, Mr. President? Where does it all end? By the Obama administration's own admission, U.S. carbon emissions fell to the lowest level in two decades. The President, of all people, should read this statistic and conclude it's time for some breath-

ing room, time to let the coal industry adjust, time to let people recover. But you don't offer breathing room in a war.

In yesterday's New York Times, the White House climate adviser said a war on coal is exactly what we need. But this isn't just a war on an entire American industry; it's a war on coal miners and their families. And these coal miners, the 5,700 coal miners who have lost their jobs in eastern Kentucky over the last 4 years under this administration, they depend on those paychecks; their families depend on those paychecks. They don't have the political clout to attract this President's attention or concern, but they are Americans. What a dramatic shift from a half century ago when Presidents Kennedy and Johnson focused so much energy on alleviating poverty in the very same mountain counties the Obama administration is now ravaging with these heartless policies.

Mr. President, if you truly care about people, come to eastern Kentucky. See what happens when \$70,000-per-year jobs disappear overnight because of unaccountable bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. At least give us some consideration of that. Better yet, start working with the coal industry to address climate change concerns and stop trying to kill it. It's time this administration put people ahead of its radical ideology.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his good leadership on this important topic on the importance of coal as a major player in our energy fleet.

If I could just for a second, Mr. Speaker, inquire about the balance of time available in the hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky's speaking to the issue of coal, because like oil and gas, coal is also important to North Dakota. It's an industry that's been around for decades. In fact, we really learned about energy development in North Dakota on coal. We have a little better than 17,000 folks that are employed either directly in the coal industry or in one of the service industries that service the coal industry. It contributes about \$3.5 billion to our State's economy. That's a lot in our little State.

We've been mining coal for decades. We've been mining 30 million tons a year for decades. We use that coal right in North Dakota, burning it to generate electricity at seven power plants in our State, and we generate some of the lowest priced electricity in the country. Again, getting to the issue of affordable energy, very important in terms of our competitiveness in the global marketplace.

So it's not just about the jobs, as important as those are—high-paid jobs, I

might add—but it's also about the competitive edge it gives us with lower cost electricity.

But in North Dakota, under our beautiful prairies, there's an 800-year supply of coal. To wage war on it today and leave 800 years' worth of a product that provides wealth and jobs and opportunity and low-cost electricity in the ground makes no sense whatsoever.

With that, I want to yield some time to my neighbor and good friend who knows a fair bit about the energy industry himself—in fact, I have to admit the Bakken was actually discovered in the State of Montana—the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I'm grateful for my good friend from North Dakota, KEVIN CRAMER, for this time to talk about what is really important to the people out in the heartland, which sometimes is a very different set of values than what we find right here in the beltway of Washington.

I was also struck by my good friend from Kentucky, ANDY BARR, as he shared his comments. It reminds me that we are the party, we are the leaders back here standing for the working middle class in this country, standing for jobs, for revenues that go to our schools, and the tax base for low-cost energy. This President says one thing, but the consequence of this policy is something that will only ultimately benefit the elite and the wealthy in this country instead of the regular working families in this country.

I want to thank my friends here today for organizing this Special Order and bringing attention to the importance of an American energy sector to our economy and to the daily lives of all Americans. In Montana, we know the importance of a robust energy sector.

Whether it's oil, gas, coal, wind, water, biomass, it's all needed to create jobs and keep energy costs low for the people of our country. In fact, one of my priorities in Congress is to fight for the all-of-the-above energy plan that helps grow American jobs, lowers energy costs, and helps us fight for North American energy independence, energy security.

Unfortunately, President Obama does not seem to share this goal. In fact, yesterday, President Obama unveiled his latest energy plan, a job-killing agenda that will hurt American jobs and American families and small businesses.

□ 1530

After his announcement yesterday, President Obama made a commitment to waging war on American energy, which was made crystal clear. In fact, by imposing further barriers to the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline and by working to severely hinder American coal production, President Obama has unveiled a misguided agenda that will only hurt Montana and American energy consumers and will cost good-paying Montana jobs.

Montana's energy sector is a huge driver for our State's economy. Our coal mining industry employs over 1,200 workers across our State. Montana contains more coal reserves than any other State in America, and it ranks number six overall in coal production nationwide. Additionally, coal production provides critical funding for Montana schools, as much of our State's coal is located on school trust lands. We forget about the contribution to our tax base, that of helping build schools and funding teachers, which comes from the energy industry.

The development of our coal reserves produces millions of dollars for Montana public education every year. My daughter is a senior at Montana State University, preparing to graduate and go into elementary education in Montana. Energy production will be critical to funding our public schools in Montana as we look down the road.

We have also seen tremendous growth from the booming development of the Bakken formation, as my friend from North Dakota alluded to, which spreads across eastern Montana and into western North Dakota. Oil production in our State has created thousands of good-paying jobs, both in the oil fields and also in the service industries that are at the heart of many of our small towns.

I would like to have the President come out to eastern Montana and see what's happening out there. Families are struggling, living month to month, but are seeing the benefits now of the energy industry as they are seeing paychecks they can count on as they look forward. It has also injected millions of dollars into our State's economy; and, like coal, it has helped provide millions of dollars in much-needed funding for Montana's schools. Recent reports show that Bakken oil production currently accounts for 11 percent of the total U.S. oil production and represents 40 percent of increased oil production nationwide. If the Keystone XL pipeline is built, it would be able to move up to 100,000 barrels of oil. That's Montana and North Dakota oil per day from our very own Bakken formation.

Mr. President, I am in favor of "made in America" energy. Montana's natural resources, like coal and oil, not only provide our State and Nation with quality American energy, but they are helping keep the utility costs low for hardworking American taxpayers. Montana gets more than half of its power from coal. That helps keep electric rates low. We see some electric cars driving down the highways today and in our towns. I'm not opposed to electric cars; but if the truth be known, we ought to have a sticker on the back that reads: "This electric car likely powered by coal." The average retail price in Montana is currently 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour, which is among the lowest in the Nation.

The construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, on the other hand, would also have a tremendous impact on energy

prices for Montanans. In fact, not too long ago, I was traveling around our State. I am the only Member of Congress for the State of Montana. It's a privilege to represent an entire State. I was up in Glasgow, Montana, meeting with the NorVal Electric Co-Op. I learned that the NorVal Electric Co-Op is expected to supply power for one of the Keystone pump stations. If the Keystone pipeline is built, it will help NorVal keep its customers' electric rates stable for the next 10 years. Think about that—10 years of no increase. Contrast that to, if the pipeline is not built, NorVal expects that their rates will grow upwards of 40 percent over the next decade.

Mr. President, these customers at NorVal live month to month. They live paycheck to paycheck. This is what is helping American middle class, hard-working taxpayers survive—expanding our energy production. By declaring a war on energy right now, you are declaring a war on American families who are struggling every month to make ends meet. For most Montanans who live on tight budgets and who carefully track where their paychecks are going, unlike a lot of the folks around here in Washington, D.C., a 40 percent increase in utility rates would be devastating. Unfortunately, under President Obama's agenda, that very well could happen.

President Obama's war on coal would severely hinder coal production in Montana and the jobs that rely on this important industry. It would be a serious blow to Montana families and to small businesses that rely on coal as a reliable source of affordable electricity. Just as bad, this job-killing agenda will be imposed through unilateral action, demonstrating that the President is more set on achieving his own political goals rather than on listening to the will of the American people or on working to create much-needed jobs.

Mr. President, the people of America are focused on paying their bills every month. That's a higher priority to them than your priority, which is that of winning an election in 2014.

By sidestepping Congress and public scrutiny, President Obama will set his agenda in motion through costly regulations and more and more red tape and bureaucratic hoops. These roadblocks won't just hurt the coal industry as we know President Obama and his advisers seek to do; these regulations will hurt hardworking American taxpayers who rely on American energy each and every day.

Let me be clear: President Obama's agenda isn't just a war on coal. This is a war on Montana energy, on Montana families, on Montana small businesses, and on Montana jobs—and it must be stopped. I will remain steadfast in this fight to stop the President's job-killing agenda, and I look forward to working with my colleagues here today on commonsense policies that grow American energy and help create the good-paying

jobs that the American people desperately need.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I especially appreciate your reference to the Keystone pipeline and to the importance of the role of electric cooperatives.

A lot of people forget that there is a Keystone pipeline. There was actually one sited and built with very little fanfare. I was at that time a member of the North Dakota Public Service Commission and carried the pipeline portfolio and sited the first 220 miles in the United States of the original Keystone pipeline. It didn't go anywhere near the Bakken, unfortunately; but it did cross 600 landowners' land—green field all the way, two scenic rivers. We put a lot of restrictions on it, but it was with very little fanfare. In fact, every landowner willingly signed the contract. There wasn't a single inch of that pipeline in North Dakota that had to be condemned to be built.

It was interesting because we have, I think, five or six pumping stations in North Dakota on the original Keystone, and the co-ops were all sort of arguing about whose territory would it be in because every pumping station was a load equivalent to a city of 10,000 people. For those who argue that it's not about the United States, the Keystone XL, that's big time for the people of North Dakota and for the people of the United States. It is about the United States. So I appreciate your raising that issue.

Another State that has a lot to lose in the war on coal and a lot to gain by more offshore drilling is Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I thank you so much for the opportunity to speak this afternoon on these important issues.

It's true that offshore in Virginia is something we've been discussing since 2004. What's interesting is that a lot of the folks said, You don't really want to do that in 2004. It's not going to really help gas prices. Do you know why? Because it will take 7 to 10 years to get it developed.

Guess what? If we'd have started in 2004 drilling off the coast of Virginia, we'd be getting that natural gas, and we'd be getting that oil off the coast of Virginia right now. It would be creating jobs. It would be creating tax dollars that could go to schools, roads—you name it—whatever the legislature in Virginia decided it wanted to spend it on. It could be going to increase the revenues of the United States of America as well. Likewise, this Congress could then be debating the expenditure of those funds and what we wanted to do with those moneys.

Instead, the naysayers keep saying, Well, not now, not now. I say to them, If not now, when? When are we going to do this? We know it's out there. We know it's a huge resource for the United States of America.

Then yesterday, on top of blocking our ability to get from the other side of the State the natural gas and the oil that is there and that we know is there and that we want to get to, the President of the United States declared what I call the "war on coal—phase 2." He has already been involved in phase 1 for some time, but in his comments yesterday, he made it clear that he's not going to wait for science to get us a solution—because it's coming. There is research that's being done on chemical looping and on other ways to use coal cleanly, where you end up with coal ash and carbon dioxide—no SO_x, no NO_x, no mercury. It's coal ash and carbon dioxide, and you can recycle the iron pellets that they use. I mean, it's really a wonderful process, but we have testing left to do on it. It has already been working at Ohio State University. They are building a facility in Alabama, and they are going to be doing testing beginning later this year that will end next year on a bigger project than what they did at Ohio State, but still it's got another phase to go even after that.

If we wait just a few years and if we do reasonable things now and if we wait for science to catch up, we can, in fact, accomplish what the President wants to accomplish on the environment and not destroy the jobs of southwest Virginia, the central Appalachia region and all other coal-producing States. There are more than 20 of them that are coal-producing States. We will be damaging their economies if we go forward.

□ 1540

It's interesting that the President noted in his speech and said:

Now, what you'll hear from the special interests and their allies in Congress is that this will kill jobs and crush the economy.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that's exactly what you'll hear. Do you know why you're going to hear it? Because it's true.

And if being a special interest means you have to be one of the people that lost their job in the coal fields of southwest Virginia or Kentucky or West Virginia or any of the other States where jobs—we've been losing them monthly. We get reports of another 25 here, another 15 there, people who've been laid off in the coal fields. And it's not just the coal fields. It's the railroads that haul the coal. It's the people at the manufacturing centers that make the equipment for the mines. It's the car dealerships that used to sell cars to the miners, who used to have jobs.

Let me make something clear, folks. Being in the mine is a hard job. There's no question about it. And we want to make sure health concerns are taken into consideration because it does have dangers to it. There is no question about that. But the workers in those mines are making somewhere between \$75,000 and \$95,000 a year if you add in their benefits. You take a district like

mine, the Ninth District of Virginia, where the average household income is around \$36,000 a year, and you start laying off 15 \$75,000 to \$95,000-a-year jobs here with health insurance included, you lay off another 25 jobs here and 30 jobs there, and ladies and gentlemen, you want to talk about destroying the economy, you're darn right you're going to destroy the economy. And if standing up for the special interests of the people who work in the mines, the people who work in the equipment factories, the people who work at the car dealerships, the people who work at the restaurants in southwest Virginia is a bad thing, then I guess I'll just keep doing a bad thing because I will continue to fight for southwest Virginia and the jobs in the coal fields.

The other thing the President went on later to say was that this issue didn't used to be partisan and now it's partisan. Guess what? The President is wrong. This is a bipartisan issue. And I'm going to look at the Bluefield Daily Telegraph and read you some quotes from some of my Democrat colleagues because it's important for the people of America to know that the President may want to divide, but in the coal fields we understand exactly what this is going to do to our jobs and our economy, and ultimately to the economy of the United States of America.

U.S. Representative NICK RAHALL, Democrat of West Virginia said:

Obama's climate change plan is misguided and could cost millions of jobs.

That's not a Republican. That's a Democrat. He goes on.

The misguided, misinformed and untenable policy that the President put forth this afternoon puts at risk the energy security of America and the jobs of millions of our citizens.

RAHALL continued saying:

Locking away the fuels that power our Nation behind ideologically imposed barriers will drive up costs for nearly every business and manner of industrial activity while driving jobs overseas. Households already struggling to make ends meet will see energy bills skyrocket.

That's NICK RAHALL, Democrat of West Virginia. He goes on to say:

The administration should be advocating new clean-coal technologies as opposed to crippling regulations.

Isn't that really where the President has been going the whole time? He said in the San Francisco Chronicle interview of 1-17-08:

When I was asked earlier about the issue of coal, you know under a plan of cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.

NICK RAHALL:

Households already struggling to make ends meet will see energy bills skyrocket.

The President is doing what he said he was going to do. He declared war on coal, and now he's going to try to see if he can't finish it by devastating the American economy and the economy of southwest Virginia and central Appalachia. It's just not right.

Mr. President, let's look at the science that your administration has invested money into. Chemical looping may be the way that we can both have what we want. I want and my colleagues want jobs for America, tax dollars coming in off of coal severance, natural gas, offshore drilling. We want to see those tax revenues coming in because then we can use that to help Americans. We want to help all Americans. You want to clean up the environment, and so do we. We can do it, but we have to be reasonable.

Let's go forward and look at another Democrat, and that would be Senator JOE MANCHIN, and he touches on this point in his comments in the Bluefield paper. U.S. Senator JOE MANCHIN, Democrat of West Virginia, said:

Obama's plan will have disastrous consequences for not only the coal industry, but also American jobs and the economy.

Democrat MANCHIN goes on:

The regulations the President wants to force on coal are not feasible. And if it's not feasible, it's not reasonable.

It's clear now that the President has declared a war on coal. It's simply unacceptable that one of the key elements of his climate change proposal places regulations on coal that are completely impossible to meet with existing technology. The fact is clear: our own Energy Department reports that our country will get 37 percent of our energy from coal until the year 2040. Removing coal from our energy mix will have a disastrous consequence for our recovering economy.

These policies punish American businesses by putting them at a competitive disadvantage with our global competitors, and those competitors burn seven-eighths of the world's coal, and they're not going to stop using coal any time soon. It's only common sense to use our domestic resources, and that includes our coal.

Senator MANCHIN is absolutely right because let me tell you that when we burn coal here and we create jobs here in the United States of America, as you well know, that means we're not sending those manufacturing jobs overseas to another country. Particularly if those countries are in Asia or in some of the emerging economies, they don't have anywhere near the regulations we have. They don't have the regulations we had in the year 2000 or the year 2005 to comply with.

So we can create the goods here, create jobs for Americans, create tax dollars which will help us deal with the national debt and deficit problem. We can do all of that here, and we can do it by burning coal more efficiently and cleaner than the countries that we're competing with. But instead the President wants to ignore all that. He wants to ignore those facts and go forward and say, No, we can't do that.

I go on with the quotes from the San Francisco Chronicle because right now he's not singing the same tune. He goes on to say after the "skyrocket."

Even regardless of what I say about whether coal is good or bad, because I'm capping greenhouse gases, coal power plants, you know, natural gas, you name it, whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers.

Who are the consumers? I believe the consumers are the average family out

there, the single parent trying to raise children, the elderly, the folks trying to struggle with that \$36,000-a-year-annual-household income, the miners and the workers in the factories that produce the goods that help the miners do their job who now don't have jobs, they're still going to have that electric bill coming in.

You know, it's interesting that the President actually cut in his budget proposal the LIHEAP money, which is the program to help the people who can't afford to pay their heat bill. So at the same time we're creating more unemployment, we are also going to take away some of the benefits that helps those folks. It just doesn't make sense. The President's policies don't make sense, and I submit to you all that the President needs to rethink this. He needs to look at clean-coal technology because that's the winner for America, for American jobs, for American prosperity and for America to go forward into the future, leading the way.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you so much for your insights and your experience in this very important industry of coal and all of the things that it supports and that support it.

I think that an appropriate way to sort of wrap this discussion up is to remind folks that while we are advocates for domestic energy development, American energy production that creates a competitive global advantage in all areas, we are also good stewards of the environment.

Let me just close with this. These counties in North Dakota that have seven power plants burning coal, all got A ratings from the American Lung Association. And I believe that the same God that created the beauty and splendor of the oceans and the mountains and the prairies and the topsoil, put the minerals underneath it, and we ought to use all of them for our benefit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

□ 1550

U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a place that is very near and dear to my heart, a place that is the source of great beauty, the source of millions of jobs for this country, an economic driver, not just for the region that I represent, not just the State in which my district resides, but for this entire country and, for that matter, this hemisphere.

I am here today to speak about the U.S.-Mexico border, and I have the privilege and honor of serving with

other Members who represent significant sections of the U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border. We are joined today by SUSAN DAVIS from California; PETE GALLEGOS from Texas; and FILEMON VELA, who is also from Texas. But before I yield to them, I want to talk a little bit about my special section of the U.S.-Mexico border in El Paso, Texas.

El Paso is home to more than 800,000 people who, along with the citizens of Ciudad Juarez, form one of the largest binational communities anywhere in the world. El Paso has for decades served as the Ellis Island for Mexico and much of Latin America. Literally millions of immigrants who are now U.S. citizens, who are productive members of our communities, have passed through the ports of entry in the district that I have the honor of representing.

Beyond that and beyond the human dimension of what the border produces, the beauty, the wonder, the creativity, the culture that develops from there, the border also is an important part of who we are as a country and our past. It is one of the most essential places anywhere in the United States today, as seen by the debate that is taking place in the Senate; and it is the future of this country, whether you look at it demographically, whether you look at it economically, whether you look at it culturally or by any other measure, the border is absolutely critical to the United States.

I want to talk about a couple of aspects that help to define this critical place that the border holds for this country. I thought I would start with trade. There are more than 6 million jobs here in the United States that are dependent on the trade that crosses our ports of entry at our southern land ports between the United States and Mexico. More than 100,000 of those jobs are in the district that I represent in El Paso, Texas. The State of Texas itself has 400,000 jobs that depend on this trade. More than \$300 billion a year flows between our two countries. Mexico is the second largest export market for the United States. We are the largest export market for Mexico. And a critical aspect of the trade that comes into the United States from Mexico that is very important to remember is that unlike any other trading partner that we have, more than 40 percent of the value of the trade that comes north from Mexico originated in the United States. So we are literally producing together even those things that are imported into the United States from Mexico.

Again, Mexico is a source of jobs. It's the source of so many things that are positive to our economy, our culture, and to our communities; and all that comes to a head at the U.S.-Mexico border.