

February of 1992, Iraq refuses to allow the destruction of certain facilities used in weapons programs.

April of 1992, Iraq calls for the end of surveillance flights and threatens the safety of pilots.

June of 1993, Iraq refuses to allow remote controlled monitoring cameras at two missile engine sites.

March of 1996, Iraq refuses access to five inspection sites designated for inspection.

June of 1996, Iraq denies access to sites under investigation.

June of 1996, Iraq denies access to another inspection team.

November of 1996, Iraq refuses to allow inspectors to remove missile remnants for analysis.

June of 1997, Iraqi personnel attempt to physically prevent a helicopter pilot from flying to inspection areas.

June of 1997, Iraq denies access to inspection sites.

September of 1997, an Iraqi officer attacks inspectors photographing unauthorized movements of Iraqi vehicles.

August of 1998, Iraq announces that they will refuse to agree to any United Nations resolutions until the oil embargo is lifted.

In fact, Iraq has violated 16 United Nations resolutions and sanctions. Sadly, I believe that future inspections will once again be met with blatant defiance and further problems.

Removing Saddam's weapons of mass destruction will only occur when we remove Saddam Hussein. Just in the last several days, Iraq stated that it will not accept any new United Nations resolutions. Furthermore, Iraqi officials have already started adding conditions to their allowance of unconditional access.

We must not allow ourselves to be led down that same path of noncooperation that Iraq has led the world down in the past. We do not need to look beyond Iraqi defectors, many from within Saddam's nuclear program, to learn that Saddam Hussein is dangerously close to obtaining nuclear weapons and has advanced considerably in his biological and chemical weapons programs. I do not believe that we should have to wait for another United States city to be devastated, a military base to be targeted or even to be attacked in order to respond to the threat of Saddam Hussein. Every minute we delay only brings this enormous threat closer to reality.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President's actions to come to the Congress and seek the Congress's approval. As freedom-loving nations continue to eliminate international terrorism, this war will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.

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

(Mr. KUCINICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PAUL ESPINOSA RESOLUTION

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my resolution recognizing the contributions of my constituent from San Diego, Paul Espinosa, to both the Latino and the arts community. A few years ago, a study conducted by a leading Latino nonprofit concluded that representation of Hispanics in mainstream network television decreased during the last 30 years. The few roles that were held by Latinos often depicted them as criminals, maids or gardeners. Paul Espinosa observed this disturbing trend 20 years ago and dedicated himself to making documentaries and films about Hispanic Americans. He applied his academic background in anthropology to media and developed textured depictions of Hispanics.

The results have made Paul Espinosa one of the country's most respected and recognized documentary filmmakers. His works, to name a few, include the Lemon Grove Incident, the Hunt for Pancho Villa, and the Earth did not swallow him, Uneasy Neighbors, and The Border. The characters and experiences in his films are as diverse as the Latino community itself. He chronicled the story of a controversial 19th century New Mexico priest, the defining summer in a young migrant boy's life, and the actions of parents in Lemon Grove, California fighting for their children's education. Through these films, Paul Espinosa shows that Latinos possess a complex and dignified history. These previously untold stories examine the social issues surrounding the protagonists and provide a history lesson for all their viewers.

Many consider Paul Espinosa's films catalysts for important cultural dialogue. These films are so highly regarded that they have become the basis for film festivals bearing his name in Texas and California. Academia has also recognized Paul Espinosa's films for their contributions to education. Various high schools and universities include some of his films in their curriculum. Paul Espinosa, who holds a B.A. from Brown University and a Ph.D. from Stanford University, was named a Regents Lecturer at the University of California San Diego in 2000 and is frequently asked to lecture at numerous universities on his films.

Besides his work as a filmmaker, Paul Espinosa is a media arts activist. He is strongly dedicated to enabling an

upcoming generation of filmmakers. His involvement with the Media Arts Center of San Diego and the Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers speaks to his commitment to support aspiring media artists and increase the visibility of traditionally underrepresented groups.

One of the Media Art Center's most promising initiatives is the Teen Producer's Project. It teaches young people artistic and analytical skills by emphasizing effective communication through the use of digital video, interpersonal skills and creative writing.

Paul Espinosa has defined his career by making films that tell a meaningful story. His films have spurred discussion and challenged its viewers to reexamine their perceptions of Hispanic Americans.

I hope you, Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues will join me in honoring this community artist, his accomplishments in the media arts and his triumphs for the Latino community.

□ 2030

MAKING AMERICA INDEPENDENT OF MIDDLE EASTERN OIL

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been much debate on how the United States should proceed with Iraq. I rise to draw attention to an issue that is critical to this decision-making process.

As we debate how and whether to take military action in Iraq, I should hope that we could all agree to take economic action against Saddam Hussein. Now, it is clear that the United States is overly dependent on foreign oil. The United States presently imports 48 percent of the 19.7 million barrels of oil it consumes each day. Of that total, approximately half a million barrels come from Iraq.

Now is the opportunity to pursue a policy of making America independent of Middle Eastern oil. To do this, we have to aggressively pursue new technologies and development of renewable energy, biomass, geothermal, hydropower, solar and wind. A renewed effort toward policies that encourage reduced reliance on fossil fuels and more secure sources of dependable energy would mean the creation of jobs that would strengthen our economy and better serve our national interests.

Now is the precise moment for the United States to shed its dependency on any Iraqi oil and work toward a future when our domestic energy policy plays a role in how we implement strategic initiatives.

Already we are told that Saddam Hussein does not use the proceeds from the sale of oil to feed his population or to provide medical needs for his people. We are told instead that the profits

from these sales are going to his own personal needs, to his aggrandizement with palaces and other monuments that he builds to himself, and to embellishing his Republican Guard. Especially if that is the case, then we ought to be talking about not buying Iraqi oil so that he has the proceeds with which to act in that manner, and we ought to be talking about convincing our allies in the international community to do the same.

This will not be easy, but the fact of the matter is we have a capable State Department and a capable Secretary of State who ought to go about the hard work of working diplomatically to convince our international community that that is one way to enforce inspections and enforce disarmament, one tool to use to get the attention of Saddam Hussein, knowing there is a hammer at the other end that can be effective, and we ought to do it.

In the long range, we ought to make sure that we have an energy policy in place that allows us not only to back off of any use of Iraqi oil, but to eventually overcome any need to rely on Middle Eastern oil. It is a relatively small portion of the fossil fuel that we use in this country; and over a period of a reasonable number of years, a concerted and wise energy policy will allow us to strategically pull out of that area and resolve many of the crises we may have in the future dealing with Middle Eastern problems and situations, politically and otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a policy that would be wise. I think we have international resolutions for inspections and disarmament that need international enforcement. We ought to call upon the United Nations to do everything in its power to work within the international community to make sure that they in fact enforce those resolutions and have inspections and make sure that we have disarmament in Iraq.

But that is hard work, as I said before; and it is not as easy sometimes as taking an overpowering military force and attacking. But there is no imminency to any attack on the interests of the United States at this time, and we have an international body and we have an international means to act; and we have the time to do that and try that. We should exhaust all avenues before going to the extreme avenue of an unprovoked, in the sense of any action against the United States directly, action. We should make sure that we use our resources, work within the international community, understand that we can embargo oil to Iraq as an opening step, and get our allies to do the same as a way of enforcing provisions for inspections and disarmament. We ought to move in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can get some agreement on this, and I hope that we can work within the international community to do just that.

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

(Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OPTIONS WITH REGARD TO IRAQ

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

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, the rush to war continues here in Washington, despite the possibility of the reinstatement of effective, unfettered inspections aimed at the destruction of weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein may have hidden from past inspections or may have developed since that time.

Now, Prime Minister Tony Blair, as a surrogate for this administration, did provide a more concrete and detailed report than anything provided by the Bush administration to the United States Congress thus far on what is going on in Iraq. But the interesting thing is, in reading through the 50-some odd pages of this report and perusing the photographs, the actual conclusion is that inspections did work, U.N. sanctions did work, and are still working. The containment and deterrence doctrine has worked with Saddam Hussein.

In fact, the previous program before the inspectors left was extraordinarily successful, more so than would be admitted by this administration, that is very dismissive about the possibility of going back in with intrusive, unfettered inspections with a mandate to destroy any weapons of mass destruction that this miscreant may have managed to develop.

I will read a few quotes from Prime Minister Blair's report. He talks about their attempts to obtain nuclear weapons: "In August 1990, Iraq instigated a crash program to develop a single nuclear weapon within a year. By the time of the Gulf War, the crash program had made little progress."

They go on to say that "UNSCOM had totally dismantled the physical infrastructure of the Iraqi nuclear weapons program, including the dedicated facilities and equipment for uranium separation and enrichment, and for weapon development and production, and removed the remaining highly enriched uranium."

It is hard to reconcile that with the assertions that intrusive inspections under the auspices of the U.N. will have no impact on Saddam Hussein or his attempts to obtain weapons of mass destruction.

In early 2002, the British intelligence judged that while sanctions remained effective, Iraq will not be able to produce nuclear weapons. That is on page 27 of the justification given by the Prime Minister of Britain for a preemptive war against Iraq. He cannot

build or obtain nuclear weapons, according to British intelligence, as long as the sanctions remain in effect, and that is without intrusive inspections backed by the full force of the United States and around the world.

There are many other passages. This is incredibly instructive reading. I would recommend it to my colleagues in Congress. It is certainly more detailed than anything provided to this Congress, either in classified briefings or outside of classified briefings, and certainly more detailed than anything provided to the American public, NATO or anybody else by the United States, and the British have done us a service.

But the case they make is the opposite of the conclusion of their Prime Minister. The case that is strongly made here is that a return to the regime of an intrusive, unfettered weapons inspection and destruction program would effectively preclude this dictator from ever obtaining weapons with which he could threaten other countries in that region, and most certainly the United States of America.

So this, to me, certainly demonstrates that the rush to war, the first preemptive war in the history of the United States, the first preemptive war since the horrible destruction of World War II and the U.N. and the agreements we have reached since then, breaking with all precedent, the United States, in some bizarre version of "Minority Report," the movie, will decide that we have people in the administration who can determine whether or not someone presents a real and present threat to the United States, even if they made no threats, even if there is no documentation of them having the capabilities on carrying out on the threats they have not made; and we, the United States of America, should be able, in violation of all international law and all precedents of our Nation, be able to preemptively attack and destroy that country for the purposes of regime change, because we do not like who is running that country.

Well, there are a lot of brutal dictators around the world running a lot of countries I do not like, including Saddam Hussein; and I would support democratic efforts and subversion efforts and any other way to get those people out of power. But a war that opens the door to worldwide conflicts, to Taiwan and China, India and Pakistan and any other host of countries, is an incredibly dangerous precedent, and this report from the Prime Minister to his Parliament documents that it is not necessary. We have an effective option before us.

ENERGY AND THE POTENTIAL FOR WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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.