SMART SECURITY AND IRAQI SECURITY FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, assured us that 142,000 members of the Iraqi security forces have been fully trained. That statement leads me to wonder, if the number of trained Iraqi security personnel equals the number of United States troops in Iraq, why have we not begun to bring our troops home?

If the Iraqi people are trained to protect their country, as General Myers claims, then why has the Bush administration left our troops to be sitting ducks in Iraq for the foreseeable future? Why are not the Iraqis relying on these 142,000 security personnel for the heavy burden of keeping Iraq secure?

Sadly, the Bush administration wants the American people to ignore the fact that 150,000 American troops and 142,000 Iraqi troops have not been able to secure the country.

That is because by invading Iraq the Bush administration has created a whole new generation of terrorist recruits whose common tie is their hatred for the United States occupation.

This immoral, ill-conceived and unjust war against a country that never provoked us and never posed a threat to the United States, has made Americans and Iraqis alike, much less safe.

Most of the 1,500 U.S. troops who have been killed in Iraq died after President Bush made those now infamous remarks about the end of major combat operations in Iraq. The banner Mission Accomplished prominently displayed in the background. Mr. Speaker, the way to honor our brave troops is by preventing further lives from being lost. In addition to the 1,500 U.S. troops killed, more than 11,000 Americans have been severely wounded and a staggering tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians have died in this war.

The tremendous cost of the war is no less dangerous to our security here at home because thousands of Iraqi insurgents have been created since we attacked Iraq. Congress has charged U.S. taxpayers over $200 billion in less than 2 years to pay for the ongoing occupation of that country.

Imagine what we could do with $200 billion. We could fund our Nation’s homeland security efforts for an entire year or shore up the budget shortfalls of every single State in the country and still have billions of dollars left over to help reconstruct Iraq’s decimated infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pursue a new national security plan, one which defends America by relying on the very best of American values, our commitment to peace, our commitment to freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership.

With the help of Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Friends Committee on National Legislation and Women’s Action for New Direction, I have created a SMART security strategy for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral, American Responsible and Traditional.

A SMART security strategy for Iraq means providing the developmental aid that can help create a robust civil society; building schools for Iraqi children so that they can learn about peace and freedom; water processing plants so all Iraqis will have clean drinking water; and ensuring that Iraq’s economic infrastructure becomes fully viable in order to avoid a fiscal collapse.

Instead of troops, let us send scientists, educators, urban planners and constitutional experts to help rebuild Iraq’s flagging economic and physical infrastructure and establish a robust and democratic civil society.

It is time for the Bush administration to pay its own claims. If 142,000 Iraqi security forces have been trained, as General Myers told us yesterday, then the President should agree with me that it is time for the United States to cease playing a militaristic role in Iraq and begin playing a humanitarian role.

SMART security is the right approach for America in Iraq. The SMART approach would prevent any more American soldiers and Iraqi civilians from being needlessly killed. It would save the United States billions of dollars in military appropriations, and just as importantly, it would keep America safe. It is time for America to adopt a SMART security policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

OIL PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) will address the House for some period of time talking about energy sources, oil in particular, and the fact that many experts say that oil production, especially in the United States, but actually throughout the world, oil production of conventional oil under current patterns is expected at a rate much faster, that means the use of oil by the world community is supposed to grow much faster than oil discovery production.

What is clear, because we are not sure exactly when that peak will come in oil production, some say it is peaking right now, some say it will peak in 10 years, the amount of oil we get out of the ground will exceed the demand; but what is clear is that at some point in this century, world oil production will peak and then decline. There is uncertainty about the date because many countries that produce oil do not provide credible data on how big their reserves are.

More uncertainty calls for more caution, not less; and caution in this case means working to develop alternatives. When production of conventional oil peaks, we can expect a large increase in the price up to the price of other alternatives. Therefore so-called unconventional oil or renewable fuels.

Although increasing domestic production may ease oil dependence slightly, the United States is only 3 percent of the world’s estimated oil reserves and uses 26 percent of the world’s consumption.

I want to explain just from the perspective of the United States the huge increase in energy demand in the last century. I am going to use the word quadrillion. Quadrillion is a number. It is followed 15 zeros, it is the number quadrillion. To measure energy use in a country, we use BTUs. British thermal units. A new furnace, whether oil or natural gas, you see the BTU to determine how much energy it is going to cost. We use BTUs to determine how much energy a country uses, you use a short term for quadrillion called “quads.”

In 1910, the United States used 7 quads of BTUs. This is 7 quadrillion BTUs. In 1950, the United States used 35 quadrillion BTUs. In 2005, the United States uses 100 quadrillion BTUs, and we are accelerating that. We are increasing demand for oil for our energy needs. The world right now, 2005, uses 345 quadrillion BTUs, an enormous amount of energy.

We know today that our appliances, whether a washing machine, a refrigerator or dishwasher, we know they are making more efficient than they ever were, certainly 20, 30, 40 years ago; and yet we are using more electricity, not less. We know that automobiles and trucks and our transportation is much more efficient than it was 20 years ago, and yet the demand is increasing. We burn more coal, more natural gas. Each home, as efficient as each home is today, burns much more oil and electricity because of the demand on energy needs. We are not decreasing by getting efficient. Rather, the demand is greater, we are using more and more.

The question is if we are increasing demand and production is going to peak now or in the next decade or two and our production, while the demand goes up, especially with oil reserves, are we at the early stages of the twilight for oil as an energy source? And if we are, what do we do? Well, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) will speak on a number of aspects of oil production decline. We will talk much further about the details of the solution to the problems of
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our energy decline, but I want to close with two last things: How do we harness a new alternative energy source and make it replace what we have been using for more than 2 centuries? How do we do that? We do it with initiative, ingenuity, intellect, vision, and leadership.

In 1990 I said quadrillion was one with 15 zeroes and talked about how much energy we use, and right now it is 10 quadrillion BTUs, we are no too far away from understanding how to separate hydrogen and oxygen from seawater. Our energy demand is increasing; oil production is decreasing. With intellect and leadership, we can transition to a new fuel source.

OIL DEMANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUCSON of California). Under the announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker: In this first chart we have some headlines from The Washington Post just a month or so ago. These are headlines from just one day in The Washington Post. The Dow drops 174 against the Euro and the Yen. Another headline: "Dollar Slides Against the Euro and the Yen." Another headline: "Consumer Confidence Slips in February."

Now, should we have had any indication that these were going to be the kinds of headlines that we have been reading in our paper recently? We need to go back a few years, as indicated on this next chart. Let us go back to the 1960s and then a statistic by the name of M. King Hubbert, a geologist, was working for the Shell Oil Company. He was watching the discovery and the exploitation and final exhaustion of individual oil fields. He noticed that every oil field followed a very typical pattern. It was a little slow getting the oil out at first, and then it came very quickly and reached a maximum, and then it tailed off as it became more difficult to get the oil out of the ground.

This followed a bell curve. Here is one of those bell curves. Now, bell curves are very familiar in science, and in life, for that matter. If we look at people and how tall they are, we will have a few people down around 4½ or 5 feet and some up to 7½ feet; but the big mass fall in the middle, clustered around 5½ to 6 feet. Looking at a yield of corn, a few farmers can get 50 bushels per acre, some may get 300, but the big mass today it is somewhere around 200 bushels per acre for corn.

Hubbert noticed when the bell curve reached its peak, about half of the oil had been exhausted from the field. Being a scientist, he theorized if you added up a lot of little bell curves, you would get one big bell curve, and if he could know the amount of reserves of oil in the United States, and he was doing this in the 1940s and early 1950s, and could project how much more might be found, he could then predict when the United States would peak in its oil production.

Doing this analysis, he concluded that we would peak in our oil production in 1970. This curve is what is known as Hubbert's Curve. The peak of the curve is what is known as Hubbert's Peak. Sometimes this is called the "great rollover" because when you get to the top, you roll over into the other side. It is frequently called "peak oil." So peak oil for the United States occurred in 1970, and it is true that every year since then we have pumped less oil and found less oil. The big blue squares here are the actual amounts that we deviated a little from the theoretical as M. King Hubbert predicted, but not all that much.

At the bottom, see the difference the big field in Alaska made, and see what that made in the down slope, that never increased production in our country. It just meant that we were not going down quite as fast. You can see that here on the curve. Notice that the Alaska oil production was not the type of thing that should have been, but a couple of things meant it could not be. One was it could not flow at all until we had a 4-foot pipeline. So the fields were developed and they were waiting; then we got the pipeline on board, and it was filled with oil and oil started to flow, and Members see the rapid increase here. It could not flow any faster than through that 4-foot pipe, and so it levels off at the top. We have pumped probably three-fourths of the oil when the other side. It is frequently called "peak oil." So peak oil in the United States occurred in 1970, and it is true that every year since then we have pumped less oil and found less oil. The big blue squares here are the actual amounts that we deviated a little from the theoretical as M. King Hubbert predicted, but not all that much.

Many people would like to open up ANWR. ANWR has considerably less oil than Prudhoe Bay, so the contribution will be significantly less. I want to note on this chart we also have the red curve, which is the theoretical curve for the former Soviet Union. It is a nice bell curve, peaking a little higher, they have more reserves than we do, and later because we entered the industrial age with vigor before the Soviet Union was quite there. Notice what happened when they were making notes of how precipitously it fell here. After they got things organized, the fall stopped and now they are producing more oil. As a matter of fact, we might see a little upsurge in this; but the general trend is still going to be down.

On the next chart, and we have here the same Hubbert Curve, but the abscissa is a little too long and the ordinate a little too compressed, so it is not the sharp peak that was seen before. That is the curve we saw before. It shows the Texas component, and it shows the rest of the United States; and it also shows some natural gas liquids. We learned how to extract those a little later because we were getting that as a bell curve, it would peek about here. It is little and then it is much, and then it tails off.

This is the contribution of Alaska, and you can see this not going to be our salvation to pump ANWR because ANWR contains probably not even half as much as Prudhoe Bay. And notice the small contribution that Alaska made. And that is not a bell curve for the reason I mentioned before because we had to develop the fields are they waited for the pipeline, and then it would surge through the pipeline when it was developed. So you do not see the tail getting greater and tailing off.

This is gulf oil. Remember the hullabaloo about the big finds of gulf oil that were going to solve our problem? That is what it did. There never was a moment in time between the big Alaska oil find and all of the pumping discovery and pumping in the gulf, there never was a moment in time when it decreased the price in our country. It just meant that we were about here, about 1970.

Now, the next chart shows what is happening worldwide.

The red curve here shows the actual discovery of oil. Notice that that peaked. There was a big find here that distorted the curve a little but if you recall when you would have the typical bell curve. It started somewhere back here off the chart, then it peaks, and then it is down hill and it tails off. These are the discoveries. The last find there is simply an extrapolation. We have no idea where it is going.

We are, by the way, very good at finding oil now. We use 3D seismic detection techniques. The world has drilled, I think, about 5 million oil wells and I think we have drilled about 3 million of them in this country, so we have a pretty good idea of where oil is.

A couple of Congresses ago, I was privileged to chair the Energy Subcommittee on Science. One of the first things I wanted to do was to determine the dimensions of the problem. We held a couple of hearings and had the world experts in. Surprisingly from the most pessimistic to the most optimistic, there was not much deviation in what the estimate is as to what the known reserves are. So there. It is about 1,100 gigabarrels. That sounds like an awful lot of oil. But when you divide into that the amount of oil which we use,