

of terrorism that we have seen in these last few years. Those are extraordinary events. And the drafters of this treaty understood, and though I do not agree with the premise under which they drafted this treaty, they understood there might be extraordinary events that threatened the national sovereignty of a country. And if that occurred, it should be a fundamental right, a basic right contained within the four corners of that treaty, that allowed a country, a United States or a Soviet Union, to withdraw from the treaty.

And that is exactly where we are today. We have no choice, in my opinion, but to withdraw from this treaty, and we have no choice but to offer protection to the American people.

What has happened in these 30 years? We know, from my earlier graph that I showed, that nuclear proliferation now exists throughout the world. We know that the probability of a missile attack against the United States, either intentionally or accidentally, is going to occur at some point. In fact, every day that goes by gives us 1 more day to make sure that when that missile attack occurs or when that accidental launch occurs, we are prepared to defend against it.

Now, if we fail, for example, and the worst failure or the worst scenario I can imagine is some country, because they do not have the fail-safe mechanism that our country has, accidentally launches against the United States. Under those circumstances, right now our only response really is to do nothing, which no President is going to do when you lose hundreds of thousands of people, or to retaliate.

□ 2310

Mr. Speaker, no President is going to go without retaliation. So if anything, you want to have a missile defense system in place so that an accidental launch does not start World War III. So if someone launches against the United States, or if somebody launches against an ally of the United States of America, or let us take it further, let us say some country accidentally launches against an enemy country, let us say someone launches against North Korea, the United States of America, our vision will allow our country to have the capability. We find out from our command center that India has by accident just launched a missile against North Korea; we should have the capability to stop that missile so it does not even hit a country like North Korea throughout the world which can prevent a horrible disaster from occurring, only if, however, my colleagues on this House floor support the President of the United States in demanding that this country forthwith deploy a missile defense system on behalf of the citizens of the United States of America.

That is an accidental launch. Let us talk about an intentional launch. Do you think you will continue to see in

the future a proliferation of missiles if the people building the missiles know there is a system in the country that will stop their missiles on the launching pad? That there is a system that the United States of America possesses that will not only stop an incoming missile from hitting the United States or an ally, but is so technically advanced that they can destroy their missile on their launching pad? How many more missiles do you think they will build?

The vision that I have for the future, for my children's generation, for my grandchildren's generation is that they will look back at us and say, missiles were those useless things back then. Nobody has any use for a missile today because anytime a missile goes off, it is stopped instantaneously. That is the goal.

We should not stand by some treaty that says the way to stop proliferation of missiles in the future is not to defend against them. Give me a break. That is like saying the way to stop the spread of cancer is not to take any chemotherapy. Do not offer chemotherapy as a threat, and maybe then people will stop smoking. That does not make any sense. It is the same thing here. It does not make any sense at all to the way, the theory to stop missile proliferation is not to defend against it.

By the way, there are only two countries in the world subject to the antiballistic missile treaty. India is not subject to it. North Korea is not subject to. China is not, Pakistan is not, Israel is not subject to it. Only two countries: the United States of America and the old Soviet Union. The day has arrived, colleagues. The responsibility has arrived. The duty has arrived. We owe it to the people of America. We owe it to the people of the world to build a missile defense system. We have the technology, or we will secure the technology within the no-too-distant future.

I cannot look at any of you more seriously than I look at you this evening to say that your failure to help this Nation build a missile defense system for its citizens and for the people of the world is a gross dereliction of duty and responsibility bestowed upon you when you took the oath to serve in the United States Congress.

PRESIDENT'S ENERGY POLICY IS HUGE MISSED OPPORTUNITY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized to address the House not beyond midnight.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I do not normally participate in Special Orders, especially at this time of night; but there is something that the House is going to consider tomorrow that I believe we are heading in the wrong direction on, to wit, the President's en-

ergy policy, that I felt compelled to come here this evening to speak about the huge missed opportunity that this energy policy represents.

Mr. Speaker, as I was walking over here this evening thinking about what I was going to say, I looked up at the dome and thought how beautiful it is. I thought about some of the great inspirational things, the farsighted things that have actually taken place in this building; and the thing that really got me thinking about this issue is when John F. Kennedy stood right behind me at the rostrum and said that America, this was back in the early sixties, said America should put a man on the moon and bring him home safely within the decade. A huge challenge at that time before computers were existent and we had multistage rockets, an enormous visionary challenge to America to move forward on a technological basis, even though some of the technology was not there yet. President Kennedy understood the nature of the space race and the potential capability of the country to move forward, and challenged America with a policy.

The President's energy policy, unfortunately, does not challenge America to go anywhere. The President's energy policy, which we will vote on tomorrow in this Chamber, is a continuation of the last 100 years of old technology.

I would like to address, Mr. Speaker, why that policy misses so many golden opportunities. Let me say simply that a summary of this energy policy would be simple. It is of the oil and gas companies, it is by the oil and gas companies, and it is for the oil and gas companies. In ways that should be obvious to anyone who will look at this plan, will realize that the oil and gas companies should smile giant smiles when they consider the enormous giveaways by the American taxpayer to this old industry.

Of the \$33 billion of taxpayer money that essentially is handed out through tax incentives and royalty relief, fully 70 percent or more goes to fossil fuel-based industries, our old technological base. Royalty relief in the millions of dollars to excuse payments that are owed by oil and gas companies to the American taxpayers are written off the books, just excused. Billions of dollars in tax incentives, not for a new industry on the cutting edge of technology but for something that we have been doing for over 100 years, drilling holes in the ground to get oil and gas. This may have been a good policy in 1901, 100 years ago. It may have made sense when we needed to perfect technology, and drilling holes in the ground where we needed to give incentives to the automobile industry. But this massive give away encapsulated in this bill is now 100 years out of date. It is a perfect energy plan for a different century.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to make efforts to change that. I have offered an amendment with a Republican colleague of mine, the gentleman from

Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and I offered an amendment to try to reorient some over to clean fuels that do not burn carbon and to give people breaks when they buy an energy-efficient car or build an energy-efficient house, to help the geothermal industry, to help get more efficient transmission systems, to shift just a portion of those tax giveaways to the oil and gas industries over to these new cutting-edge technologies.

□ 2320

We felt it makes sense if you are going to give an incentive, don't give it to the giant who has been around for a hundred years stomping through the economy, give it for the new babies on the block who have growth potential, the new technologies.

What happened? We are told as of this moment at least, the majority party will not allow us to even vote on that issue. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker, for the U.S. House not to get to vote on the distribution of these tax incentives.

It is interesting because we are told we are going to be allowed a vote on some policy issues. What I think this proves and oil and gas has said, "Well, you can vote on these policy issues, but don't touch my money. Don't let anybody else have a fair crack at these tax incentives." That is wrong.

The second issue I want to address as to why this energy policy is such a missed opportunity is 3 weeks ago, I was on the shores of the Aichilik River up in the Arctic National Refuge, the national refuge established during the Eisenhower administration. I went there to take a look at this refuge and see in fact whether it is something that America ought to preserve. I also spent a day at the Prudhoe Bay oil field taking a look at what an oil field looks like. I came away with two very distinct impressions after 4 days up on the shores of the Arctic. Number one, this Arctic National Refuge that the President wants to violate is the largest intact ecosystem in America. The President is asking us to create an oil field in the very heart of the most pristine area left in America, an area where the largest caribou herd in North America has its calving grounds. He wants us to put oil processing facilities right smack dab where the porcupine caribou herd, over 100,000 strong, calve once a year in their incredible migration over hundreds of miles across Alaska and Canada. The biologists have told us that that could damage the caribou herds. I saw birds from every one of the 50 States in the union, the most prolific bird life I have ever seen. I have tramped around a lot of back country in this country.

Simply put, this is an intact ecosystem that is unique. I came away concluding that what Dwight David Eisenhower had created, George Bush should not put asunder. The other reason for that is taking a look at Prudhoe Bay, although I saw some peo-

ple who I thought were trying to reduce the impact of an oil field on the environment, the fact of the matter is whenever you think of Prudhoe Bay, it is a major industrial complex. It is not a wildlife refuge. It is time for us instead of doing the Arctic Refuge to explore the options we have.

That is the third point I want to make. This energy package is a huge missed opportunity because it does not explore the known options that America has to deal with their energy crisis. To give you an example, the President has proposed dealing in the Arctic Refuge. It will take 10 years to get any oil out of the Arctic Refuge. But let us assume that there is some oil there. The fact of the matter is even in the optimistic assessments of what we could do by destroying this Arctic Refuge, destroying what I believe is the heart of a unique ecosystem, if we simply increased our CAFE standards, our average mileage standards for our cars, by 1½ miles a gallon, just a tiny little scintilla of an improvement, we would save more oil and gas than we are ever going to get out of the Arctic Refuge over decades. We have a clear option. The option of driving and asking our auto industry to produce more fuel efficient vehicles is not going to destroy the Arctic Refuge, is more economically efficient and is clearly within our scientific technological basis, knowledge bank on how to do. The reason I know is that is the National Academy of Sciences came up with a report yesterday indicating that we could increase our fuel mileage, and the technology exists for that, well beyond 1½ miles a gallon in the next 5 years or 10 years.

We can build a natural gas pipeline across Alaska, something that I support. We can encourage and allow the 1,000 drilling rigs that are already drilling for oil, and there were only 300 of them 2 years ago, we have already had a massive increase in drilling activity in this country. We have got those three options. We ought to use these options that are within our technological data bank before we run off and try to destroy a unique wilderness that America has enjoyed since Dwight David Eisenhower was President. We have got those options, and we ought to pass an amendment to this bill tomorrow to take those. I am hoping that the majority party allows such a vote.

The fourth issue. Two years ago in Bellingham, Washington, a pipeline leaked and the gasoline subsequently exploded. It incinerated three children, three boys. Some time after that a pipeline exploded in New Mexico, killing 10 people, massive fireballs. Since those incredible disasters, guess what the U.S. House of Representatives have done as far as passing meaningful pipeline safety legislation to improve the inspections that are mandated in these pipelines. Absolutely nothing. The U.S. House since those tragedies still, since the U.S. Senate, the other Chamber,

has passed legislation, improved legislation this year, this Chamber has not been given an opportunity to vote this year on pipeline safety. Here we have this 300-plus-page energy package coming to the floor, the need demonstrated to build new gasoline pipelines, and 2 years after those tragedies, we still have not been given an opportunity to vote on a pipeline safety bill that for the first time would have a statutory mandate that these pipelines be inspected.

The pipeline in New Mexico that exploded killing 10 people had not been inspected in 50 years, because there is no law requiring it. It is absurd for us to try to think we are going to have this massive expansion of energy and not move forward on pipeline safety legislation. I am here tonight speaking for the parents of these children who were lost in Bellingham, saying it is a crime against nature if this House passes an energy bill without passing a meaningful pipeline safety bill as well. We ought to have a chance to vote on this tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I am urging the majority party to allow that vote and allow meaningful pipeline safety legislation to move ahead.

Let me just suggest if I can to the oil and gas pipeline companies. It is in the industry's interest to pass pipeline safety legislation. The reason it is in their interest is if we are going to build these pipelines, we have to site them. The industry knows that is hard. A lot of times people do not like pipelines running through their backyard, for understandable reasons. One of those understandable reasons is because the dang things blow up because we have lousy pipeline inspection criteria in our country. We need to gain public confidence in the pipeline safety system of this Nation. How do we expect to site these things if we do not have the public confidence? And we do not right now for good reasons. If we are going to expand our energy network of distribution, we need to win the public's confidence, we need to have a pipeline safety bill.

The fifth issue I would like to address, another missed opportunity. The science is overwhelming and observation is overwhelming that we have a problem with the change in the Earth's climate. The science is overwhelming that our contribution of certain gases, carbon dioxide being a principal culprit, are contributing to these changes in the global climate. When I was in the Arctic, I talked to a professor at the University of Alaska who told me that the depth of the Arctic ice has been reduced almost in half in the last several decades as a result of increasing temperatures in the Arctic. The extent of the Arctic ice has been reduced 10 percent. Glaciers are in massive retreat across North America. I talked to rangers in Denali National Park who had only been working there for 15 years who had seen the tree line move north several miles due to increasing temperatures in the Arctic.

The Earth's climate is changing and we are one reason for that. But despite that known science, the President has refused to exercise one single ounce of leadership to help this Nation move forward on a technological basis to deal with global climate change. When you look at this 300 pages, I do not have it tonight, but if you look at that several hundred pages of this energy policy, you will not find any commitment to move forward on global climate change issues. It is incredible. It is incredible at the same time the President of the United States tells the rest of the world that they can go hang, we are not going to deal with global climate change, we are just going to come home and do something in America, well, fine, what is the President proposing? In this energy package, nothing meaningful. I have offered an amendment that at least would direct the Department of Energy to report within a year about the most efficient means we could do, things we could do to deal with global climate change, to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

□ 2330

But instead of even allowing that, this bill has fully three-quarters, three-quarters, of all the tax incentives of \$33 billion go to the industry that is responsible for putting global climate change gasses into the air, the oil and gas and fossil fuel and coal industries. Instead of going forward with new technologies, they want to go backward and ignore this problem of global climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, I am afraid the White House is way behind the American public on this. The American public that I am talking about do get it when it comes to global climate change. They want to see reasonable actions taken. They want to see reasonable research taking place. But, instead of that, this administration has given their political friends 75 percent of all the benefits in this bill, instead of the technologies that could fully move us forward to deal with global climate change. A tremendous missed opportunity.

The sixth issue, and here is a small issue. I will tell you how maybe small things add up. We have introduced a bill that actually has had some bipartisan support called the Home Energy Generation Act. It would allow Americans when they generate electricity in their home or their small business through solar or wind or other fuel cell technology, it would allow them to sell electricity back to the grid. Your meter, when you do this, would run backwards. If you are not using the energy, you sell it back to the utility. Our bill would say to the utility, it has to buy it back from you. A reasonable request.

It is very important to the development of these technologies, solar, wind, fuel cell technology, these distributed energy technologies, it is important be-

cause those are the industries that do not contribute global climate change gasses. It is a small suggestion, but I guess because oil and gas does not like it, it might reduce a little bit our demand for oil and gas and coal, we do not find it in this bill. We do not even get a vote on it. That is wrong. We ought to do some common sense measures on this.

Seventh, here we have a chance for America to lead on these new technologies by having the U.S. Government buy new technologies. Does it not make sense when the U.S. Government is one of the biggest purchasers of equipment in the world to have the U.S. Government lead by buying fuel efficient vehicles, by buying energy efficient electrical appliances, by making sure that our transmission systems are efficient when we do it for the U.S. Government? Does that not make sense, when the climate is changing?

But, no, this bill does not address that issue. It does not have us in the United States Government lead. The only thing the President proposed is to buy a little tiny thing that turns your VCR off when you are not using it. That is a good idea, I suppose, but maybe we can be more effective if we have the U.S. Government buy new fuel efficient vehicles, which we do not do.

We are trying to expect Americans to conserve electricity and use efficient vehicles, and the U.S. Government does not even do it. We hope to have some amendments on the floor to change that tomorrow. We hope the majority party will support it. But, again, a missed opportunity of the energy bill.

Finally, the eighth point I want to make, we have had an energy crisis on the West Coast. I am from the State of Washington. People I represent have seen their energy prices go up 50, 60 percent, and they are going to go up more possibly as a result of this energy crisis. From the beginning, the President has simply said it is a California problem. I am not going to help. He has done a good job of not helping.

We still need some help. I will tell you what we need; we need refunds. The people I represent have been gouged in their electrical bills. For 7 months now we have been beating a drum in this House and outside of this building to ask the administration to lift a finger to help the West Coast, and, finally, after 7 months of banging this drum, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission finally issued a ruling that they want to move forward with evidentiary hearings to set a price so that in certain circumstances it is not too high. They also finally suggested that there be refunds, at least to the California citizens.

Well, we want to make sure that the energy bill makes sure that this happens, not just in California, but in Washington and Oregon as well. Why should not folks in Washington who have been overcharged for electricity have refunds as well as those in California? We have dragged the adminis-

tration kicking and screaming to do something about this, but this energy bill needs to put it in law so that no one can backslide in this regard.

So, tonight I have offered eight things, and I suspect there are more that need fixing in this bill. We are going to give it every single energy we can tomorrow to repair and fix this bill. But, Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard tonight, we will be denied an opportunity to even vote on quite a number of these subjects. I think that that is wrong.

We think this country is not a desperate country. We do not think we are a desperate people. We think we are a creative people. We think we are an optimistic people. We think we are a positive people. We are positive there are things we can do to get us out of this energy pickle, get us out of this global climate change problem, if we will just look at the future instead of adopting an energy policy for the past.

Tomorrow we will have a chance to move for that future if we fix this bill, and reject it if it is not adequately fixed. It is an opportunity we ought to seize.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0122

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY ACT OF 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-178) on the resolution (H. Res. 216) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-179) on the resolution (H. Res. 217) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.