

Vietnam war to be killed in combat—being murdered by a jihadist in an Afghan military base while training moderate Islamists . . . Roggio observes the Taliban “have devoted significant efforts to stepping up attempts to kill” U.S. and allied forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. We don’t need to be helping the so-called moderate jihadists.

And with that, I will insert the full article into the RECORD.

[From the National Review Online, Sept. 18, 2014]

**TRAINING ‘MODERATE ISLAMISTS’—FOUR MORE AMERICANS KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN**

(By Andrew C. McCarthy)

Meanwhile back in Afghanistan . . . the Long War Journal’s Bill Roggio reports that jihadists have killed four American soldiers. Three were killed in a suicide bombing in Kabul for which the Taliban have claimed responsibility. A fourth was killed in a so-called “green-on-blue” assassination—i.e., he was an American there to train our “moderate Islamist allies” at a military base (in Western Afghanistan), and one of these Afghans shot him dead and wounded two others before finally being killed.

It was the fourth green-on-blue attack this year. I wrote here about the last one, in August, which claimed the life of Major General Harold Greene, the highest ranking American officer since the Vietnam War to be killed in combat—being murdered by a jihadist in an Afghan military base while training moderate Islamists is quite appropriately considered combat (although being murdered at an American base while preparing to deploy for combat against jihadists is considered “workplace violence”). As Bill explains, green-on-blue attacks are down, from a high of 44 in 2012, mostly because of the U.S. draw-down and reduced “partnering” with the “moderate” Afghan forces (because doing so has proven perilous).

Nevertheless, Bill observes that the Taliban “have devoted significant efforts to stepping up attempts to kill” U.S. and allied forces. Mullah Omar has bragged that the Taliban “cleverly infiltrated the ranks of the enemy” in accordance with a plan hatched in 2011. As I’ve noted before, the Taliban knows our forces are leaving and wants to make it appear that they are chasing us out of the country.

Although the Taliban has never stopped conducting jihadist terror attacks against our forces, President Obama released five Taliban commanders from Guantanamo Bay in May, enabling their return to the anti-American jihad. And now, as American forces retreat from Afghanistan, our soldiers will be assigned to train more “moderate Islamists” in Syria—which apparently will not be a combat mission . . . unless the trainees go green-on-blue.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR RETURN OF AUSTIN TICE**

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am on a mission of mercy. I have a constituent who is missing in Syria. He is the son of Marc and Debra Tice. His name is Austin Tice.

On August 11, 2012, he celebrated his 31st birthday in Syria. On August 13, he was reported missing. He is a graduate of Georgetown University, and he was

there pursuing his career in journalism.

Mr. Speaker, his parents are gravely concerned, and we are asking anyone with any information concerning this young man, Austin Tice, to please contact the FBI hotline at 1 (800) 225-5324, repeating 1 (800) 225-5324. My number is (202) 225-7508.

I would like to now have a moment of silence for his return.

**HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM McMANUS**

(Mr. GALLEGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to Bill McManus, William McManus, who has announced his retirement as the chief of the San Antonio Police Department in the seventh largest city in the country.

Chief McManus has been on board in San Antonio for some 8 years, but he brought with him 30 years of experience in law enforcement in such areas as diverse as narcotics, tactical positions, criminal investigations, internal investigations, the full range of experience.

As a result of his service in San Antonio, their police department is more well-respected, more well-trained than ever in San Antonio’s history.

Chief McManus I first met when he was testifying before the legislature and I served as chair of the committee on criminal jurisprudence.

I know well his passion for law enforcement and his passion for people. We will miss him dearly at the city, but we wish him well in his future endeavors.

**HONORING JAZZ LEGEND JOE SAMPLE**

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and mourn a great American in my district. His name is Joe Sample. He made people happy by the wonderful jazz that he played.

Born in 1939, in his high school he joined with fellow students and created the Jazz Crusaders. In doing so, he enjoyed a wonderful career that saw him working with people such as Miles Davis, George Benson, Jimmy Witherspoon, B.B. King, Eric Clapton, Steely Dan, and the Supremes. He incorporated jazz in many things that he did, but he also understood gospel, blues, Latin, and the classical form.

In talking to his family this week, and to his family and his wife, I give them my deepest sympathy.

He said he was proud of his gospel music album.

We are saddened that he has lost his life in his battle against lung cancer. I

am delighted to salute him as a great American who shared his talent with young people, who was kind to those with whom he grew up, who made Texas proud, and certainly is renowned throughout this great community of Houston and the Nation.

Starting the piano at 5, Joe Sample never left his love of music and always tried to share it and be a representative of the value of what music is to children and the American people.

I ask this Congress to acknowledge with me this great hero, Joe Sample, a musician, an American, someone who we can be proud of that lived good in this country.

**MAKE OUR ENERGY MORE RELIABLE AND MORE AFFORDABLE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, today the House passed a commonsense approach to make our energy more reliable and more affordable. Our vote today would create jobs and secures our energy future by making us dependent on North American resources, not OPEC, Venezuela, or others.

I am proud to lead this effort in support of lower energy costs and more American jobs. With commonsense policies like these, we can make real progress toward reducing prices at the pump and protecting families from higher monthly electric bills. Lower energy costs also mean lower prices for groceries and other consumer goods; and by producing more American energy, we can create more American jobs. These are the issues that families struggle with at the kitchen table every night and keep you awake at night.

But House Republicans have put forward a positive bipartisan solution to strengthen our energy policy that will allow us to begin fostering the development and use of our own energy resources. Today the House acted. We passed commonsense energy legislation that takes advantage of our abundant North American energy and puts our country on a path to better infrastructure.

This approach is simple. It is a package of 13 bills the House has already passed on a bipartisan basis, including three of which were even voice-voted. They are not controversial.

For instance, this bill includes the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act that would expedite and modernize the Federal review process for natural gas pipeline permits to help facilitate the construction of new pipeline infrastructure. This bill passed with 26 Democratic votes.

It also includes H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, sponsored by my good friend CORY GARDNER from Colorado. This would

speed up the approval of liquid natural gas exports. We have an abundant supply of natural gas here in the United States, an abundance of which will allow other countries to become dependent upon us for their energy needs.

Now, our Energy and Commerce Subcommittee, several of us on the Republican side went to North Dakota last year to visit the oilfields. We flew in at night. When you fly over western North Dakota at night, it looks like you are flying over a birthday cake with lots of candles. Those candles are flaring off natural gas because the price is so low and it is so plentiful that it just makes better economic sense to burn it off. So we need to find additional resources and uses for the natural gas. They are already there: exporting, transportation. We just need to focus more on those.

Just today we heard in a joint meeting of Congress from the President of Ukraine. He talked about the security in his own country and the strong partnership with the United States. Can you imagine how much weaker Russia would be if Ukraine was more dependent or would use North American U.S. natural gas resources?

Former Obama National Security Adviser General Jim Jones testified before the Senate that Vladimir Putin uses energy as a weapon. I believe that we would be using our energy resources as our weapon. And by expediting the permitting processes for liquified natural gas terminals, it would allow us to export natural gas to countries like Ukraine and our European partners and Japan.

These policies to develop natural gas would further cement U.S. leadership in the world and grow our economy and create jobs here at home.

Secondly, this package includes the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. That would protect an affordable and diverse electricity portfolio by providing reasonable alternatives to the EPA's greenhouse gas emissions rule. It would require the EPA to develop practical solutions for new coal-fired powerplants, including just saying that you can't implement a rule until the technology exists.

Doesn't that make sense to have a rule that the technology can actually comply with instead of making a rule where there is no technology allowing you to comply with it? I wonder if there is another agenda behind that.

Lastly, this bill includes H.R. 3, the Northern Route Approval Act, which would approve the permit for the Keystone XL pipeline.

Tomorrow marks the sixth birthday or anniversary of the filing of that permit—6 years. We have liberated continents and put a man on the Moon in less time than it has taken to review this permit and approve it. It not only has strong bipartisan support in the House, it is one of the few issues that enjoys broad bipartisan coalition in the Senate as well.

We can't get this done because the President lacks the leadership to make

a decision. He would rather make a decision based on politics, continuing to delay the decision until after the next election. It is just now the third election.

Consider these few things about the Keystone pipeline that come directly from this administration's environmental impact statement on the Keystone pipeline.

It would create over 42,000 jobs directly related to the construction of the pipeline project and downstream jobs.

During the construction of the pipeline, it would contribute \$2 billion in wages to the economy in the United States—\$2 billion.

The administration acknowledged that by not building the Keystone pipeline, we had actually increased carbon emissions by 28 to 41 percent.

Many people come up to me and say, I don't get how it would reduce. The reality is, the alternative is, the pipeline that Canada is building to the east and to the west will then be exported. So that oil then is put on a ship, tanker, at least for the west it will be shipped directly to China. Maybe even the east coast pipeline will go down into the Panama Canal and over to the east.

So when you use the energy taken to ship it to China and then refined in China with less pollution controls and emission controls in their refineries than we have in the United States, you will actually be increasing the CO<sub>2</sub> carbon emissions.

□ 1930

Now, like every other piece of legislation in this package, this is stuck in the Senate and being held hostage by the majority leader. Time is of the essence before the clock runs out on this Congress. So this package of energy bills to grow our economy actually does HARRY REID a favor.

Instead of having to schedule 13 different bills, Mr. Speaker, he only has to bring up one. We have nearly 400 bills that this House Chamber has sent to him that have not been acted upon. Let's make it easier, package them together, and if he passes ten of the bills like this then maybe we are making some real progress.

The Senate floor wants the comprehensive package and to hold one vote to meet our national energy needs and grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ran to make our country energy independent, to have the level of security, national security, when you can be in control of your own economy and destiny. In my view, the cornerstone of a dynamic economy is your own energy and your own resources. You compare the countries that have the resources that they can control themselves and not be dependent on others and you see the strongest economies in the United States. This is the cornerstone. It creates jobs, it creates security. And I just don't understand why our majority leader—the majority leader in the Senate—won't

bring these great bills to the Senate floor. In fact, I think he is scared they are going to pass, and they will. They have a great deal of support.

So let's say "yes" to American energy, "yes" to more affordable energy in the United States.

I would like to recognize the gentleman from Indiana to say a little bit more on how we secure America's energy.

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you for yielding, Congressman TERRY.

I rise today in support of American energy and the families that it supports.

Mr. Speaker, American families are struggling. Many are living paycheck to paycheck as the price of everything continues to rise: a gallon of gas, a gallon of milk, electrical costs. And do you know who the rising electrical costs will affect the most? American's seniors on a fixed income and the poor.

Here in the House we have solutions, like investing and expanding American energy production. It creates jobs on which families can depend and lowers costs at home and for businesses.

Mr. Speaker, my father was a United Mine Worker in Illinois for over 30 years. It was hard work, but it was a good-paying job and provided for our family, and we are proud of the work my dad did. It afforded me the opportunity to pursue an education and become the first person in my family to receive a 4-year college degree. I went on to medical school and became a surgeon. His job as a coal miner made the American Dream possible for me. This is what America is about.

In my home State of Indiana, over 80 percent of our electricity comes from coal. My district is home to nine coal mines, every mine in the State, and they employ thousands of Hoosiers. Next door, in southern Illinois, more coal mines, which employ Hoosiers. Coal not only keeps the lights on in Indiana, but it puts food on the table for Hoosier families.

I have been to several coal mines recently, went down in the coal mine—because I like going down in coal mines since I did it when I was a kid—and talked to the hardworking men and women who every day are working these jobs. And I keep hearing the same thing, Mr. Speaker: Washington regulations are crushing our business and I am afraid for my job, what that may mean to my family.

The fact is that coal is being mined cleaner and safer than it ever has. Despite what this administration would have you believe, the coal industry has made great strides in protecting our environment while providing low energy costs for their consumers.

But every time they invest their own money to improve their mines, this administration moves the goalpost. They do this without consideration of how many jobs they are eliminating in southwest Indiana and other coal-producing States. How this impact on the energy prices consumers pay has an effect on Indiana's families.

In my district, two coal-fired power plants are closing because of this administration's energy policies.

It is not just coal jobs that are being threatened. Indiana's manufacturing jobs are beginning to feel the impact of these harmful energy regulations. You see, manufacturing makes up around 28 percent of our gross State product. We are a huge manufacturing State; in fact, the highest percentage of gross State product in the country.

Indiana also leads the Nation in manufacturing employment, and low-cost energy is part of the reason.

But the plants in my district are telling me they may not be able to survive when Washington continues to squeeze them more and more. How can Alcoa, with 3,000 jobs, stay open in my district if their energy costs double or triple?

We can bring more manufacturing to the United States, Mr. Speaker, more jobs—which is what this is about—if we just get Washington, D.C., out of the way of American businesses.

Yesterday, in a committee hearing, I asked the EPA to visit my district and, for that matter, other coal-producing States, to hear our story and listen to what my constituents have to say. While we wait for their response, the House is working.

I am proud to have supported H.R. 2, the American Energy Solutions for Lower Costs and More American Jobs Act. This comprehensive package that has already been outlined by Congressman TERRY included the best energy ideas that the House has produced this Congress. The most important piece of this legislation is it will ensure every American access to affordable, reliable energy.

This legislation approves the Keystone pipeline, the most studied pipeline in history, which even the President's own State Department has determined will not negatively impact the environment.

This project is critical to our future generations to address their future energy needs, but, unfortunately, this administration has been blocking his project for years for politics. While they turn their back on our Nation's energy needs, they have been implementing new regulations that have been costing our Nation billions of dollars. It just doesn't make sense.

Part of H.R. 2 includes Representative BILL CASSIDY's Energy Consumers Relief Act, which ensures congressional oversight of energy-related rules costing more than \$1 billion.

This commonsense bill will allow Congress to have oversight of some of those billion dollar regulations that are crushing American consumers across the Nation and that probably won't meet our standards once they are looked at by Congress. They are just costing too much, with no benefit other than an ideological approach for the administration. We need to get back to science and common sense.

H.R. 2 also included legislation that helps speed up the permitting process

on Federal lands, protects our Nation's electrical grid, and protects coal mining jobs.

Most of these bills had already passed the House and are sitting over in the Senate waiting for action. They are waiting for a vote. In fact, they are waiting for a hearing, waiting for a debate amongst our Senators about the energy solutions the House has passed.

I understand that the Senate at this point—or at least one party in the Senate—may not agree with these ideas, but let's have a discussion about it. Let's hear your ideas in the Senate to lower our Nation's energy costs. The House has spoken. This is what our constituents expect of us, Mr. Speaker, an honest, vigorous debate about the issues facing our Nation.

Doing nothing is not an energy policy, and it is no way to legislate.

I hope our friends across the Capitol and the President are watching and learning from the House's example.

Mr. Speaker, finally, in closing, I want to say we need to tap our energy resources. We are on the verge of an energy renaissance in the United States, a manufacturing renaissance. What does this mean? Low-cost energy, American jobs, putting families back to work. And that is what we all want, that is why we are here, that is why we ran for office, Mr. Speaker, to help people. It provides for lower costs. We are doing it in a cleaner way than we ever have.

Mr. Speaker, let's not look right in the face of success in creating jobs and look the other way.

I am hopeful that the Senate will take up some of the House-passed bills, including this one, before the end of the year. If not, Mr. Speaker, the next Congress in this House will act again to show the American people we want lower costs for their energy, we want good-paying jobs, we want manufacturing in America, and we will act again and, hopefully, the Senate in the next Congress can see it to where they will step forward and act.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you, Mr. BUCSHON.

You mentioned manufacturing and how important it is to your State. The reality is also that manufacturing is reliant on affordable and reliable energy.

I am the chairman of the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee under Energy and Commerce. We did a series of hearings, Mr. Speaker, on manufacturing in the United States. We had industries of all sorts testify in front of our committee. I left that series of hearings very optimistic about manufacturing in the United States, because what we are seeing is many manufacturers returning to the United States.

There was one common theme to every one of the manufacturers that were moving to the United States or returning to the United States, and it was affordable and reliable energy. Many of them use natural gas, whether

it is the steel industry that is having a resurgence right now—by the way, a beginning job in the steel industry—and, yes, they are looking for workers right now—\$77,000.

That is the middle class that is being hammered right now. We need to create those jobs, expand those jobs, but you need affordable and reliable energy.

So what is this administration doing? They pass a rule on existing electrical generation plants, existing plants, not ones yet to be built, and they say you have to lower your emission rates to the level of using natural gas. So when we talk about Mr. BUCSHON and Mrs. BROOKS, who is going to come up here and talk about the impact on coal and jobs, that is the war on coal. They aren't using "don't use coal"; they just put the number of emission particulates below what you can get if you use coal.

But, now, here is what happens in a State like Nebraska. The State of Nebraska has older coal-fired plants, most of them are smaller, in our rural areas of Nebraska. They won't be able to afford to pay for all of the changes that have to occur to meet that. And, by the way, this rule is not even finalized yet, but when it becomes finalized these plants have until June 30, 2016. We are in September of 2014. That is less than 2 years that they have to prepare.

That is why some of these rules are just so ridiculous and so obvious in how they are attacking our energy sector and making affordability and reliability a question mark.

Now I would like to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, JEFF DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership on energy, and for having this opportunity to discuss with the American people the things you are talking about, the impact of the rules and regulations the Obama administration has put forward with coal-fired power plants.

In my State of South Carolina, with the number of power plants that we have that are coal-fired generated, we will see rates go up. And, as you say, they have got until 2016. Well, the Obama administration will leave office in 2016, and that is when you are really going to see the impact of rates going up in States like South Carolina, Nebraska, and others that use coal. The Obama administration won't feel the impact and the pressure from the voters because they will no longer be in office.

But let me tell you about a winning message, and that is jobs, energy, and the Founding Fathers, things we have talked about this week as we passed this energy package.

Jobs. Let's unleash and unbridle that innovative and entrepreneurial spirit in America. Let Americans create jobs with the understanding that government creates jobs, but the government creates government jobs.

□ 1945

Americans create American jobs, and they do that through energy. Energy is a segue to job creation, and, if you dispute that fact, go to North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, or Louisiana. Look at the jobs that are created there. There are low unemployment rates, even negative unemployment rates, in North Dakota.

It is an energy-driven economy. Jobs and energy. Energy is a segue to job creation. Our Founding Fathers unleashing that entrepreneurial spirit, understanding the American Dream, understanding limited government, free markets, and individual liberties.

We do that by simple things like improving the Keystone pipeline to bring that friendly Canadian oil down to the refineries where we have capacity in this country, working with our best and largest trading partner to the North.

It just makes sense as you approach American energy independence. If we as a Congress can't approach American energy independence, why not North American energy independence, working with the Canadians and also looking south to Mexico, which just did away with the nationalization of their energy sector, privatizing more and more of Pemex and the other energy resources, opening up the Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement area in the western gap? A million and a half acres are now open to production on the Mexican and U.S. sides of the western gap.

In South Carolina, we want offshore energy production. I want to applaud the Palmetto Policy Forum for a study they just put out that shows the economic impact. When people think about energy jobs and offshore, they think about the guys in the hard hats and the oily uniforms turning the drill on the derrick.

But guess what? It is all the jobs that are created onshore to support that effort offshore. Those are the pipefitters and the welders and the widgetmakers and the auto body mechanics and the supply vessels and the heating and air repair guys that go out to the rigs and repair the heating and air and the refrigeration and other things that are going on out there because it is a way of life.

Those guys are onshore, at home, and they are eating at their local restaurants and tipping their waitresses and going to their churches and tithing. They are joining the United Way and the chamber of commerce and sponsoring those ball teams.

It is a trickle down. The first domino that falls is for us to allow offshore drilling.

The bill we passed this week does a lot. I want to applaud the Energy and Commerce Committee, but I also want to applaud DOC HASTINGS and the Natural Resources Committee.

It increases offshore production, increases onshore production. It opens up that Federal land that is currently off

the table for oil and gas production, but also wind, solar, and transmission lines and all the things that happen, that is now off the table on Federal land out West.

Look at a map of the West. There are a lot of sunny areas out there in the desert; but guess what? You own it. Your taxpayer dollars set it aside. It is Federal lands, but it is off-limits. Even if you believe in solar and wind power, you can't have that on Federal land because it is off the table for that type of production as well.

This prevents duplicative hydraulic fracturing regulations. Guess what? We have got an abundance of natural gas in this country, and we are finding more and more every day onshore. We can build LNG terminals.

We heard a great speech from the President of Ukraine today. If we could export LNG from America to Ukraine, lessen Ukraine's dependence on Russian gas and also export the technology that we have for fracturing, they want that technology because they want to lessen their dependence on Russian gas.

It is because of a word that he mentioned over and over today, Mr. Speaker, and that was "freedom." Freedom. Freedom from Russian gas and that dependence. Europe wants it because they are dependent on Russian gas as well.

Let's export the LNG, the gas that we are producing in abundance in this country, and let's help our allies in Europe and Ukraine.

All that we do, all the bills that we talked about, we have had an absent Senate when it comes to energy independence, and we have had an absent White House when it comes to energy independence, other than supporting Solyndra and other green initiatives and wasting taxpayer dollars.

We need real things that work. It takes 24/7 base load power in this country to make the engines of the economy work. 24/7. What does that mean? Base load power, what does that mean? That means when you flip the light switch and the lights come on; and, when the companies that are manufacturing products all over this great land cut those machines on, this power supply is available to turn the engines of the economy, producing American jobs, producing American manufacturing items.

That happens with 24/7 base load power that comes from coal, natural gas, hydro, that comes from nuclear power, all of the things we should support while we continue to work on the necessary components for wind and solar to actually work, and that is the storage capacity because wind and solar is intermittent.

The sun doesn't always shine, and the wind doesn't always blow, but I will tell you what works, and that is the proven technologies of oil and gas, nuclear, hydro, the things that we are talking about in the bills we passed today that actually work.

Jobs, energy, and our Founding Fathers. Let's put Americans to work.

Let's unleash that innovative and entrepreneurial spirit. Let's have an energy-driven economy, and we can do it.

South Carolina wants to be a part of that. Nebraska is already a part of that. Indiana—I have talked with Indiana folks that are here. South Carolina wants to be a part of that as well.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you. I appreciate that.

I now yield to Mrs. BROOKS from Indiana.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Thank you to the gentleman from Nebraska for bringing together my colleagues, with tremendous energy—my colleagues who have the energy to talk about this package of bills that will encourage investment in our infrastructure, lower energy prices, and create good-paying jobs for millions of Americans.

My home State of Indiana is especially well-positioned to take advantage of Chairman UPTON's and what they are calling in Energy and Commerce the "architecture of abundance" that is embodied in the bill that we just voted on and passed.

Last week, the commissioner of Indiana's Department of Environmental Management testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that, in fact, 28,000 Hoosiers are employed in the coal industry and that our State sits on top of a 300-year supply of this abundant resource.

By rolling back the disastrous proposed EPA regulations on coal-fired gas plants, this bill will save Hoosiers 32 percent on their electric rates and keep our businesses competitive.

As the Nation's leading manufacturing State, Indiana heavily contributes to the oil and gas extraction business by producing the equipment that makes the energy renaissance possible.

In fact, the industry already contributes \$16.6 billion to the Hoosier economy, while supporting over 136,000 jobs. H.R. 2 will expedite LNG export applications and approve the Keystone pipeline, initiatives that we know would add billions of annual GDP to our economy and create tens of thousands of good-paying jobs.

Make no mistake, I also fully understand the value that renewable resources play in our energy mix. My district alone is home to two ethanol plants, a wind farm, and a newly-opened solar plant.

Renewables bolster Indiana's local economies while supporting 53,000 Hoosier jobs. This is a massive growth sector in our State, and H.R. 2 would continue to promote the development of alternative sources of energy for the benefit of our economy and the environment.

The Congressman from Nebraska's bill makes pipelines more feasible; and, as the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service found, "pipelines provide safer, less expensive transportation than railroads" that currently carry gas and oil.

Pipelines mean fewer spills, less emissions from vehicles transporting fuel, and better access to natural gas which produces 30 percent less emissions than petroleum.

Republicans are committed to a responsible environmental policy that protects our children from pollutants and preserves our pristine wildlife for generations to come.

However, American ingenuity and technological advancements have allowed U.S. energy-related carbon emissions to fall to their lowest levels in nearly two decades, showing we can tap into our vast natural resources while still being responsible stewards of our environment.

Indiana Governor Mike Pence and 14 other Governors recently wrote to the President:

The economic health of our Nation depends on accomplishing a balanced energy and environmental policy.

Madam Speaker, that is exactly what this bill does. I hope the President listens, and I applaud the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you, Representative BROOKS. You had mentioned something that we really haven't injected into this particular conversation, and that is the renewables.

I am proud that our local power district has 30 percent of their energy produced by wind, a renewable source. I personally think that solar is going to be, over time, a significant part of a portfolio, but maybe not in the way that many people think because many people think of filling the desert with these solar panels.

The reality is that technology today is to be integrated into buildings. Think of your office building's windows generating power. That is exciting technology that is in the research labs right now, so we need to include that.

I am glad you brought it up because people listening may think that we only want fossil—but it is just that fossil fuels are under attack—and you need a diverse portfolio; otherwise, you really jeopardize your economy. If you are just only on oil and you only get it from overseas, you can see where you are in jeopardy.

I just wanted to thank you for bringing that up.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Thank you. And the diverse all-of-the-above energy policy, if we use renewables in addition to oil and gas, that creates even more jobs, and I applaud you for your effort to always think about the environment as well.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you.

I want to yield to the gentleman from Georgia. I don't know if you are a Bulldog or not, but you are in Congress.

I now yield to ROB WOODALL, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Nebraska. We are all Bulldogs in Georgia, even those folks who went to the trade school in downtown Atlanta

known as Georgia Tech. We are Bulldogs at heart.

I want to thank you for leading this hour tonight because, so often, when folks think about what we do here, they are thinking about Republican this, Democrat that, partisan this, partisan that. Folks get mired down in philosophical debates.

What you have done here tonight is get into the core of what I think we all, as Americans, care about. We are talking about energy security. We are talking about an all-of-the-above energy strategy that lowers energy prices, puts more money in the pockets of every single family through lower prices, and creates job opportunities not just in your State or my State, but all across this country, and, Madam Speaker, that provides us with energy security.

I grew up in the seventies. I remember the gas lines. I remember sitting outside. That was our great President from the State of Georgia that was presiding in those days, and I will never forget President Reagan's first inaugural address.

He was talking about the challenges that we were facing as Americans. He was talking about the big dreams that it was going to take to overcome those challenges. He conceded that they were big dreams, but he said, "Why shouldn't we dream those dreams?" Because, after all, we are Americans, we are Americans.

What my friend from Nebraska said about the oil exploration in Canada really struck me. We have this debate about whether or not we should build a pipeline to bring Canadian energy down into America to provide American jobs, American construction, American manufacturing, and there are those who say, "Well, no, don't do it because it would be better if that oil stayed in the ground."

That is not a choice. That is not an option that is anywhere in this House or that is anywhere within our jurisdiction. The gentleman pointed out exactly the truth of the matter which is, if we don't do it, somebody else will. If we don't do it, somebody else will.

There is not a nation on the planet that is going to burn that oil more responsibly than we will, and I love that about us. Madam Speaker, I love that about us, that no one will do it better than we will.

This bill is H.R. 2. We reserve those numbers for the most important things that we do. I don't know if folks know that, Madam Speaker.

Those top 10 numbers in the bill calendar are reserved for the biggest and best thing that we do, but, because people think this is such a partisan institution, they might think we save those numbers for the "Republicans are the Greatest Act." They might think we save those numbers for the "It's Our Way or the Highway Act." Nonsense. We save those numbers for the things that matter to everyone.

My friend from Nebraska can correct me if I am wrong, but we have pack-

aged together a collection of bills that have passed this House. We put them together in H.R. 2, and every single bill in that package passed with a bipartisan vote.

Mr. TERRY. It is true.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I want you to hear that. We had a chance here. Republicans run this show. If we wanted to just jam something through, we could, but, when we talk about energy independence, we are not talking about Republicans and Democrats. We are talking about Americans.

□ 2000

We are talking about every family in this country. And what the gentleman from Nebraska has done is put together those commonsense ideas that have been agreed upon by both sides of the aisle—bipartisan votes, every one—and said let's not let this year expire without doing those things that we can do, agreeing on those things on which we can agree.

Mr. TERRY. May I interrupt you on that point because it is interesting.

When I am back home—and maybe you get this—we get input from our constituents. And one of the most frequent ones is: Why don't you do the bills that you do agree on?

In essence, that is what this bill does because we have had 30, 40, 50 Democrats involved in the bills and voting for them; and so this is an amalgamation of bipartisan bills, but yet we had less Democratic support for today's bill than we did as individual bills, and I think maybe there is a little bit of politics being played.

Mr. WOODALL. You may not know, Madam Speaker, but my friend from Nebraska is the author of the Northern Route Approval Act. It is one of those bills that passed here with a bipartisan majority, and it is in this package. It is in this underlying package.

We talk about this as if it is an energy bill. Because it is H.R. 2, it is the energy bill. But that very same language that my friend has authored and led through this House of Representatives is included in the Study Committee package known as the JOBS bill, JOBS Act, that collection of bills that will put Americans back to work, that will grow the economy, that will do those things that are on the minds of every single American family.

Too often we talk about energy issues as if they are separate from those issues; and what my friend knows and what he has been leading in this hour tonight, Madam Speaker, is that energy issues are jobs issues. Energy issues are family issues. Energy issues are issues to every single American citizen.

Never before in my lifetime have I had the hope that we would get the hands that have been around the American neck by those who supply us with energy. We have that opportunity.

I was listening to my friend from Indiana talk about coal. We are the Saudi Arabia of coal in America, the Saudi

Arabia of coal. And the administration is trying to singlehandedly tie the hands of the energy industry not to exploit—and I mean “exploit” in the best possible sense of the word; I mean “exploit” in the utilize, in the harness, in the grow sense of the word—taking that off the table. That is not an environmental decision. That is a jobs decision, and we feel that in each and every one of our districts.

Madam Speaker, there are a lot of ways to run this institution. You can run this institution with the iron fist that says “my way or the highway,” or you can run this institution with those commonsense ideas that speak to every single American family.

Folks think this is an election year, I say to my friend from Nebraska, and they think that that brings out the worst in this body. What I want to say to you, under your leadership, these bills that we see here tonight, these bills that were packaged in H.R. 2, that most preeminent number in priority here at the House of Representatives, what you are leading is that language, that bill, that opportunity that puts America first and being a Republican or a Democrat way, way down the list.

I think that is what folks are looking for. I think good policy is good politics. I think doing the right thing for the right reason is better than having the right commercial at the right time.

It matters, and it matters to me that we have leaders like you who carry that message. I am grateful to you for leading the hour tonight. I am grateful to you for including me in it, and I am grateful to you for yielding me the time.

Mr. TERRY. And I am grateful you stayed long enough to speak tonight. You did a great job, and I really appreciate all of the work and effort you do to secure America's future.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, energy, again, is the cornerstone of our economy. Sometimes we speak rather scientifically. We don't speak in the terms of how does it really affect me, not as a Member of Congress, but, you know, we represent 600,000 or 700,000 people in our districts. What we are trying to do is secure America's future. If we focus on energy, we secure it in so many different ways.

I hear from my constituents that they are frustrated at the increase of food prices in the grocery store, the continuous up-and-down swings of gasoline at the pump. The costs per family for just transportation fuel has gone from 6 percent of their income to now 11.6 percent, just in the last 6 years. Those are the type of things that really make it more difficult for our families in our districts. So a solid, encompassing energy policy helps alleviate those cost frustrations of every family.

Many people will say, You talk about affordability and reliability. What are you talking about? How does it actually make things more affordable? What is reliability?

Well, if your electric bill is going to go up, if you have an existing power-

plant that can't meet the new rule where the plans have to be submitted in June of 2016, so what they will have to do is either close that plant or invest, some are talking anywhere from 100 to \$500 million or more to comply to this rule. What do you think happens when that power district spends \$500 million? They pass that on to the consumers. Your electric bills will go up.

We met with our electric generators over the break, and they told me that some of these, they are just going to have to shut down these smaller powerplants.

What happens to those communities? They can't invest \$100 million or more into those, so they just close them down, go onto the market and bid for the energy that is out there.

But when you have—and a new GAO report just came out recently, or some report, that they expect even more powerplants to close because of these rules. So when you have more communities and districts bidding against each other, the price is going to go up for that electricity as well.

So you have kind of got it both ways. If you comply to the rule, you are going to raise costs. If you just close the powerplant, the rates are going to go up.

What we are trying to do here is just figure out a pathway where we don't have to have this level of disruption and price increases by these rules. And what we are saying here is, come forward with a better rule that gives us more time and a bright pathway so that we don't make a financial impact to our families.

So the bottom line here, Madam Speaker, is, if we secure our own energy future, our country will continue to be the greatest country in the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

#### MILITANT ISLAMISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to start by commending the Congressman from Nebraska. Having invested across borders in many different countries around the world, I believe that good-paying American jobs come mostly from competitiveness.

In order for our companies to be competitive and produce good-paying American jobs, we need competitive energy prices. Therefore, I support this bill and think that it can produce lots

of great jobs in America. I, for one, drive an automobile made by Americans in America.

Yesterday, I voted “no” on the proposal to train and arm Syrian rebels. I did so because I am convinced that we and our allies need to come together and unite behind a much broader and very long-term plan with the goal of ending militant Islamism across the globe once and for all. In my opinion, anything less, such as reacting crisis by crisis, like playing Whac-A-Mole, is doomed to failure.

To begin, we must accept the realities of the challenges we face and the generational nature of the threat. We can easily agree that ISIS today is the most visible and immediate threat of militant Islamic extremism. It is a clear and present danger to the Middle East region and, yes, beyond. We can all agree, ISIS must be eliminated. But moving forward, it would be a mistake and, I think, a missed opportunity to focus solely on ISIS. ISIS is only one part of a widespread metastasizing cancer of hatred, intolerance, and violence.

We are facing a cancer of militant Islamism, with cells under various names in dozens of countries. In planning the elimination of ISIS, we, with a coalition of the willing, must do so, recognizing it as part of an overall global disease. Success requires a broad, diverse, and longstanding international coalition committed to defeating the cancer of militant Islamism once and for all.

Now America is uniquely qualified to provide the leadership, including the airpower and mission command structure; but this time, the funding, military equipment, and ground forces must be provided by others.

Too many times in the past, the United States has borne an extremely disproportionate part of these burdens. This time it must be understood that U.S. forces are not going to be the combat boots on the ground, nor will the American taxpayer be paying the bill.

It is time for our allies, especially the Arab and Muslim nations, those most significantly and most immediately threatened, to step up. They need to provide the resources, especially the ground forces that are needed in this conflict. And coalition plans and action plans going forward must be guided by an overarching strategic vision of a world someday, somehow free of militant Islamism. That must be our cause.

Success will begin but not end with the containment, isolation, and, over time, elimination of ISIS and other militant cells, wherever and whenever they arise.

One by one, Islamic militant organizations must be eradicated around the world. They must be eliminated from the Middle East, from the Near East, sub-Saharan and north Africa, and south Asia. Any additional cancer cells or seeds of cancer in Europe, the U.S., or elsewhere must be also be eliminated.