

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.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House this evening, as we have had speakers here earlier, focusing on issues of energy and the potential for war in the Middle East.

I think it is appropriate that these two issues are in fact before us, because oil and the Middle East are linked in the minds of the public; and, in fact, I think any credible observer would agree that in fact they are linked in fact.

Tonight, as one reflects on the status of the potential growing cloud of war in the Middle East as we are dealing in this country with issues that relate as we speak now, there is a conference that has been meeting in terms of the energy policy. I think it is appropriate for us to step back and reflect on the status of what this Congress has done in the course of the last year to deal meaningfully with energy policy.

It is something that in and of itself is important for us to focus on, but it would seem that in the aftermath of the horrible attacks of September 11 of last year, the rising tensions in the Middle East, the pressures that took place as we moved into Afghanistan, what we have seen in terms of the potential problems with oil that is concentrated in terms of the 50 percent or more that comes to the United States from foreign sources, that there would be a sense of urgency about that discussion.

Americans want and deserve a national energy policy that ensures safe, affordable and clean energy. One must only be disappointed by the lack of leadership and urgency that we have seen with the administration, and, sad to say, here in Congress, to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, to say nothing about reducing the impact of the pollution that is associated with that dependence.

We have now been working on an energy bill for almost 2 years; and the plan that has come forward from the House does not even employ simple steps to reduce the demand for oil that years of study have demonstrated beyond question are necessary and in fact will work.

Sadly, this is in the midst of the economic challenges that we face as we have seen the promise of fiscal stability go out the window. In my State of Oregon we have consistently in the course of over the last year and a half had among the highest unemployment rates in the country.

It was less than a year and a half ago when we heard from the President that we could in fact embark upon a massive tax cut because we were going to have over \$5 trillion in surplus; and, in fact, it was alleged that one of the real problems we were facing as a Nation was the possibility that we would be paying off the national debt so rapidly that we would not have safe investment instruments.

Well, we have dodged that bullet. We have not just a tight budget, but we have deficits now for as long as the eye

can see. We are going to be borrowing between 100 billion and \$200 billion of Social Security trust funds. One only hears faintly the echo of the lockbox that people were going to set aside these monies, and we are looking at a significant long-term structural deficit.

□ 2045

But in the context of that, we have the conferees looking at an energy bill that would give away billions of dollars in new subsidies and tax breaks for fossil fuel, for the automobile industry, for the nuclear industry while sadly shortchanging clean, sustainable energy sources.

Having a dependable supply of energy and using it wisely is critical for Americans to be able to have livable communities. However, in response to the terrorist attacks and the call for more stable and predictable energy supply, we should not increase our dependence on fossil fuels in the way that we have for a century. The question is not whether we should reduce our dependence on oil, but whether we have the will; not whether we will reduce dependence on fossil fuel, but how and when we are going to achieve it. What is our strategy?

With the United States holding some 3 percent of the world's oil reserves, yet consuming over 25 percent of the fossil fuels, we will never drill our way out of reliance on the unsustainable sources of oil. But aside for a moment that the vast majority of the oil that we rely upon is concentrated in a handful of countries in an area that has never been particularly stable, but has been growing increasingly unstable over time, much of the recoverable oil in the United States, the 2 or 3 percent, is environmentally and politically difficult to access.

Now, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle in the Republican Party and, of course, the White House believe that drilling for oil in the Arctic Wildlife refuge is an important part of the solution. Well, the fact is that even if we were to disregard the serious questions and problems associated with it, the reserves that we can recover in the Arctic are likely to provide only a few months energy supply for the United States, some have suggested 6 months or less, and it is not going to be available to us for the better part of a decade.

If we, in fact, are concerned about energy security, if we are concerned about potential terrorist threats, putting our reliance on the 800-mile Alaskan pipeline seems to be a rather slender thread to rely upon. Recall that it was just a year ago when we had a drunk with a hunting rifle shoot up the pipeline, spilling almost 300,000 gallons of oil before the problem could be solved, and that was in the early fall.

Consider what would have happened if this drunk had assaulted the pipeline later in the year, in the winter. Interrupting the flow of oil would have

caused the entire pipeline to be subject to freezing up, and we would have an 800 mile long piece of Chapstick, hardly a safe and secure method of assuring oil supply to the lower 48 States. If a drunk with a hunting rifle can disrupt the flow, think what would happen along 800 miles if a few determined terrorists decided to inflict damage on it. Not something that we are going to rely upon.

The notion that this is, in fact, part of a comprehensive energy solution that is going to be an important part of solving our problem is, at best, disingenuous for the American public as it is damaging to the environment. The public has made clear its opposition to drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

Now, where would the administration take us next? According to the petroleum industry, western Federal lands hold 95 percent of untapped United States oil and 40 percent of untapped natural gas. In the last year, 2001, the administration approved 3,800 permits for companies to drill for oil and gas, the most in one year since 1988. Reflecting for a moment that it has taken eons for the radiant energy from the sun to convert by natural process to fossil fuels, in the course of a few generations we will have used up nearly all of the Earth's entire supply of accessible petroleum.

The question is increasingly not just how much oil is left in the ground, but how long can we go on increasing the rate at which cheap oil is extracted. I think it is clear that there is a finite duration; it is just a matter of time when that curve is crossed and when the cheap oil is reduced, starts to go away that we change the economics of the petroleum industry. One hopes that we can convince our friends in the administration and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join the American public in realizing that we do have the technology to meet more of our energy needs through alternatives. Through energy conservation we have not, by any stretch of the imagination, exhausted the potential of energy savings through conservation, through increased full efficiency. Remember that a 3-mile per gallon increase in fuel efficiency for SUVs would offset the entire amount of oil that we expect to extract some day from the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, if we change our policy.

It is an opportunity for us to think about new creative ways to accelerate that progress. In one hour, there is more energy that the Earth receives from the sun, through the solar process, than is the entire year's output in fossil fuels. Energy and fuel efficiency is the quickest, cheapest, cleanest way to save not just energy. Most people will recover in a relatively short period of time over the course of the life of a vehicle the savings for any increase in the price of that vehicle. If they are going to have to have a more expensive SUV, if the people are not going to cut down on the power at all, they will end up in being able to recover those costs

through savings that they will achieve in terms of reduced expenditure that they have. Passenger cars, for example, use more than 40 percent of the oil consumed in America. The average American driver spends 443 hours driving every single year. In fact, America's cars, light trucks, consume one-tenth of the annual global oil production.

Mr. Speaker, we have resources available to us to, in fact, make a difference in energy efficiency, and it is something that we want to focus on with this Congress, not allow this time to get away from us, use the opportunity of the energy conference bill and each opportunity that comes before us from now until we adjourn to be able to advance the cause of America's energy security.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that I have been joined by the gentlewoman from southern California (Ms. SANCHEZ), my colleague, with whom I have been pleased to work on a variety of issues that speak to the environment, to transportation. She has a wide variety of interests that range from the environment to national security. I am honored that she would join us this evening. I yield to the gentlewoman should she have some comments that she would wish to share.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon, and I thank him for coming down to the House floor tonight to speak about such an important issue. With everything going on right now, with our Nation assessing whether to go to war in the Middle East and the state of our economy being so shaky, we in Congress need to make sure that we are asking the right questions.

For instance, we are here tonight to talk about how are we going to achieve a realistic solution to U.S. foreign oil dependence?

Now, it is not like this is a new question. I remember back in 1973, 1974, I am a Californian. We use a lot of oil, we drive a lot of cars, we go a lot of places, we drive long distances. I remember standing in lines and waiting in 100-car lines the last time we had a problem with OPEC and prices going up, and we all swore that we would do something about this and that we should not be so dependent on cars that use so much gas. For a while we remembered that and we started to work on and import and get more gas mileage for our cars. But then what happened? The SUV situation, and now we find that we are back up to those gas guzzlers, once again.

So we have to say to ourselves, this is an opportune time when we can make some real policy decisions and put into play some very important solutions, possible solutions. People ask me all the time, well, what answer do you have, LORETTA, to importing oil from Iraq or from the Middle East or the OPEC countries? There are a lot of ways, and it does not just have to be that we have to go off to the Arctic circle and drill the last plain that we have

that is not touched by humans. There are other ways to do this.

Let me give my colleagues an example. I am from southern California. We had an energy crisis about a couple of summers ago, about 18 months ago, blackouts in our production, our factories were being affected because we were not getting the electricity we needed; we had natural gas prices go high on us. Now, we now know that much of that was artificially created. But for the moment, while we were in the middle of all of that, we were asking ourselves, how are we going to solve this problem?

Well, the first thing is consumption. Why is it that we consume the way we do? And we offered incentives at the State level. As it is, I come from a large family. My dad always taught us to turn off the lights as we left the room and turn everything off, so I grew up that way, so our energy bill was low. But the Governor told us, if you conserve 20 percent more than what you normally use, you will get an incredible savings on your electricity bill. Let me tell my colleague, people rose to the occasion in California. We saw an incredible drop in the consumption of electricity. We learned that once again, things that we know, but we do not think about, that we should run our machines, our washers and dryers and dishwashers and stuff at night, rather than during the day when the regular business shift is using that power.

□ 2100

So that we do not have to create more power plants, nor nuclear power plants, divert more rivers, create more energy. We can actually use what we already have, as long as we use it efficiently.

California proved that we could do it. It was not a hardship. We were not killing ourselves to get that done. We understood that it was the right thing to do for the moment, and we could continue, and many people have. Many people have learned to live with less, if you will. We can do that in so many ways.

Why is it that every time that we set standards at the Federal level to require automobiles to get higher gas mileage, and we say it is going to be 7 years off, the companies need to work towards this, why is it that we reach the 7 years, and all of a sudden we need to change the law because nobody invested in that, nobody really did it? We could have done it. If they knew we were going to stick to our guns, they would do that; they would increase the efficiency of our automobiles.

Or we could just remember to put all our shopping trips in one haul. There are so many things that we could do; for instance, offering incentives. Do not punish people, but offer people, companies, incentives for new technologies, to invest more in new technologies for wind and solar and fuel cells. I will bet if we did that and we

were real about it, if we put the money behind that, that we would find companies that would be willing to step up and use that and do it and find the solutions so that we would not be so dependent on foreign oil supplies, or even on the need to drill our own supplies that we know exist in some of the States that we have.

We have to build better vehicles. We have to light and heat our buildings more efficiently. I know that by doing that we could lower our dependence on fossil fuel oil, which is the real problem that exists here.

We have said for years that we are going to do it, but we have never stood behind that. We have never, as a Federal Government, as a policy of the people, said: be more efficient. Let us strengthen energy efficiency standards. Let us create incentives for a new generation of vehicles. Let us raise the fuel economy standards; and let us adopt a strong, renewable portfolio standard. If we do this, we will not be dependent on the Iraqis of the world.

I thank my colleague for bringing this to light. We need to discuss this more. We need to get the American people involved in deciding that they are part of the solution towards this dependence that we have on foreign countries because of the oil that they possess.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments and her leadership.

I will always remember the visit we took last year with some of our colleagues to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, where we were camping on a plain amidst the caribou; where we had a chance to really sense the vastness of that area, to get a feel for what was at stake as we looked at other areas that had been developed and were continuing to be developed for oil production.

It was clear that this was one of America's jewels, and I have appreciated the gentlewoman's commitment in terms of going up there to see it firsthand and the gentlewoman's continued advocacy for a more rational and thoughtful energy policy.

Hopefully, working together, we can advance these causes here in Congress that will make a difference for America's energy security.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I just want to add, it is very important that we save that last frontier. I would like my nieces and nephews to be able to see a part of the North American continent that is the same as it was 100, 200, 600, 1,000 years ago. They deserve a chance to see a plain that is open, that is in its austere and pristine condition. That is a legacy that I think is important for us to protect, especially when we can do it through better efficiency and tightening down and understanding that we are part of our own problem.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman said it well, and I thank her for her participation.