

Whereas a key component of new engagement is mutual efforts to bring greater stability to world energy markets and to support sustained economic growth in Russia and the United States; and

Whereas both Russia and the United States can play a critical role in supporting energy development among the resource rich countries of the former Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) in proceeding with [this important energy dialogue?] the Governments of the Russian Federation and the United States should consult widely with interested parties to promote exchanges and to seek support from the broadest cross section of business and civil societies; and

(B) the United States should remove trade and economic barriers [with respect to Russia?], including provisions of law that are no longer applicable, such as chapter 1 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (commonly referred to as “Jackson-Vanik”); and

(2) Congress—

(A) supports the actions of the Russian Duma to strengthen investment incentives in the Russian energy sector, such as full implementation of production sharing legislation, encouragement of regulatory reform, and other measures to attract international investment into the Russian energy sectors;

(B) supports the actions of the Russian Duma to permit full implementation of [energy?] projects on Sakhalin Island and in the Timan-Pechora region, all of which offer unique opportunities to increase world and United States supplies of petroleum;

(C) encourages regulatory and investment framework in Russia to expand Russia's oil and gas export capacities;

(D) supports the accession of Russia to the World Trade Organization (WTO); and

(E) supports continued high level and sustained exchanges on energy development between the Governments of Russia and the United States and between businesses in the two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I would also call my colleagues' attention to a speech being given at the National Press Club this Thursday by Senator CONRAD BURNS. In that speech he will focus on the need for America to move toward joint U.S.-Russian energy cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, one final point, I will be contacting the administration tomorrow because the upcoming summit on October 1 and 2 in Houston is critically important, but to this date my understanding is it does not have a large focus on the legislative process as part of the energy initiative. And, obviously, we cannot have a joint energy relationship unless both bodies in both countries are directly involved. So I would call upon the administration to provide a provision in that conference for Members of the House and the Senate, members of the Duma and the Federation Council to speak to the issues of importance that will allow us to implement the ideas and the proposals of both President Bush and President Putin on ways that we can expand the cooperation between the U.S. and Russia in the energy arena.

UNITED STATES SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN UNITED NATIONS WORLD SUMMIT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned this last week from participation in the United Nations World Summit for Sustainable Development. It was truly an amazing experience, Mr. Speaker. It was the largest conference ever conducted by the United Nations. It was attended by over 100 heads of state who took part in the summit, joined by over 21,000 people, 9,000 delegates, 8,000 representatives of a variety of nongovernmental organizations and 4,000 members of the press. It was something that I will remember for a variety of reasons.

In one respect it was interesting in terms of the context in which the summit was taking place. Amidst news of drought, forest fires, devastating storms and flooding around the world, millions of people had been displaced in Asia, there were disastrous floods in central Europe, everybody that I met with and I had the opportunity to visit with the representatives of over two dozen countries, there was not one person when did not feel that the terrible ecological disasters that provided the backdrop in the news were not somehow connected to the cavalier treatment that we have accorded to the environment. There was virtually no skepticism expressed on behalf of the concerns for global climate change, for instance.

Now, while personally embarrassed that the United States did not have a greater presence, and somewhat overwhelmed by the environmental challenges we face, I returned from that experience with a greater sense of optimism than I would have thought possible just a month ago.

Now, make no mistake about it, I fear the United States was the big loser at that summit. I mention that there were 104 heads of state, not the President of the United States, who was staying on his ranch in Crawford, Texas, and participating in various fund-raising events around the country, allowing the United States to be portrayed as an obstructionist or uninterested in a conference to which most other countries sent their leaders. I found a certain amount of irony when the United States, at least some members of the administration are beating their drums for a potential action against Iraq, when a number of people noted the need if we are going to be moving forward to have a global alliance similar to that which was assembled by President Bush's father when he was involved with the war against Iraq with Operation Desert Storm. It seemed particularly ironic that the head of our government, who had an

opportunity to meet with our global partners, strengthen bonds, and obtain support for difficult policies that require international cooperation was not there. It had a number of other spill-over effects. Frankly, we did not get credit for many of the more positive developments that we were involved with.

For instance, during the negotiations on the plan of implementation, which was the international agreement produced at the summit, the United States negotiators opposed most of the specific targets in the plan dealing with climate change and energy. The United States opposed language that would have set a goal for industrialized countries to increase their use of renewable energy by just 2 percent over the next decade. It is kind of hard to believe that the United States, with all of its resources and technology, its leadership, with a public that understands the need for energy independence and not being further reliant on unstable energy sources in the Middle East, hard to believe that our administration thinks it is not possible that the United States could meet the challenge of increasing our use of renewables in the next decade by just 2 percent.

It was disappointing that the United States seemed to avoid any discussion of global climate change, our contribution to the problem, and meaningful solutions.

The United States did finally support the summit goal to cut in half the number of people living without basic sanitation, matching our objectives for clean water, drinking water. This was important, Mr. Speaker, because by linking those two goals together, we have the opportunity to increase 300 percent the effectiveness of our investments. And I was pleased that at the last minute the United States abandoned its advocacy of destructive language that would have undercut women's reproductive health and freedom. It was a little embarrassing for a while that our partners in the fight for reproductive women's rights were those coming from the Arab states. In its original form it would have been a declaration that the Taliban would have felt comfortable with.

□ 1945

But as I say, this was one area where we were able to see some changes that took place.

Mr. Speaker, I have some other thoughts and observations relative to the experience here; but I note that I have been joined by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Los Angeles, California (Ms. SOLIS), and I yield to the gentlewoman to make some comments, a woman who is deeply concerned about environmental issues and provided leadership internationally and at home for herself in California.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would like to also thank the gentleman from Oregon for putting this discussion here before the public.

And I too, Mr. Speaker, rise to express my frustration with the leaders of our country, particularly the Bush administration, in their failure to be fully supportive of all the participants at the recent Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development. The Johannesburg conference was a meeting where nearly 200 countries came together for 10 days to search for ways to bring clean water and sanitation to nearly 2 billion of the world's poorest people, the world's poorest people.

Because of this administration's unwillingness to help meet the needs of our global society, there were a few binding commitments made at the conference and our world leaders left that conference without addressing some of the most pending issues, like issues regarding AIDS, smokestack emissions, or uneven benefits of global trade. Carbon dioxide emissions, as my colleagues know, have risen 18 percent above 1990 levels in the U.S., by 11 percent in Japan, 13 percent in Canada, and almost 30 percent in Australia. As our carbon dioxide levels have risen, so too have our instances of weather-related disasters, and we see that here in the U.S. more and more.

Since 1975 these natural disasters, namely droughts, windstorms, and floods, have increased by 160 percent, killing approximately 440,000 people and causing \$480 billion worth of damage in the 1990s alone. And still the U.S. negotiators fought efforts to decrease our world's dependence on dirty fossil fuels and increase our focus on alternative energy use by refusing to commit to deadlines that would have held our world leaders accountable? Any teacher or student will say that deadlines are necessary to ensure progress. We know that. And yet this administration would rather continue to allow people to live in unsanitary and unhealthy and unthinkable conditions in the name of flexibility.

During this past week, we heard repeatedly from U.S. officials that actions speak louder than words. If our actions are truly commendable and beneficial, why does this administration fear committing to sustainable development not only in action but in clear words and statements? There must be some form of accountability. No longer can we live without the understanding that this is a global society and we have to work together with real plans and real goals and real accountability to ensure that development is sustainable, not just in this country, in the U.S., but in the entire world. We have a responsibility.

The world's scientists predict that the Earth's temperature could rise by a global average of 6 degrees celsius by the year 2100. This reality demands action now; and 10 years ago at the Rio conference, many new initiatives and goals were put forward, and at this conference there were only two instances where we set a true goal. Number one, by 2015 we committed cutting

in half the proportion of people who did not have access to basic sanitation. Number two, we established greater marine-protected networks. And in every case existing commitments were either reaffirmed, watered down, or altogether trashed.

When are we going to get serious about solving the problems of sustainable development? The goal of the summit was to implement a vision for a healthier and more sustainable future; but it fell far short, and now our country risks falling behind our competitors who will develop innovative and profitable and clean and efficient technologies, but where does that leave us? Where does that leave the United States?

It is time for this administration to start focusing on sustainable development.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we have also been joined this evening by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), my colleague from Carmel/Monterey, a gorgeous district in California. I have been impressed since the day I first came to Congress with the Congressman's deep appreciation for the environment and the leadership that he has provided, whether it is for scenic highways, coastal conservation, understanding the role that sustainable agriculture plays, and was host to the first White House conference on the oceans.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for comments on the world environmental summit.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my colleague and good friend, for yielding; and I want to congratulate him and my other congressional colleagues who went to Johannesburg, South Africa. While he was in South Africa, I had the privilege of being in his beautiful State, in fact in his district of Portland, Oregon; and I can tell my colleagues that indeed the western United States and particularly Oregon is one of the most beautiful States in the United States; and I would recommend to everybody who wants to see spectacular scenery and uncrowded highways just to visit that great State.

My colleagues all came together in Johannesburg about 2 weeks ago to address the global issues that exist at the intersection of economic development and environmental sustainability. I happen to be very keenly interested in the outcome of that because my district that my colleague just mentioned is the salad bowl center of the world and we cannot continue to produce fresh fruits and vegetables if we do not have a clean environment, clean water, clean air; and we know that from our interest in trying to develop small business economy through tourism and ecotourism that indeed the environment sells. Well, the environment cannot sell and cannot be there for small businesses if it is dirty.

My colleagues all went to Johannesburg to declare along with other coun-

tries the commitment to making the Earth cleaner, a more healthy place for humans and all living creatures; and I, following the press article, I was struck by how many poor Nations, who could least afford to send representatives from their government and non-government organizations, but indeed did hope that they could persuade the richer countries to help them grow their economies in socially and environmentally sustainable ways.

I think one of the most positive outcomes of the summit was the agreement by all nations to begin managing the marine resources with an ecosystem approach and to restore fish stocks to sustainable levels by the year 2015. I pledge to continue to work with the U.S. and all nations to make these goals and reverse the devastating trends in pollution and overfishing that we see in the oceans all over the world.

I was shocked, as my colleague's comments pointed out, and I am sad to say that I believe that our administration remains blinded to these issues; and I think it remains blinded because they really have not listened beyond the short-term special interests, corporate interests in America.

Let me tell my colleagues that I represent the State of California and chair the Democratic delegation in that State. Look at California. I mean, we have that comment here that sort of anything but California, but indeed, California is a nation-state. It is 33 million people. It is the fifth largest economy in the world. It is the most diversified in businesses, everything from Hollywood to Silicon Valley to agriculture. It was the leading agriculture State; and it goes on and on and on.

Yet this State that is such an economic engine, which has more cars, more people to consume energy, more air conditioners, more houses, more buildings to heat and cool, more of everything, has created policies in that State, political policies, that are implemented and carried out. The bottom line is that California consumes the least energy per capita of any State in the United States.

Why am I saying this? Because if the U.S. remains unwilling to truly come to the global negotiating table, strong commitments toward such efforts as reducing the emission of greenhouse gases and urging a change of the way from an unsustainable pattern of consumption and production, then California is going to suffer, the businesses of California. Why? Because in business there is a need to have fairness, and fairness essentially is a question of certainty.

If one is going to take capital and put it into something at risk, they want enough certainty that they are going to be able to get a return for their investment. That is what California businesses do every single day. Only the balance of that certainty is shifted away because the Federal Government fails to take a lead in leveling

the playing field, which means, really, upgrading the playing field so that California, which is doing things that are environmentally very sensitive, gets treated wrongly in this town. It hurts all the small businesses who are not able to compete on a level playing field, and it certainly hurts our big corporations.

Are they going to the State legislature and asking the State to repeal all these tough environmental laws in California? Absolutely not. In fact, our national leadership should be championing the leadership of cleaning up the pollution. This administration should be acknowledging the leadership of California Governors. When we look at them, Republicans and Democrats alike, Republican Governor George Deukmejian; a Republican, Governor Pete Wilson; and now Governor Gray Davis, who just signed the toughest automobile car sequestration emission standards in the world.

That is the kind of leadership that American people are asking for. Was it easy to do politically? Absolutely not. Everybody who was in the automobile industry opposed it; and yet California has the largest automobile sales, the largest consumption of automobiles in the United States.

Why was it accomplished? Because it really was the right thing to do. California really wants to move towards sustaining itself internally on energy and making sure that energy is clean. We are the leader of wind energy; we are the leader of solar energy; we are the leader in geothermal energy; we are the leader in biomass production. All of these alternatives, which show that we can meet these really tough standards and still make a profit, I think ought to be recognized.

Business really needs fairness at the national level, an equal playing field; and I ask this administration, I ask the President of the United States, to help bring up the rest of the Nation to California standards, to recognize, as the leaders in California, ought to be praising Governor Davis. But because it is an election year and people are sensitive about partisanship and the President is a Republican and the Governor is a Democrat, that instead of praising him for doing the right things, there is a criticism going on and that criticism is just unjustified when we look at the voices that were in Johannesburg and what they were saying.

They want this Nation to join California, to be more like California, so that together we can lead the world, not drag the world down, which is the image that we had in Johannesburg.

I am absolutely thrilled that members of the legislative branch, the checks and balance system that we have in our Constitution, were able to go to Johannesburg and to indicate to the delegates that not everybody in the United States was against setting some really tough global standards and to providing the money and capital and leadership to move the world in that

way. I am thrilled that my colleagues and others, including, I see, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is here, people that ought to be thanked by the American people for their commitment to making sure that the world understands that we in the United States are trying to, in Congress, invest moneys in developing appropriate technologies so that those technologies can be applied in the developing countries around the world so that they can indeed have a clean, healthy environment to raise their children in.

I thank my colleagues for representing us at the world summit and thank them for having this colloquy tonight.

□ 2000

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's attendance and his focusing on the leadership, for instance, that has happened now in California dealing with more fuel-efficient cars. I think it is clear that the American public would have responded, if Congress and the administration, when we were dealing with an energy bill, would have stepped forward to produce similar standards on a national level to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, to protect the environment, to reduce greenhouse gases has ultimately saved the taxpayer money.

The gentleman referenced our being joined this evening by our colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). Let me just say that one of the positive aspects of this conference, for me, was watching men and women from around the world who were policymakers and who understand the need to protect the environment come together. I had the privilege of watching our colleague from Maine participate in an organization called GLOBE, Global Legislators Organized for a Balanced Environment, and I am pleased to say that the United States Congress was well represented in a bipartisan fashion.

I think the international president, or chair, is our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), who was eloquent on several occasions in pointing out that there is some bipartisan support for improving environmental standards. The national chair is the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) chaired some interesting negotiations with representatives from a dozen different countries around the world dealing with renewable energy.

I am pleased that the gentleman is here. I am pleased to have watched him in action provide some leadership in Johannesburg on behalf of not just the United States but parliamentarians from around the world, and I would be honored if the gentleman would join in this discussion at this point.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and it certainly was true that being in Johannesburg for the time we were there was a very inter-

esting experience. My colleague mentioned the meeting I chaired on renewable energy, and that in itself was an eye opener, I guess I would say, because we had around the table several representatives from Japan, two from Slovenia, two from Sweden, one from Thailand, one from the Philippines, one from Uruguay, and I am sure some others. It was a cross-section of nations large and small from really all around the globe. South Africa was included as well.

The interesting thing, to me, is how much different countries are trying to make sure that these international goals that are being talked about more elsewhere than here in the United States somehow fit their own countries and their own experience. And that is basically what you would expect. But what is true, I think, from this experience and from others is that most other countries realize that the climate is changing fast; that it is due to human emissions, carbon emissions in particular, and that, and this is where the United States is not following, that we need to do something about it. We need to do something fairly serious quickly. It is clear that the Europeans are taking the lead in a number of renewable energy technologies, wind and solar and small hydro and others, and we are being left behind.

I happened to go to an exhibit by BMW, where they were describing an engine that can run both on gasoline or alternatively on hydrogen, and they were arguing that this kind of internal combustion engine that can run on hydrogen is a transition to a hydrogen future. One of the problems is that, of course, if we are going to have cars that run on hydrogen, and in fact where the by-product is not carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, or whatever, but water, where you could get to zero emissions quickly, we do not have a lot of hydrogen filling stations around this country or in Europe. And they were talking about this as a way to do a transition.

Mr. FARR of California. If the gentleman would yield. I am very curious about the gentleman's discussions. We spend a lot of time here in the House of Representatives and on the floor arguing trade issues, and obviously issues come up about trade sanctions. When the gentleman looked at the commitment that people were making in South Africa, did he get any feeling that we may be isolating ourselves from future markets because our standards are not good enough, our automobiles are not clean enough; and, therefore, they are not going to allow them to be sold in those countries; that our other exports of our machinery does not meet high enough standards to be marketed in those countries, and that we are really shutting off our ability to do trade?

Even though a lot of times the brainpower for that technology really rests in the United States, it is just that we have not had a commitment to investing that brainpower in the tools that

can be incorporated in our polluting instruments.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no doubt that the gentleman is right. A couple of things. It is clear that the EU legislature and individual European countries are setting higher standards. They are setting some standards. They are setting higher standards, obviously, than the Federal Government here for carbon emissions. And the result is that they are triggering the need to do a substantial amount of research and development in renewable fuels, in ways of converting to new fuels, and to having more renewable technologies.

I think it is likely, based on what I heard in Johannesburg, that Europe is going to go roaring by the United States when it comes to developing new technologies of this kind. That is going to leave us, in the long run, at a disadvantage in the European market. And when carbon restrictions come in this country, as they surely will, it will leave U.S. automakers and others really behind the 8 ball.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Could I just interject for a moment? Because I enjoyed touring that exhibit with the gentleman from Maine by BMW, and it did strike several chords. One, to the point made by our colleague from California, we are already being foreclosed by certain market segments. Next year, there are three hybrid vehicles that consumers can choose from, all made in Japan. And they have a waiting list for them. People want them. They are in my colleague's district, in my district, and it is a little frustrating to see that.

We have, however, American automakers who are meeting the standards, the higher standards in Europe. They are meeting the 40-mile-per-gallon fleet standard. They are having to contend with that. They are competing in the European market already. But they are somehow feeling that they cannot impose those higher standards here at home. And I find that a little frustrating.

And I know that the gentleman's point is right. In the long run, to the extent to which we resist that, we are going to lose business, not just internationally but we are going to lose business here at home.

Mr. FARR of California. Well, it is rather embarrassing, if not shameful, that our country that is always sort of championed as being in a leadership role of higher quality, of better standards, of caring for living things, protection of species, and so on, would be so negative about in this race for to clean up the planet; that we are not at the front of the parade.

It is embarrassing for me from a State that is trying to be at the front of the parade but not having any cooperation from the Federal Government to keep us up there or to encourage us to go further by bringing the rest of the Nation up to those levels.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If I could make one last point, then turn it back to my

colleague from Maine. Just following up on that, in that session that the gentleman from Maine chaired, we were joined by a friend of ours from Great Britain, a member of parliament, Tony Coleman, who pointed out that in Great Britain in the 1990s, they made the transition from dirty coal-fired power plants to cleaner gas power plants to generate electricity.

We in the United States, if we, instead of as the administration is suggesting, undercutting the new source review and dealing with the requirement of our own Clean Air Act for these dirty power plants that are having a devastating effect on my colleague's State, amongst others, we would just deal with the spirit and the letter of the law, clean up those power plants, we would reduce our emissions to the level that we had in 1990 and be well on our way to meeting the Kyoto protocols.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not think people realize that one-third of all carbon emissions in this country come from these old coal-fired and oil-fired power plants that are grandfathered under the Clean Air Act. If we just bring them up to new source review standards, we will do an enormous amount to improve the carbon emissions situation in this country. That is probably the easiest step to take. It is probably the first step that we will take at some point to deal with these old power plants, and it makes no sense to keep putting it off.

I thought it was interesting, the meeting that GLOBE held. They had all sorts of meetings. In fact, GLOBE was a very active organization in Johannesburg. They did a terrific job. But the meeting I was chairing was all about the most controversial topic in Johannesburg, which is whether we should set targets and timetables for renewable energy.

Right now, globally, renewable energy sources, as defined by the U.N., represent about 2 percent of all power generated in the world. And the question was should we move to a target of getting, as I recall, a 10 percent increase by 2020 over the 2 percent that was applicable today and in 2000. It was a major goal but an achievable goal. At least the rest of the world thought it was achievable.

But it struck me that the problem the United States has, and particularly the Bush administration right now, is we cannot argue for a position to be adopted internationally if we are not willing to advocate for that position at home. And the fact is that the President's Clear Skies Initiative, so-called Clear Skies Initiative, basically would reduce carbon emissions in this country by about as much as if we did nothing at all.

Carbon emissions are continuing to go up, but they are going up slightly less than they did in the past. Under the President's proposal, they will continue to go up at a significant rate but

slightly less than they did in the past. The rest of Europe, the Japanese, and countries in Africa and in South America, are saying what good does that do? You have to first stabilize the emissions; stop them from growing. And that is really what we need to do.

So that was a tremendous point of contention throughout Johannesburg. The U.S. never gave in. They never agreed to any targets or timetables. But I believe that the reason is clear: The President has basically said global warming is a problem. Adjust to it. And that is not the kind of response that the rest of the world believes is responsible.

Mr. FARR of California. It certainly does not demonstrate leadership. There is no way anyone can take the United States position and argue that we are a leader in this field.

I think we have been a leader in bringing about the consciousness of global pollution and admitting that we are, as tremendous consumers of our material goods, leading the world in pollution. And we have been a leader in recognizing that we have to do something about it, but that has always been initiated more by local communities and States. There has been sort of an attitude in America that you think globally and act locally. And certainly that has been the response coming out of the West, and I think out of my colleague's State of Maine as well.

The frustration that I have experienced in my political life has been that without leadership we do not get commitment of research dollars, of essentially those key dollars or those lending programs through international banks.

Attention was brought to me by a constituent who actually worked out the technology with a lot of firms, none of which were American companies, on how we could reduce all oil dependence on all the islands around the world. All of the islands do not produce oil, so they have to ship it in. It is very costly. Yet they are surrounded by two things; they are surrounded by sun and they are surrounded by saltwater. If we could use the sun to convert the saltwater, one, we get fresh water for the island, which, in addition, could be used for mariculture, so we could start growing fish products onshore that would have global markets as well as a domestic market; and, two, we reduce the independence of having to ship this oil. Hawaii is a good example in our country. And we have a by-product of clean water and an energy source.

□ 2015

That is very expensive to do; and the first time it is done, it is not cost effective. There is no profit. There needs to be a risk, and usually those kinds of risks are taken by government loans and subsidies, but we have to get it started.

I wonder if there was any discussion in Johannesburg about how to get the money in place to do some of these absolutely essential things.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We met with business people, governments, and with academicians from around the world; and it does not seem that this is something that should be beyond our capacity.

First, the simple fact is that the future of energy in some way is going to deal with solar energy. In 1 hour, the sun radiates as much energy as the world consumes in a year with all of its fossil fuels. Being able to advance the technology, which is moving forward, to be able to harness virtually an unlimited supply of energy for the Earth's needs seems to be a top priority.

We had advocated, all of us in the U.S. delegation, Members of Congress from both parties, suggested there be one simple step, that when we have all of these export credit agencies, OPEC, the World Bank, Ex-Im, that there be a commitment that 10 percent of the energy facilities be renewables. We could do that with the stroke of a pen. It would move forward, help jump-start this. Sadly, that was resisted.

The goal of 15 percent by 2015 seems to be within our grasp if we use opportunities like this. But both gentlemen have been talking about United States leadership. I am frustrated that the United States steps back and uses excuses in lieu of leadership. In that session that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) chaired, there was a minister from India, and we point out that the United States consumes 36 times the energy and has 36 times the greenhouse gas emissions than the average Indian. The average citizen of India emits one-sixth of the greenhouse gases of the world average, whereas the United States emits six times the world average, 25 percent for less than 5 percent of the world's population. Yet somehow the administration feels that this desperately poor country of India that is emitting less than one-thirtieth of the greenhouse gases than we are, somehow they should step up and assume leadership. I think it is an abrogation of our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I appreciated the way the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) guided that forward to have a resolution that was approved by these parliamentarians unanimously.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, his point is an excellent one. One thing that we need to do more of with both China and India, they are going to be using some coal. Both have supplies of coal. They are developing their economies faster than other countries around the world, both are in different ways. But the best technology we have for clean coal use we ought to be making sure gets transferred to the Chinese and the Indians so they can do the best they can in holding down emissions.

I want to say a couple of other things about the U.S. position. It struck me that the problem was not that the United States did nothing, but that our

reach was so short. By rejecting any effort to set targets and timetables for getting to more renewable energy, we were basically sitting back on the primary issue before the conference.

I would say the administration took several positions. They said we want to establish partnerships, partnerships between governments and the private sector and the nonprofit sector. Many of them were rolled out, and many of them I think are going to make a contribution. There is nothing wrong with a proposal for partnerships that deal with some of these environmental issues. The administration was also saying that we need to insist on good governance because so often aid money has been wasted when it goes to governments that are corrupt or inefficient; and that, too, makes good sense. But, it fell so far short of what the expectations were around the world, and I think in many quarters here in the United States.

It was only right near the end of the conference, probably a day before I left, which was the day before Colin Powell spoke, that we actually agreed to one target which had to do with sanitation, trying to move and I do not remember the exact number, but to cut in half the number of people living without sanitary and sewage facilities around the globe by 2020. But there was a case where at last, after a lot of negotiation, the U.S. finally came around to the position that the rest of the world had arrived at a long time before, and we were the lingering hold-out.

I just want to make one more point about the mood. At a number of different meetings, I got the sense that we do face a crisis. Sustainable development is more than the environment. In fact, it is more than the economy of a country plus its environment. It also involves how people are living and whether they have a standard of living that is appropriate and one that is reasonable for them to expect given the circumstances of that country. In other words, sustainable development to the rest of the world has an economic component, an environmental component, and a social component. Often here in the United States we kind of leave out that social component, perhaps because we are at least generally the wealthiest country in the world. But it did seem to me that there was a sense both in a meeting that I went to on Latin America and in some of the conversations on Africa that this globalizing system, this growing uniformity of financial structures in developing countries, was not working very well for ordinary people.

In too many countries around the world which have been forced to open their markets both to goods and capital from other countries, they have found that the capital that comes rushing in can go rushing out just as fast; and they are concerned that their economies are not growing. They are stagnating. In Eastern Europe, after

the breakup of the Soviet Union, in Africa, even Latin America, the rates of growth have been negative or so slow as to cause serious social problems.

Mr. Speaker, that is a component of this debate that needs to be addressed; and I think it needs to be addressed by making sure that when we set policies, whether trade policies or aid policies, we are doing things that empower people at the grass roots in countries so they can go out and make a living and start a business and have the kind of economic growth that we have experienced so often in this country.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that concerned me was that we seem in the more developed countries to have a blind spot towards that equity, and there did seem to be a dual standard.

There was a fascinating meeting which discussed the devastating impact that the more advanced countries' agricultural policies have on poor countries. All three of us had deep reservations about the agriculture bill that passed on this floor and was signed into law by the President just a couple of months ago.

But the European Union, for example, is ignoring its own egregious agricultural practices, which are actually worse than ours. For instance, poor countries in Africa were denied access to the European sugar market where prices are kept artificially high, some three times the world price, to deal with the sugar beet industry in Europe. Poor countries cannot have access to that market; and the Europeans are producing so much that they are dumping that sugar on the world market, undercutting the poor sugar farmers in Africa, much like corn from the United States is going to Mexico and driving poor farmers out of business in Mexico. And our farmers are getting rich subsidies from our government. It costs them more to produce than they get from the market, and the surplus is dumped overseas.

Yet we have aggressive policies to try to force some of the poor countries to open their markets to protect intellectual property I understand, to protect capital I understand, to protect drug patents; and sometimes it is less understandable why we do not do more to protect poor countries, and yet we hammer them with our inconsistent, and I would be prepared to argue, improper agricultural policies that are bad for the taxpayer, bad for the environment, and bad for most farmers and end up devastating poor farmers around the world.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I think what turns that around is leadership. Leadership needs to be provided to get us out of the broken modality.

I think back to the years when I was a Peace Corps volunteer and had no resources except the people. They did not want to necessarily be American consumers and have all these goods, because they could not afford them; but they wanted a better life-style. What I

think they wanted from the leadership was how can we have a better life-style without having to pay the price of pollution. They would say we live in pollution and streets that do not have sewers. We live in houses that do not have clean water, or any water at all. We live in houses that have no electricity, or if we have it, it is very weak because it is borrowed from what they call contraband electricity.

They were not asking for more bad, more ugly, more evil; they were asking how do we use the smart technologies in the United States. And I think we have done that on a couple of examples. For example, cell phones, a great technology, have eliminated a need to wire everything. Those things are very, very costly; and we are using a technology where satellites can help us communicate all over the globe. That has a social impact. It allows people access to information, and we do not necessarily have to build poles. Look at how if we could tear down all of the power lines in the United States how much more attractive many communities would be if they did not have all of those wires hanging everywhere.

My experience has been to lead us into the appropriate technology that is necessary for us to be in this world. The gentleman mentioned corn in Mexico. The one thing that the Mexican farmers are doing is they are starting to grow organic. Where is the organic market in the United States? They do not have to buy a lot of expensive fertilizers and get into the expensive infrastructure to compete with America. They have cheap labor. Organic farming is labor intensive. It takes more people to produce a crop than just doing it with chemicals.

There were examples of where American technology, American ingenuity can help countries overcome some of their pollution problems. I think what we have not demonstrated in this country is the will, the political will, the leadership that it takes to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's recognizing the struggle that there was in Johannesburg with trying to defend America.

□ 2030

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Does the gentleman from Maine have some concluding thoughts?

Mr. ALLEN. Just a few. One of the interesting things I found in Johannesburg is people look at us the same way that we look at other countries. That is, we look at the policies set by the current administration, whether it is Britain or France or Germany, Russia, wherever, as being sort of the beginning and end of opinion on that subject in that country. And I think that one function that the six of us served who were over there is that we had a different view from the current administration, and that seemed to be of great comfort to a lot of people, that we were having a debate in this country, that it

was not simply the case that people in the United States were saying, "No, we're putting our head in the sand. We're pretending that climate change isn't going on. We've decided to adapt somehow."

I do not know about you, but in my State, every summer is warmer than the last. We used to have snow all the time at Christmas. Now it is relatively rare. The changes are visible to most people even though they are hard to quantify. But when you look at them, when you look at the numbers, and I can take one State, Alaska. In the last 30 years the average temperature in Alaska has increased by 5.4 degrees. That is an enormous increase. In many places the permafrost is melting, the roads are sagging, trees are tipping over, buildings have less secure foundations. It is leading to dramatic changes.

I just think that what we have got to do here at home, those of us who believe this is a serious problem that needs to be dealt with, is keep urging our friends and colleagues to take this issue seriously, because as soon as you take climate change seriously, a whole set of things follow. You have to have an increasing emphasis on renewable energy of all kinds, small hydro, wind, solar, fuel cells and all of those technologies. I suspect that all of the estimates of cost are a little out of whack, because what we are saying is, with the right commitment, we are going to stimulate new technologies, the development of new technologies that will give an additional boost to significant parts of our economy. The rest of the world understands that. That was evident at Johannesburg. It is time we caught up with the rest of the world.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I appreciate the leadership that he developed. I know it was not easy, having witnessed a little tiny bit of his Maine summer the week before, I do not know how hard it was for him to fly halfway around the world for a couple of days, but I think the conference was better for it and I deeply appreciate his willingness to do so. I must say that at the summit, I was encouraged by some other people that we encountered, where some of the hypocrisy of some of the richer countries, they were taken to task by well-organized and articulate poor people, by representatives of nongovernmental organizations, by a growing consensus of elected leaders like the gentleman helped guide dealing with renewable energy. We saw business step forward to embrace the challenge of the Kyoto Protocol.

The gentleman from Maine and I went to Abutu village where there were spectacular exhibits, one that was managed in part by the Smithsonian, that had a number of United States agencies that told a lot about the environment. But if you looked at that exhibit, and we walked through the exhibit tent, including the Department of

Energy and NOAA and EPA, the Department of the Interior, there was no information on global warming, on climate change. None. But if you went next door to the exhibit of BP, British Petroleum, there they had information. There you had an international corporation that has sometimes had its problems with the environmentalists, but they have a saying, "BP stands for Beyond Petroleum." They have made a corporate commitment to meet the Kyoto protocols as a corporation. We found that the World Business Council for Sustainable Development joined in the fight for a real target for investment in renewable energy. We had citizen advocates and nongovernmental organizations that were effective in holding governments accountable. They were able to cut through the secrecy and the backroom deals. They provided us with the best information about what was actually occurring, who was doing what. I think it is important to note that their reactions were anything but knee jerk. I think they were very sophisticated in terms of their analysis of trade, environmental practices, the impact on our globe as well as proposing simple, commonsense solutions that are actually within our power to implement. I personally came away from that summit surprisingly encouraged.

Yes, at times the problems seemed overwhelming: 325 million children not in school; 1.1 billion people without clean water; 2.4 billion without adequate sanitation. Yet amazingly progress is possible in sanitation, water supply, affordable housing and agriculture. The citizens from around the world and business leaders are moving in that direction. It is clear that we have the know-how, the skill to change current destructive practices and teach people how to help themselves. I was stunned by the potential resources that are within our grasp. For what Americans spend on cosmetics every year, we could largely meet the target for sanitation, saving millions of lives each year and promoting a more stable world. By reforming our costly, environmentally damaging farm programs, we could help poor farmers around the world while we protect the U.S. taxpayer, the environment and our family farmers, cleaning up, as we mentioned, the dirty coal plants as required by the Clean Air Act in this country, and I salute the gentleman from Maine's leadership to try to make sure the United States does something about it, would put us on track to meet the Kyoto goals. Simply by doing what we know how to do, spending money more wisely, following our own environmental laws and heeding the wishes of the public, we can save the planet.

The world summit, I feel, was an important step in pulling these pieces together and making them a reality. The United States is the world's richest country. As its biggest polluter, it has a special obligation and responsibility

to address these global environmental issues. I assure you that I am willing to work with you to make sure that we in Congress move in that direction.

Did the gentleman from California have any concluding thoughts?

Mr. FARR of California. I just want to thank the gentleman. I would love to see the leadership, the political leadership, elected leadership and the administration, would it not be wonderful if the electricity on the President of the United States' ranch was totally generated by solar power and that the vehicles that were driven on that ranch or were used were these hybrid vehicles as other countries have had. That is the kind of leadership. We need to demonstrate by our own actions as I have at home by using solar power to generate energy in my piece of property down on the Big Sur coast. That is the kind of leadership I think that the people are asking for, is demonstrate by your own use. My wife wants to get for our next car a hybrid car. I think each one of us can do our part. But at the same time we have to look and commend those areas, as I said, like California that has really moved on a huge scale to convert 33 million people into being energy-conscious, and to being environmentally sensitive.

I want to thank the gentleman for representing our Nation's viewpoint in the global conference in South Africa. I appreciate him and our other colleagues in this House attending that.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman from California. When we talk about leading by example in energy efficiency, does the gentleman from Maine have any experience?

Mr. ALLEN. I have done the same thing with a vacation property I have in Maine, which is convert to solar power. It is absolutely wonderful. We all need to take whatever steps we can. The gentleman from Oregon referred to the hybrid cars that exist. I do understand that Ford next year is going to come out with a hybrid. I have not seen it yet, but I understand they are working on one. It may be out next year. So there are going to be opportunities for the American public to save energy, save money and contribute to making this a cleaner planet.

I thank the gentleman very much for organizing this special order.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman for joining me.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5319

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5319. The record should reflect that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) was intended to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 5319.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

THE IRAQI SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I found the previous speakers' comments interesting. In part their comments were accurate, but I should point out that when we talk about the Kyoto treaty, what they should bring to the attention of the body is that when it was voted on by the United States Senate, the vote was 99-0. 99-0. That was not all Republicans, that was Democrats and Republicans combined in the United States Senate. Not one vote in favor of that so-called treaty. Why? Because that treaty unfairly assaulted the United States of America.

Obviously we as elected representatives of this country want to stand in front of this body and stand in front of the American public and commit to do things that are better. We can do a lot more to conserve, everybody in this country, in this world, can do more to conserve and, frankly, conservation right now is going to get us a lot further than my colleague's suggestion that the President of the United States convert his ranch in Texas to solar power. Conservation is the answer right now. In the long run, solar power, in the long run energy from waves, in the long run energy from other sources is what is going to be the answer, but in the short time, sitting here and condemning the United States of America as some people might do or feeling that the United States of America should hang its head low is wrong. The leading technologies in the world on environmental control, on assisting us with stopping pollution, on making coal cleaner burning and so on, without a doubt the leading technologies in the world are developed by the scientists in the United States of America. There is no other country in the world that has helped more other countries with their environmental problems, assisting them, sending them financial aid, doing anything we can to assist, than the United States of America.

The United States of America has nothing to apologize about. The United States of America is committed to do things better. But I for one am tired of seeing foreign country after foreign country after foreign country bash the United States of America. And we see it come to this floor. Some of our colleagues, while well intended, seem to get up here and become apologists for the greatest country in the history of the world. This country, the United States of America, has fought for other countries, has gone overseas more than any other country in the history of the world to fight not for American land but to fight for other people in this world.

Who do you think led the battle in Bosnia? Who do you think got communism out of Europe? You can go to example after example after example. It is the United States of America. To see some of my colleagues, or to see people stand up and continually bash the United States and put a spin on it is discouraging.

Take a look at Berkeley University. I cannot even imagine. There is an actual debate at Berkeley University on the commemoration for September 11, whether they should allow red, white and blue to be worn. Not a flag, just the colors red, white and blue, whether they should be allowed to be worn on campus because it might offend somebody. The American flag might offend somebody, so maybe we ought to take it down. Come on. Give me a break. Patriotism in this country today is still very strong. This country has got a lot more things going right for it than it does wrong. This country will stand head to head with any other nation, not just existing nations today, but look in the history of the world, and I challenge my colleagues, look in the history of the world to find one nation that has done as much as this Nation has done for the poor people in the world, for hungry people in the world, gone to the defense of many, many nations in the history of the world, educated more people than any other country in the world, educated them to a higher level than any other country in the world.

And what is the biggest export of this country that no other country can match? In fact, cumulatively, if you put all the history of the countries together in the world, they do not even come close to exporting what the United States of America exports as its biggest item. What is that item? It is freedom. The United States of America has broken the ice. It has taken the lead. It has put the footprints in the sand for freedom. And we see that some of our citizens for some reason act ashamed of being an American. The beauty of freedom is that they can always move. If the beauty of this country is so bad that you do not think it can be improved or you think that you have to continually criticize this Nation, go somewhere else.

I am one of those people that likes to look at the good things that this Nation does. Look what this Nation has done for the world in the development of medicine, in the development of vaccinations, in the fight against cancer. We can go down a list of a thousand different items. You pick the items. And amongst the very top of doing positive things, of doing good things, is the United States of America.

2045

Many times, many times the United States of America, when nobody else would stand up, it is the United States of America that ends up standing up. It is the United States of America that is the first one out of the foxhole, and it has not come without cost.