

We would take several days for contemplation, because this is a matter of the utmost seriousness. Then we would bring that base bill which had received the most votes back with an opportunity for amendment, and then we would proceed to a final vote.

I would hope we could get the necessary two-thirds on that process, and I would hope it for this reason: that if we do not find some solution, be it mine or someone wiser than me, we leave this country subject to chaos and constitutional ambiguity and unelected shadow governments, which I think would mortify the people who wrote that magnificent document, and I think would mortify most Americans, should that event occur.

□ 1930

So I will ask my colleagues to consider the resolution that I have put forward. It is H.J. Res. 83. I think it is rather simple, as most constitutional amendments should be. I think it is reasonable. It should be a bipartisan effort.

If one is not compelled by H.J. Res. 83 and one thinks there are better ways, I welcome the discussion. Look, please, then at House Resolution 572. House Resolution 572 says we will have a debate and the rules for debate will be open. There will not be a committee chairman saying, only my amendment or my proposal is allowed. It will be the House of Representatives reviewing several alternatives, having the discussion, and trying to resolve this most grave of problems.

The entire Constitution was written in one hot summer in Philadelphia, several months. We have been 2½ years since September 11 and we have been unwilling, not unable, but unwilling to address this change.

There are people of good intention who I respect profoundly on the other side, but what I do not respect is the refusal to let other people of good intention engage in this debate. I find it profoundly ironic and troubling that those who assert that they oppose these amendments that I have offered and that others have offered is because they respect the sanctity of the vote, which I respect as well. Again, no one is proposing a substitute for direct election, for permanent replacement of Members. We are talking about temporary replacement. But they have said it is so sacrosanct, this principle of direct election, that we cannot even consider any alternative. And ironically, in defending the principle that one must be elected in order to serve in this body, they have at the same time said the people who have been elected to serve in this body are not entitled to debate this most serious of issues.

So we have been sent here by our constituents. They have entrusted us with the most profound of responsibilities; and yet some individuals in this body have said they will not entrust us with the responsibility to ensure the continuity of this very institution and

to ensure that constitutional measures will exist in a time of catastrophe.

Please, I say to my colleagues, I beseech my colleagues, bring this issue up for a vote and for true debate. Let us not play partisan politics; let us not assume that one committee chair or 2 committee chairs have greater wisdom than this body. That assumption flies in the face of the principles of Madison and the rest of the Framers. Let us assume that the collective good intentions and intellect and scholarship of this body can craft a solution that will ensure the continuity of this institution that we all so cherish and will ensure that if that horrific day ever happens and we perish, we will perish knowing that our Nation will be left in good hands, rather than in confusion.

U.S. ENERGY POLICY MEANS LOWER PRICES AND MORE JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a portion of my time talking about the situation that has been rapidly developing of late, a situation that sometimes is called outsourcing or offshoring, whatever one's term might happen to be. The definition seems to be very much the same, though: sending American jobs to foreign countries.

Now, some of our friends on the other side of the aisle seem particularly eager to make this subject a central one for the next, oh, about 7 months. I relish that opportunity. I relish the opportunity to also have that debate. To quote their presumptive Presidential nominee, I would say, "bring it on."

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are unwittingly the biggest proponents of this very problem that they highlight: outsourcing, offshoring. What I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, is that by their opposition to a comprehensive national energy policy, they create and nurture an environment that is, in fact, hostile to job creation. The very thing that they say they are critical of, they are fostering a hostile environment toward job creation. Corporate greed is not responsible for outsourcing; anti-energy, anti-job policies are responsible.

Since 2001, Mr. Speaker, this House, this body has passed comprehensive energy legislation three times, led by Republicans. The other body has repeatedly failed to follow suit and, as a result, our Nation has no energy policy today. The ramifications of this lack of national energy policy are absolutely staggering.

Mr. Speaker, let me itemize. Gasoline prices have increased 30 percent. U.S. imports of oil have increased 10 percent. The price of crude oil has increased 65 percent. The cost of natural gas has increased 92 percent. And ac-

ording to the United States Department of Commerce, America loses 12,389 jobs for every \$1 billion spent on imported oil.

Let me repeat. These are not my numbers; this is from the United States Department of Commerce. America loses 12,389 jobs for every \$1 billion spent on imported oil. That means, based on today's current prices, that we are offshoring, outsourcing 1.7 million jobs every year.

Mr. Speaker, the House passed an energy bill in this 108th Congress. It is estimated that that energy bill would produce 838,500 new good-paying American jobs. It has a great deal of incentives for cleaner fuels, renewable energy, and tough environmental standards. That bill would lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy and strengthen our economic and national security and independence. The U.S. has always been a leader when it comes to the steady increase of better-paying jobs and improved standards of living. That is why we consume, yes, we consume 25 percent of the world's energy; but we create 33 percent of the world's economic output.

Mr. Speaker, it is developing countries around the entire planet that covet our economic system and our economic output, our ability to produce not only goods and services, but the jobs that produce the goods and services. That is why people look to the United States of America as that shining city on a hill, that vision of something better. And in order to achieve that, developing nations worldwide struggle to develop an energy system that is the very foundation of these United States of America, the jobs we create, and the economic output that we enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, one-third of the total economic output of the world is produced by the United States of America, but we are at risk today. We are at risk because of not a faulty, not a weak, but a nonexistent national energy policy. What America needs right now is an affordable, reliable, and safe supply of energy to strengthen our economic and national security and to help create good-paying jobs. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the entire Congress to do their job and get a national energy bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by one of my colleagues, a classmate of mine, the distinguished gentleman from the State of New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE). The gentleman from New Mexico has spent most of his life before he came to Congress very, very close to this issue of energy. Coming from New Mexico and the West, he is intimately familiar with the issues of energy resources, energy production, energy utilization. It is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate him bringing this very critical issue to the American public tonight.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle continue to complain about the jobs being driven out of this country as if it is the President's fault. The gentleman from Colorado, my friend, has adequately described the problems of a failure to pass the energy policy through the entire House as a source of great difficulty in this Nation. There are two things, Mr. Speaker, that we must provide to keep our way of life, to keep our standard of living in this country. Those two things are food and energy. If we ever ship all of those requirements overseas, this Nation will find itself undergoing a change in the lifestyles and the abundance which we have been treated to and which we have become accustomed to.

This Nation has been blessed with abundant natural resources, including natural gas and other fossil fuels. Almost all of the natural gas used in the United States comes from inside the United States, comes from domestic sources. Natural gas provides a cheap and plentiful source of fuel for home heating and, more importantly, manufacturing facilities, particularly the chemical industry. The chemical industry uses natural gas as a fuel and also as a raw material in the production of its products. Those products include plastics, fertilizers, and many of the other products that we find and use daily. Today, the United States has the highest natural gas price of any industrialized nation. It costs the equivalent of \$10 per gallon of gasoline. Most people do not know what they pay per thousand cubic feet of gas, but it equates to \$10 per gallon in gasoline, and one can imagine the stress that industries are undergoing.

Sadly, this increase in price has contributed to higher home-heating costs and the loss of thousands of American jobs, including jobs in my home district in New Mexico. Throughout the United States, chemical manufacturers have lost an estimated 78,000 jobs since natural gas prices began to rise in 2000. These 78,000 jobs lost in one industry, the chemical industry, the chemical manufacturers, have been lost to manufacturing facilities in the Middle East, Asia, Europe, and South America. Why do those jobs move overseas? Because our domestic supplies have been interrupted to the point that our prices in this country for natural gas are in the \$5 to \$8 range. Typically in this country, \$2 is the range for natural gas.

We had a briefing in the Committee on Transportation last year which showed us that the price of natural gas here in this country is between \$5 and \$8. Overseas in Russia and overseas in Africa, the price is 50 cents and 70 cents respectively. When we are paying 10 to 20 times more for natural gas in this country as other countries, the economics will eventually take hold and companies will move infrastructure out of this country.

What happened to cause the gas prices to increase so dramatically?

First, there are two conflicting domestic policies. Number one, the U.S. adopted a policy in the 1990s encouraging the use of natural gas as the fuel of choice to burn in power plants to generate electrical power, even though we have abundant domestic coal resources. Natural gas was the clean fuel, the fuel of choice; and it was mandated by the Federal Government. The increased U.S. restrictions on oil and gas, however, the restrictions to production of natural gas on public lands has caused the supply to decrease, while the demand is increasing. Those two conflicting domestic policies have combined to force jobs offshore into other countries.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot long sustain the loss of these jobs because of conflicting policies and because of the special interests who would drive our jobs overseas.

□ 1945

In 2000, Americans consumed about 23 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, almost 23 percent of the energy used. The U.S. Energy Information Agency forecasts that by 2020 domestic natural gas demand will increase by more than 60 percent, to between 32 and 35 trillion cubic feet.

Much of the U.S. current production is coming from mature fields. Gas supplies from these fields are declining at about 29 percent per year. A mature field is one where the gas has been produced out of oil to the point that the down-hole pressures do not force the gas to the surface in the same quantities as used to occur. It is a naturally occurring phenomenon that you are able to gather in so much gas from one well before you have to drill another well.

We find these declining production curves to be a major threat to the price of natural gas in America and, therefore, a continued impediment to creating jobs in this country.

We often hear from our friends about the failure to create jobs, and they themselves are standing arm in arm with the groups who would limit the production of our natural gas which would get the cost of the natural gas to a point where our industries would become competitive again. Most of the promising new oil fields and gas fields in the U.S. are on public lands: the Rocky Mountains, Alaska, and the outer continental shelf. These areas are in the Rocky Mountain regions and Colorado and New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, if we as a Nation choose not to access our own natural resources, with our high standards for compliance with our environmental laws and regulations, we deliberately reduce our economic security and reduce the opportunities for continued leadership in resource development, manufacturing, and technological advancement; and, at the same time, we deny our fellow citizens the opportunity for high-paying, family-wage jobs with good benefits.

We do not even bring up in this discussion the additional risk to national security. It is time my colleagues and I take the bull by the horns and fix our Federal land use policies so we can access our abundant natural resources for the benefit of all Americans. Why do we need to do this? People in the southern district of New Mexico understand why.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we need to do that is that our standard of living is at stake. Also, the number of jobs that are created in this country are at stake. But even more importantly, the ability to pay for our utilities is at stake.

People on fixed incomes are facing the price increases that my colleague from Colorado has mentioned to us already. We are facing tremendous increases in the price of gas, in the price of electricity, in the price of heating our homes and cooling our homes. Last we forget, last year in the heat wave in Europe more than 10,000 people died from that. This is a matter of life and death as well as the future of our economic engine that powers this country.

Mr. Speaker, families spend about 5 percent of income on energy, but for many low income and minority families nearly half of everything they earn is spent on energy. Price increases will be a crushing blow for many, Mr. Speaker. Many people in my district are forced to choose between essentials of heat and food. While we have soaring natural gas prices, the cost is carried by the consumer.

Consumers pay more for goods that are produced with natural gas. These goods, I have mentioned before, include fertilizer, which is a key component in the food production.

We get to the unhappy state where the supply of natural gas can scarcely meet demand in two ways: First, it is an effort to make our air cleaner, which is an admirable condition. Many electricity producers and factories have switched to natural gas. But this switch has caused the demand to increase to such a point that the prices are now making our industries non-competitive with overseas markets.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to do anything about the loss of jobs and the failure to create jobs, we must begin to have a balanced approach to our policy of accessing public lands. Our balanced approach would say that, yes, we can be environmentally friendly while we develop our resources.

It has been proven in Alaska, that State we saw the concerns about the tundra there in Alaska along Prudhoe Bay. We found that what producing companies did was drilled in the wintertime. They built ice pads and ice roads. When the well was drilled, they did no damage. Then when the spring came, the thaw came, those ice pads and ice roads disappeared to leave just the hole in the ground and the producing wellhead.

Since our way of life is at stake, since our entire economic engine is

powered by affordable energy, Mr. Speaker, it is past time for us to begin to discuss and begin to solve the ways that we access our public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I have more comments, but I will yield back to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ). I thank him for bringing this important discussion to the floor of the House.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for a very intelligent and concise presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Congressman serves on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, quite appropriate for our subject matter tonight.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words from my colleague from Colorado Mr. BEAUPREZ.

I am here to talk about a subject that is just critical. We just have to get down to, really, the brass tacks. It is really hard for me to understand.

I hope my colleague from New Mexico stays around because maybe we can get involved in a debate and discussion on the multitude of issues.

This energy bill took in numerous committee work from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, to the Committee on Resources, to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Agriculture had a part in it, the Committee on House Administration had provisions, the Committee on Science had provisions. This is one of the few times that you have a comprehensive national energy bill and plan.

And we are there. We are so close, I could almost taste the finish line. Because the critical nature is readily evident to all of us. It is amazing that when you have the highest gasoline prices that many of us have ever seen and you definitely have the highest natural gas prices that anyone has seen, to huge blackouts in the Northeast, millions of people without power, why cannot we move an energy bill? Why cannot we have a vote and then a passage of a plan that would bring some security, some safety, some reliability to the energy markets and the energy industry and the folks that want to conserve?

There are actually great conservation provisions in this energy bill. We worked at great length to make sure that all stakeholders were involved in the debate. It was a free and open debate, taking many hours in the Committee on Commerce, late into the night, open, amendments passed, amendments defeated. The bill brought before the floor, the bill passed overwhelmingly in the House. The conference committee did its work, brought the bill back to the House and had another good vote on the conference side, and now we are held hostage by a minority in the other body.

It is unfortunate because unless we act on legislation, unless we have the public policy debate on energy, on where we want to be in the future, then

we are going to see the same type of activities that we are seeing today.

And, of course, in this political season, the opposition would love to see no energy bill. It is hypocritical to complain about the high cost of gasoline when you voted no on the energy bill. It is hypocritical to talk about the loss of manufacturing jobs in this country when you voted against an energy bill. It is hypocritical to continue to spout the same rhetoric when our grid goes unchanged, new investments not flowing to protect the grid, ensuring that if we make no changes a risk of future blackouts could be in the foreseeable future.

I am at a loss for words sometimes in the way we operate here. I love the institution, I love the ability to come on the floor, to have great debates on public policy, but eventually you have to move on. A majority has to speak its will and especially in the needs that were addressed earlier on energy. It is so vital to our economy. It is so vital to our national security. It is so vital for the things that we take for granted.

I remember reading an analysis of our use of electricity in our homes and power tools and all the neat little gadgets we have. The average citizen, because of our ability of using electricity and machines and technology, it is like we have 340 servants. The stuff that we are able to do because of the use of electricity and machines would be similar to having many, many servants doing our every whim.

That is part of the reason why we have prospered so greatly in this country, because we are willing to take risks, we are willing to take capital, put it at risk, hoping to get a return. And when we want the economy to move forward, when we want job creation, when we want to keep manufacturing, one of the major costs in the manufacturing is the energy cost.

But yet we are hamstrung, I think, because of political calculations on an upcoming election that we do not want to see improvement in the economy, that we do not want to see job creation, that we want to complain about no security on our electricity grid. We still want to see higher costs for natural gas. We want to see high gas prices.

They want to blame this administration, the only administration that has brought a comprehensive energy bill before the legislative body and the House and the Senate has been vetted and voted on. Again, very hypocritical and embarrassing to my point of view.

As we continue to focus on the manufacturing jobs, I find some relief in the debate that there is a difference between the payroll survey and the household survey on jobs and job creation. But, having said that, even though the numbers are better, the job loss statistics are only based upon payrolls.

So in my district in southern Illinois, there are a lot of farmers. They are self-employed. They are not counted on

the payroll surveys because they are self-employed. So in all these jobs statistics they are not there, because they are not salaried.

But we do know that the manufacturing economy is stressed. If we want to ensure that we have job creation, we are going to move a highway bill. I think it is going to be a good bill. It is going to bring, obviously, leveraging dollars from the Federal Government and State governments to be able to build roads and infrastructure; and we want that.

Listen to what the Department of Commerce says about job creation in this energy bill. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, America loses 12,389 jobs for every billion we spend on energy imports. And, of course, we spend a lot on energy imports. At today's oil prices that means America is sending more than 1.7 million jobs overseas for oil every year.

We have oil in this country. We have it, as we talked about before, in ANWR. We have it on the continental shelf. Illinois is the tenth leading oil-producing state. A lot of people do not know that. A lot of our wells are marginal wells. They take energy to get the crude oil out of the ground. We have a gusher that was hit about a year and a half ago.

It is new technology. It drills underneath a wildlife preserve. It is producing for us a million barrels a year, which is a pretty good add toward meeting the demands that we have here.

□ 2000

It is not going to solve our problems. We are still going to have needs for export, but we do have great natural gas reserves in this country. We have got enough, and I am continuing to look at my friend on the Committee on Resources because they deal with this all the time, to meet our natural gas demands for 25 years, if we would just get access to them; and this is all not natural wildlife refuges in pristine areas. It is Bureau of Land Management scrub land. It is nothing that we even need to worry about other than it is the Federal Government's land, and we cannot even permit ourselves to go and look for natural gas reserves. Again, it just boggles your mind.

An estimated 85,000 jobs have been lost by the U.S. chemical makers since natural gas prices began to rise in mid-2000. If we cannot get natural gas at an affordable price, more and more the production facilities will be forced to pack up and leave the country.

One of our problems in this whole fuel debate is we have not built a new refinery in 25 years in this country, and we have a Balkanized fuel market, which means we have specific fuels for specific reasons.

I always tell the story, I fly into St. Louis. I am a St. Louis metropolitan Member of Congress. I live over in Illinois, and my hometown is Collinsville, but if I were to fly in and we get picked

up, I would have to go to the northern part of my district, the State capital of Springfield, and I would have to gas up the car before I took the drive. Well, the gas that I put in in Missouri would be different than the gas, regular unleaded, would be different than the gas in my hometown of Collinsville which is only 30 minutes from the airport, which would be different from the gas in Springfield, Illinois, regular unleaded, only 90 miles north. Three different blends of fuel in less than a 200-mile area.

Now, when people ask why are we having a gas crisis, I will tell you one reason is we cannot move product from point A to point B because it is not the proper mix for a proper region. You know what the energy bill does? It addresses this. There are 48 different fuel mixes in this country, and it tries to pare them down to five. It still says you need different fuels for different regions; but let us get realistic and say five regionally, that way you can move product when the supply and demand equation goes wacky. It is a great provision. It probably would have been helpful in this time of our energy needs.

The energy bill will help create or maintain over 156,000 full-time and part-time jobs in my home State of Illinois. That is how important this energy bill is for me, just my parochial interest, as a Member from Illinois.

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has repeatedly testified that energy prices are the single greatest threat to job creation and the continued growth of an otherwise burgeoning economy; but instead of getting a national energy policy, the people of America wait. They see energy prices rising higher and higher. They see jobs in manufacturing disappear because a plant closes due to high energy prices. They see us sending billions of dollars to foreign countries to buy oil. What they do not see is an energy bill.

The House passed the energy bill conference report, and we are still waiting, obviously, for the other body to at least do something. It is time for Congress to send an energy bill to the President that will create and maintain needed jobs across this country.

This is an important debate, and I applaud my colleague for organizing this Special Order because in the public policy arena, I mean, we have to be in the arena. We have to be debating the major issues of our time that not only affect us for the next election cycle, but really this is a comprehensive energy plan that will affect our children and our grandchildren.

So I applaud my colleague from Colorado. I hope to stay around for a few minutes and maybe can add based upon what other things are mentioned or added, but I really appreciate that.

Mr. BEAUPRÉZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments; and a couple of things that he said sparked a little bit of my memory, if I might.

I know that in Illinois, of course, there is a tremendous amount of agriculture, a lot of farmers. That is what I spent most of my life in is a farm family; and a few months back, as you were preparing to take up this energy bill, I held a hearing in my district back in Colorado in Golden, and we had a gentleman at that hearing who is a potato farmer from an area of Colorado, southern Colorado, high mountain plateau, called the San Luis Valley; and he grows some pretty high-quality potatoes down there.

Like a lot of farmers, though, he struggles with ever-shrinking margins, and every year they try to get a little more efficient and try to squeeze just a little bit more out of the land and their operation and still make a living.

He told me something that I thought was profound and probably a fact that goes unnoticed by most everyone. He went through his operating overhead, all of the costs on an annual basis it takes for him to operate his potato farm. Thirty-five percent of his operating overhead is energy-related, not just the fuel that he puts in his equipment, gasoline, diesel, but the energy to run. We are a pretty arid State. So you have got to irrigate, to run the electric motors to pump the water for the sprinklers to irrigate with. Obviously, the chemicals he fertilizes with are produced from natural gas primarily, 35 percent of his overhead.

Now go to that gentleman and tell him that gas prices are going to go up 30 percent or more, natural gas is going to go up 92 percent, so his electric bill is going up dramatically and see what he has to say.

When we talk about these rising energy prices affecting jobs, it is real. It is as real as it gets, and having been in business most all of my life until I came to Congress this past year, and being a community banker, I came in contact with businessperson after businessperson, and there is only so much they can do, so much more efficient you can get. At some point, you throw up your hands and say I am done.

So when we are saying tonight that the lack of an energy policy, as I stated earlier, it is not a weak one, it is not a short-term one. It is no energy policy this Congress has failed to pass. It is extremely real, and blaming the President, as the other side of the aisle likes to do night after night, day after day for this outsourcing of jobs situation, we need to look inward.

I will say again, the reason that we are losing jobs in America, we need to look at the people that are promoting higher taxes and higher regulation that render us less competitive and the people that have refused to give this country a commonsense, sane, straightforward energy policy that would allow us to have affordable, predictable, sustainable supplies of energy, domestically produced energy. That is where we need to look. That is the problem.

I thank the gentleman. I was thinking of back to that hearing that I had

in Colorado on natural gas, and there are statistics and numbers out there to boggle the mind, but one that stuck with me from that hearing was relative to natural gas, which I know the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is close to, is that we have enough natural gas in this country just under Federal land, nonpark, nonwilderness Federal land for 100 million homes for 157 years. That is a staggering amount.

Natural gas prices, at least back in my hometown, are nearly double right now. Somebody said, well, we have a storage problem. Somebody else responded, yeah, we have got a storage problem. It is all stored under Federal land, that is our problem.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), just pointed out, we get in the way. So I would be pleased to, once again, yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) on this critical subject.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPRÉZ) is like I am, a business owner. He understands that you just do not create jobs out of thin air, and you do not do it without good thoughts and good resources.

The gentleman from Illinois adequately pointed out that it is hypocritical of our friends on the other side of the aisle to talk night after night about the failure to pass an energy policy when it is the other side of the aisle that is blocking that energy bill from being passed.

The environmental extremists who stop production of oil and natural gas are the ones who are responsible. The process for drilling a natural gas well on public land is to file an application for permit to drill, an APD, and that process simply goes in for review, and when it is reviewed, the application is either given or denied.

What happens is that the extremists will file a lawsuit, and many times that application simply dies right there without ever even a hearing, and by the way, they have limited access. The extremists have limited access to over a trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Rocky Mountain regions.

Now, then, sometimes the cooperation between the extremists and the government groups has gotten just a little bit too close and friendly. In a recent case that the media has not done a very good job of covering, three BLM employees in Wisconsin were convicted of racketeering, conspiring to keep people from drilling on public property. It is going to be very interesting to see how other employees in the Federal Government begin to respond to that conviction, understanding that their actions sometimes are simply extortion.

I have constituents of mine who report that Federal employees will tell them no, no, you really do not have a problem, but your case would go much easier if you would contribute to, say, this archaeological study that our office is doing. If you gave a check of

\$25,000, maybe things will go easier. When I was out flying over the Salt River project, one group held hostage that project for a \$25 million contribution into this extremist environmental fund.

Mr. Speaker, those are the things that are driving jobs offshore, that hostility to business and the development of energy. The most heartbreaking story, Mr. Speaker, that I have seen here in Congress occurred in the Committee on Resources about a month ago. Members of the union came in, the union that deals with workers who cut timber and who create the pulp wood and paper. Those union employees were talking about the loss of their jobs in that industry and were heartbroken by the fact that they were going to lose the wages that their families depended on, and they are good, good living-wage jobs.

The Members on the other side of the aisle said, oh, but you do not understand, you can get a job in the hospitality business. I am sorry, but the unions and Republicans do not often match up. The unions and the other side of the aisle do the most, and it was their friends telling them you could lose these high-paying jobs in the timber industry and you can get a job working at the hotels. The union representatives literally spit back at them across the table the words, We do not want your hospitality jobs; we want our jobs in the timber industry.

What a heartbreaking thing. I began to do research on that, and I am pleased to show a chart tonight. I am not pleased to show the chart tonight. I am horrified to show the chart tonight that describes the loss of pulp and paper mills and plants throughout this country.

The dots on this chart represent the mill closures and employee layoffs from 1989 through 2003. The blue dots with Xs are mills that have been closed, and the red dots list the number of employees that have been laid off during the past 16 years. The small blue dots represent the remaining operating U.S. mills and plants.

Since 1997, the forest products industry has lost more than 120,000 family-wage jobs and closed more than 220 plants. While there are many factors that contribute to these mill closures and the loss of family-wage jobs, several issues stand out.

Number one is the lack of access to timber resources on the Federal lands that have been brought about through the Endangered Species Act, the roadless rule, and the lawsuits filed by the anti-development environmental extremists. Access to timber resources results in lack of raw materials needed by the mills to produce their products.

□ 2015

High natural gas prices, and we have discussed why we have high natural gas prices, are also driven by misguided environmental policies. During the 1990s, the U.S. environmental policy encour-

aged the use of natural gas for the generation of electricity as a clean alternative to the coal-fired plants. However, during this same time and continuing through the present, area prospectives for oil and gas production have been put off limits to exploration and development. This includes almost all of the outer continental shelf offshore gas production, portions of the gulf, and a significant part of the Rocky Mountain natural gas resources.

America gets more than 85 percent of the natural gas we use from domestic production. These conflicting policies have driven natural gas prices to historic highs, above \$5.50 per thousand cubic feet, the highest natural gas prices of all the industrialized nations. This makes the United States less competitive and is outsourcing our manufacturing industries, including the production of forest products.

Our misguided environmental policies are directly responsible for the loss of the majority of family-wage jobs in the forest products industry. In 1990, almost 12 billion board feet of timber were harvested from the Federal estate. That is 12 billion in 1990. Today, we harvest 2 billion board feet of timber from the Federal estate. Our national forest resources are allowed to lie fallow, to build up excessive fuels. They are subject to overgrowth, they are subject to disease, and they are subject to fire.

We are finding that the wildfires are going to destroy our forests before we ever cut them. When the fire races across the top of our forests, killing these mature trees, it only makes sense to go in and harvest the charred timber. But, instead, the extremists will file injunctions, they will file lawsuits to slow the process down.

Recently, in my district, we had a large forest fire. Before the timber could be cut, the value of the timber had lost 60 percent of its value because of delays created by the extremists who said it is better not to ever touch one tree than to cut these charred stumps that were left and had valuable timber in them.

Mr. Speaker, our watersheds are completely dependent on the quality and the character of our healthy forests, but also an entire industry is dependent on the way that we manage those resources. In this landscape, my constituents are asked to forego a development project that would provide family-wage employment so that a passerby's view is not spoiled. The same passerby expects my constituents to live with the charred remains of timber that could have provided feedstock for a local mill, that could be made into 2-by-4s for a neighbor's home, that could be paper used by a local school or business, a lovely piece of furniture to be passed into the next generation, or it could be used to make a young woman's high school prom dress.

If we as a Nation choose not to access our own natural resources, with our

high standards for compliance and with our environmental laws and regulations, we deliberately reduce our economic security and reduce the opportunities for continued leadership in resource development, manufacturing, and technology. We deny our Federal citizens the opportunity for high-paying, family-wage jobs with good benefits. We also risk our national security.

Mr. Speaker, on the second chart, and I would show it briefly, it has a picture of a mill that is being closed; and much like the Vietnam wall, the names of the casualties are listed down below in black. Those names go on and on, 220 of those that have closed. I have got the closings here in a document that is 25 pages, with 35 mill closures on each page.

There are mills that have been closed in Alabama. Over 300 jobs lost at another plant in Alabama, at Cusa Pines. Here is one where 450 jobs were lost in Mobile, Alabama. Another 500 jobs lost in Mobile, Alabama. Camden, Arkansas, lost 600 jobs to these policies. We go page after page after page, California, Florida. St. Mary's, Georgia, lost 800 jobs in one mill closing. Page after page. Illinois lost many, many jobs to mill closings because of the misguided attempts of environmentalists to block every single tree from being cut. We have Louisiana with mill closings, Massachusetts, Maryland, Maine, and Michigan. State after State, 25 pages, 35 mills per page. When we get to Oregon, we have page after page after page of mill closings in Oregon, 100, 180 jobs.

This information is readily available to those in this body who would want to access it, but the disappointing thing is that our friends do not want reality in the debate about where jobs are lost and why they are lost. They simply are looking for their agenda to be carried out at all cost.

My friend from Illinois adequately characterized it as hypocritical. The job loss, the pain in the States and the rural areas of this country are borne by individuals who have to live with the policies that are implemented in our courts and in our regulations that face our businesses as they try to make a profit in the hostile environment that is created in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) for organizing this, and if I have an opportunity, I will have further comments to make. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. He brings up a number of very clear points.

I think the gentleman from Illinois mentioned 1.7 million, the estimated number of jobs we have lost because of our dependence on foreign energy sources, primarily oil. It is absolutely tragic. And the gentleman from New Mexico highlighted some of the extreme, radical environmental concerns and efforts that have restricted our energy development and energy production in this country.

One would think, Mr. Speaker, that a few wake-up calls would be enough to get Congress' attention. Electricity blackouts. The big blackout in the Northeast. We had rolling blackouts even out in my neighborhood. The skyrocketing prices we are going through right now.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that just as we are concerned about taxes in this Chamber, the information that my colleague from New Mexico just pointed out, those are taxes, too, the most painful kind of taxes. When your job goes away, that is 100 percent tax. When the cost of production goes up, that is a tax as well; and it eliminates jobs. When businesses become less and less and less competitive and finally close their doors, that is a very real tax on the business, on the employees that work there and on the community that depended on it.

How many wake-up calls do we need? Well, our environmentalist friends apparently believe many more, because they still cause us to not have an energy policy in this country. They seem, in fact, to oppose all forms of energy. A few years ago, they were the ones telling us to use more natural gas. Why? Because it is more affordable, and it is abundantly available. But it is those same people who are now telling us no to natural gas. They have caused us to limit production right here in this very country where we have enormous resources.

So it is no to clean-burning natural gas; no to hydroelectric energy; no to clean coal energy; no to new outer continental shelf gas and oil exploration; no to more energy exploration in Alaska; no to more energy exploration in the inner mountain west, my home; no to more electricity transmission lines; no to more power plants; no to more energy pipelines; no to ANWR, and I would like to return to that; no to liquefied natural gas ports; no to offshore wind energy farms, even renewables; and no to onshore wind energy farms.

The environmentalists seem to have two policies: one, BANANA, build absolutely nothing anywhere near anything; or NOPE, not on planet Earth. Now that is some energy policy for a Nation, again, Mr. Speaker, that produces 33 percent of the world's economic output. And, yes, we consume 25 percent of the world's energy. That is how we produce that economic output.

I would like to yield some of the remaining time that we have to the gentleman from Illinois once again. Again, he serves on the Committee on Energy and Commerce and should have quite a little bit of insight on this issue.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Again, I thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker. Actually, he has mentioned some of the things that I probably should have mentioned, being a little more parochial. I am so passionate about this because for southern Illinois this bill is the best bill I think we will ever see coming across the pike.

And why would I say that? First of all, if you looked at a geological map of what is called the Illinois coal basin, it in essence is the entire State of Illinois, with the exception of Chicago and the suburbs. It actually bleeds over into Indiana, and it bleeds over into Kentucky. It has as much energy resources there, 250 years of Btu burning capability, as Saudi Arabia has oil. Why will we not have access and use of those energy issues?

Illinois is also a highly nuclearized State. We have 11 operating nuclear facilities in the State of Illinois. As my colleague from Colorado said, nuclear power is, as far as emission-wise, there are no emissions, but of course we have concerns with individuals.

I want the public to understand base load generating, which is the everyday needs for electricity, just to run the lights on average the whole year, and then peak load generating, which is the times where you really need additional electricity, and that is best met with natural gas, where you can turn it on and turn it off. But base load generating is those standard fuels that we have used for many, many years: hydroelectric, coal, and nuclear power. They have to be part of a national energy policy, and in our bill they are, they remain, and that will help us have safety and security in the energy markets for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for again managing this hour on energy.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, in the time that is remaining, to return to the issue of ANWR.

Now it is estimated that, if we were able to construct the natural gas pipeline that has been proposed from ANWR down to the lower 48 States, not only would we dramatically increase our availability of natural gas to the lower 48 but we would create more than 400,000, 400,000 direct and indirect jobs from that one pipeline alone.

Now let us talk about ANWR just briefly. This is a map that points out the entire State of Alaska on the far side of the chart. For scale, you see in gold the area known as ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve; and you see that it is roughly the size of the State of South Carolina. The area we are talking about, and this is the entire Arctic National Wildlife Reserve, ANWR, the area we are talking about is not the entire reserve but just the coastal plane. In fact, in the coastal plane, only the little area in red. It may or may not be that location, but that is the 2,000 acres within the bill that is limited for production. Just that one spot.

□ 2030

I am told that if you thought of it in terms of a very large room, it would be like a postage stamp in the corner. I visited this site last August. I wanted to see it for myself. I flew up. I flew to

Prudhoe Bay here. I flew over to this village of Kaktovik right here. About 270 Eskimos live there. I visited with the president of this entire Eskimo corporation. Think of it as an Indian tribe, if you will, these few hundred that live in this region; and we talked about this.

This is as flat as flat gets. It is as flat literally as a table top. We asked him, What about drilling? What about exploring and producing in ANWR? What should we do? He says, drill it. I said, Really? He said, Yeah, drill it. One of my colleagues that was there with me said, But what about the caribou? This gentleman had already mentioned that they still hunt the whales and they fish in the frozen sea. They hunt the animals, including the caribou, for survival. What about the caribou? He said, What do you mean? He said, Wouldn't we scare them off? He looked at him and he said, We hunt them and kill them and they come back every year. What part of this don't you get?

It is pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the people that depend on this area, that have the most at stake, in fact, their very lives at stake, their survival, their way of life are saying, drill it. This is the kind of insane environmental policy, people that have nothing to do with this area, have never seen this area, are thousands and thousands of miles from this area, are prohibiting the people that do live there, that do have a vested interest, that care about it the most, from reaping the benefits of it. That is insane environmental and insane energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on for hours on this subject. It has negatively impacted this Nation long enough, and it is time that it stop.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico for a closing minute or two. Unfortunately, we need to bring this hour to an end.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

(Mr. PEARCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEARCE. We will do more on this same subject at another time. In the closing minutes, let me talk about the hostility that we find against business in this country. Behre Dolbear publishes an annual survey entitled "Ranking Countries For Mineral Investments." This survey ranks the 25 countries with the largest mining industries and/or the most significant mining industry potential. To establish the annual rankings, the survey considers seven criteria that influence investments by the mining industry in each of those 25 countries. These criteria include economic systems, political systems, social issues, permit issues, corruption, currency stability, and tax regimes. A review of each country relative to each of the above criteria is performed, using the general assumption that a technically viable mining operation is being considered in that country. The countries are then

given a ranking from 1 to 10 in each category, with 10 being the most favorable.

Recently in 2004 the USA scored well in economic systems and currency stability, et cetera; but it had a dismal ranking in the category of permit issues. This ranking is based on the time and expense required to get permits, not on stringency of regulations. In 2004, the U.S. had a numerical score of 4. That score puts the U.S. 19th out of 25 countries. The U.S. ranks below Peru, Ghana, Colombia, South Africa, Argentina, Canada, Brazil, Namibia and Bolivia. Only seven countries rank below the U.S.

Keep in mind that this is an improvement, that the Bush administration has made progress because previously under President Clinton, we had a 2 ranking. The U.S. was tied for 24th out of 25 countries with Indonesia. Just why does the U.S. have to have such a low rank in permit issues?

Mr. Speaker, we have covered tonight the many, many reasons that jobs are moving offshore in America while our industries are being decimated, why manufacturing is being sent overseas and our friends, while talking about it, continue to be a part of the problem. I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for allowing me to participate in this Special Order.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that shortly I will be joined by some colleagues for our customary Tuesday night hour where we discuss the situation in the Middle East with a particular focus on Afghanistan and Iraq. We have described this hour as the so-called Iraq Watch. As we did recently, I think it is an opportune time to explain to those watching us this evening and my colleagues who preceded us that the normal legislative business of the House of Representatives has concluded, and we are now in that period called Special Orders.

That is why we have an empty Chamber. Members are elsewhere, doing their homework and getting prepared for tomorrow's legislative business. Again, in terms of equity and fairness, Republicans are allocated 2 hours and Democrats are allocated 2 hours and we alternate back and forth. As I mentioned earlier, I anticipate that I will be joined relatively soon by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to have our customary conversation.

But I would like to begin this evening's conversation with those that are

viewing us and, as they join me, with my colleagues about the issue of credibility, because as I am sure we are all familiar, if our word is not trusted, if we are perceived to be untrustworthy, we encounter serious problems as we go through life. The same is true obviously of a nation, particularly a Nation like ours that claims justifiably a certain moral authority, a Nation that values truth and honesty and a Nation that is hurt when others speak of deception and deceit when it comes to the United States of America.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that our motives are being questioned. There was a recent survey done by the Pew Foundation. This was a survey done in seven nations spread across Europe and the Middle East. Majorities in those seven nations believe that our intervention in Iraq was motivated by a desire to control Mideast oil. Let me read to you those nation-states and the percentages that embrace this particular view of the United States of America. Fifty-one percent of the people in Russia accept as gospel that our intervention in Iraq was predicated on a desire to control Mideast oil. Fifty-eight percent of the population of France shared a similar view. Sixty percent of German society echoed those sentiments. In Pakistan, the number was 54 percent. In Turkey, an erstwhile ally, 64 percent, almost two-thirds of the population, believed that the United States launched the attack on Iraq because of our desire to control Mideast oil. In Morocco, that number was 63 percent. In Jordan, that number was 71 percent.

What is particularly disturbing, Mr. Speaker, is unfortunately this cynical view is reinforced by various news accounts that reveal American companies have been doing business with rogue nations. There was a recent CBS "60 Minutes" expose. I think most Americans were unaware that despite the fact that nations like Libya, like Iran, like Iraq were considered rogue nations, Iran particularly, being one of those nations designated by the President as part of the Axis of Evil, that in fact American corporations, or let me restate that, subsidiaries of American corporations could actually do business with those whom we considered our enemy, with those whom we had placed on a list described as being those states sponsoring terrorism.

This issue was really brought to light by the New York City comptroller who in his research discovered that the \$80 billion in pension funds for all city workers were invested in corporations such as GE, ConocoPhillips and Halliburton that exploited, if you will, this loophole in the law. Obviously, people from all over the world are fully aware of the fact that the Vice President, RICHARD CHENEY, was the former CEO of Halliburton. So I know it comes as a surprise to them and certainly came, I think, as a shock to Mr. William Thompson, who was the New York City comptroller, that pension funds were invested in Halliburton, and Halli-

burton had created a subsidiary, a subsidiary in the Cayman Islands that purportedly was doing business with Iran.

As we have recently discovered, of course, Iran is suspected of developing a nuclear weapons program. Clearly, any business that would be done with a rogue nation would benefit that rogue nation. In any event, this particular expose by "60 Minutes" that established that there was an offshore subsidiary of Halliburton in the Cayman Islands was in fact operating during the tenure of the Vice President.

□ 2045

According again to the transcript of the 60 Minutes interview, the subsidiary sells about \$40 million a year worth of oil field services to the Iranian government. This does not enhance our credibility, Mr. Speaker. I think it undermines our credibility. And when the 60 Minutes crew went to interview officials from Halliburton, they were denied access.

But again they got on a plane. They went to the Cayman Islands, and what they discovered in the Cayman Islands was an office with a phone and no employees. Subsequently, because of a conversation they had with an individual in the building which housed this so-called subsidiary or independent company, they were told that, no, that mailing gets rerouted to Houston. Subsequently, they learned that in Dubai, which is a city in the United Arab Emirates, that there was the operating arm of the particular embassy. But, again, no answer, no response.

So what we have is a parent company, Halliburton, declining a request by 60 Minutes for an interview but through e-mail communicated it has no intention of leaving Iran or addressing the questions that the interviewer had raised about the independence of its subsidiary.

So we wonder sometimes why we are perceived in a particular way, because, again, our credibility is so vital to our claim of moral authority. I do not have an answer, Mr. Speaker. But I think the American people are owed an answer. I along, with several other Members, my colleagues on the Iraq Watch, have requested to the Attorney General, Mr. Ashcroft, that a special prosecutor be investigating to determine whether there is potential criminal culpability. But it goes to our core value of transparency and honesty and truth.

Much has been stated recently about the testimony of Richard Clarke, and that continues to play out. As we have seen today, the National Security Adviser, Ms. Rice, apparently will testify before the 9/11 Commission. But I think the salient import of Mr. Clarke's position is that Iraq had been the focus of concern since the beginning of the administration, and that seems to be confirmed by the former Secretary of the Treasury Paul O'Neill.

So I went back and reread the book authored by Mr. Suskind in collaboration with the former Secretary of the