

## IRAQ AND THE "BOLDER APPROACH"

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, appeared on "Meet the Press" yesterday morning and made this assertion, and I quote Dr. Rice: ". . . when we were attacked on September 11, we had a choice to make. We could decide that the proximate cause was al Qaeda and the people who flew those planes into the buildings and, therefore, we would go after al Qaeda and perhaps after the Taliban and then our work would be done . . ."

"Or we could take a bolder approach, which was to say that we had to go after the root causes of the kind of terrorism that was produced there, and that meant a different kind of Middle East. And there is no one who could have imagined a different kind of Middle East with Saddam Hussein still in power."

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the weapons of mass destruction? In the run up to the war, no one said anything about a bolder approach.

We were told about uranium purchases from Niger. We were told about the world's most dangerous weapons falling into the hands of the wrong people. We were told by Dr. Rice herself about the specter of mushroom clouds over American cities. We were treated to a campaign of fear and deception about weapons of mass destruction because the Bush administration knew that was the only way to convince the Nation and the Congress to commit to this war.

They knew that this bolder approach, this ideological pipe dream, was an absolute nonstarter.

So what are we supposed to tell Cindy Sheehan and the thousands of other mothers, fathers, spouses, siblings, and friends of dead soldiers and soldiers who were wounded? That their children died or were wounded not to protect America but for some "bolder approach," because the Middle East is the personal chess board of a gang of neoconservatives who have not had to sacrifice a thing for this war?

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Iraq a few weeks ago to meet the troops to learn more about their mission. I cannot tell the Members how impressed I was with the courage, the loyalty, and intelligence of our soldiers from the officers down to the citizen soldiers of the National Guard. They are, indeed, the best America has to offer.

My question is: Why can we not have political leaders with the same honor and integrity as the men and women who wear the uniform, who take the risks, who make the sacrifices? It is nothing short of tragic the way the Pentagon and the White House have let down and even exploited the men and women in their charge. They sent them to Iraq on false pretenses, on a poorly

defined mission, without all the tools they needed and without a plan to bring them home.

I have been calling for our troops to come home this entire year. I have called for hearings. I have introduced resolutions. I have forced a vote in this Chamber. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not just speaking for myself. A majority of Americans clearly share this anxiety and skepticism about the war.

I have tried to jumpstart the conversation about how to go about ending the occupation. At the hearing I convened last month, some very sound ideas were laid out about how to end this debacle and how the United States can play a constructive role in the rebuilding of Iraqi society.

But the President will not engage on this level. He will not engage in this conversation. He offers nothing but platitudes and vague assertions. Terrorism is bad and freedom is good, he tells us. We need to stay the course, he tells us. We will be there as long as we need to be there, he tells us.

This is not enough. The American people and our soldiers deserve better. They deserve a plan, an endgame, a clear strategy to return Iraq to the Iraqi people and the troops to their families back home.

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

(Mr. PAUL 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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

## URGING HELP FOR PAKISTAN

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the nation of Pakistan is experiencing the greatest natural disaster

of all time. There is no recorded disaster with the dimensions that the earthquake in Pakistan has produced. Forty thousand at least are already dead. Forty thousand at least are dead already, and with the freezing weather coming and the inaccessibility of the people in the mountains, another 40,000 could easily die, being frozen to death or starved because they cannot be reached. Millions are homeless.

Now is the time for America to come to the aid of this nation in great distress. These are people, first of all; and for humanitarian reasons, we certainly should come to their aid. They are also citizens of Pakistan, a major ally of the United States, a major ally which has done a great deal in the fight against terrorism.

I know disaster fatigue has set in with a lot of Americans and certainly our media. We had the tsunami, an overwhelming disaster. We had Katrina, Rita. In Central America they had Hurricane Stan.

Unfortunately, the media has reached the point of exhaustion too early. Not enough is being said about the great tragedy in Pakistan because I think they just do not want to deal with another great disaster with the kind of coverage it needs. It does not have it.

When we add up all these disasters, the tsunami, Katrina, Rita, and Pakistan, the tragic numbers should not overwhelm us. We should not throw up our hands and say it is just too much, we cannot deal with it. It is the most massive disaster in history, the Pakistani earthquake; but yet 40,000, though it may seem like a lot, and in the case of Katrina we do not know whether it is going to be 10,000 or not, and in the case of the tsunami, if we add them all up, still relative to the population of the world, it is a very small number of people.

We have almost 6 billion people in the world. Surely 6 billion people in the world and almost 200 nations in the world can come to the aid of people who have experienced these disasters this year, can come to the aid of those in Katrina, those in the tsunami, and those in Pakistan. Surely we should not get weary of being weary of disasters so early. We must go to the aid of Pakistan and not write it off because we have had enough disasters. We need more attention paid to this.

When we look at numbers, we lost 600,000 people in the Civil War in America. 600,000. We lost 400,000 or 500,000 in World War II. The Russians lost 18 million people in World War II. Those are numbers which can really overwhelm us. Surely we have dealt with problems on that scale. In World War II we mobilized, and in terms of men and materiel and the effort to win World War II, it was overwhelming.

But it would not take even one-tenth of that effort to go to the aid of Pakistan at this point and deal with getting the practical things that they need. They need helicopters because those

mountains cannot be reached any other way. They have got to have helicopters to transport whatever they are going to transport. They need it, and they need it right away. The people are freezing in the mountains. They need food. The U.S. must lead the way.

I do not want to get into any discussion of competition, what nation is doing what and are we doing less than any other nations. I do not think that is the kind of discussion we ought to have. We ought to just understand we should come to the aid of Pakistan to the extent that we can. We are the greatest. We are the most resourceful. We are the richest Nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth. We should not hesitate to lead on this matter. We should step out there and not yield leadership and wait for someone else.

We have made past mistakes with Pakistan. Pakistan was our ally during the Cold War, and yet we treated them very poorly, and we did not take care of the needs of Pakistan once the war in Afghanistan was over and they had helped us to win the war against the Russians in Afghanistan originally. Now Pakistan has come to our aid in the war against terrorism. The Government of Pakistan teeters on the brink of rebellion because of the fact that large numbers of the Muslim population do not approve of the close friendship of Pakistan with the United States, the alliance with the United States against terrorism.

Let us come to the aid of our friends and make up for past errors. And here is a time when they have this great calamity that we can act and wipe out any harsh feelings about the past. Now is the time to act. For the future, as long as we can see it, I assure the Members that the Pakistani people will be grateful for what we have done. We ought to seal the alliance and make certain that they understand that we are their friends in every way possible. We do not want to just use them to fight the war on terrorism. We do not want to just use them to hunt for Osama bin Laden. We do not want to just use them in a critical time when we are threatened by terrorism. We care about them; and when they need help, we will be there.

Practical help is needed right now. We need cargo planes. At Kennedy Airport they have cargo-loads of material to go to Pakistan. They have no planes to send them there. They need the practical help. We need helicopters in Pakistan right now. Across the border in Afghanistan, we have hundreds of helicopters. We should give up the hunt for Osama bin Laden for a little while if necessary, and those helicopters should go to Pakistan. They need food. They need tents. They need attention from the whole world.

We need our caucus here, Members of Congress. We have a Pakistan Caucus. The Pakistan Caucus needs to meet as soon as possible. I call on the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and

the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who are co-chairs, to call to meet as soon as possible. And let us, as Members of Congress, see what we can do to come to the aid of our friends, to come to the aid of millions of people who are in great distress and they look to the United States for leadership. We should follow that leadership. God expects us to provide leadership to help the people of Pakistan.

□ 2000

#### PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have here an article that appeared on the front page of USA Today. It is above the fold. It is the center article. It says: Debate Brews: Has Oil Production Peaked?

The undeniable facts that spawned this article were noted by a number of the leading persons in our country several months ago, Boyden Gray, McFarland, James Woolsey, and a large number of retired four-star admirals and generals when they noted the facts that are on our first chart here: That we have in our country only 2 percent of the world's reserves of oil; we have 8 percent of the world's oil production. Just those two statistics together say something rather interesting. If we have only 2 percent of the oil reserves but are producing 8 percent of the world's oil, that means we are really good at pumping oil, does it not? That means that we are pumping down our reserves four times faster than the rest of the world.

We represent only 5 percent of the population, they noted, and we consume 25 percent of the world's oil and import about two-thirds of what we use. They wrote a letter to the President saying: Mr. President, the fact that we have only 2 percent of the reserves and use 25 percent of the world's oil and import two-thirds of what we use is a very large national security risk. We really need to do something about that as a country.

Whether you believe, as this article points out, that oil has peaked—in just a moment, Mr. Speaker, we will note how this term came into existence—or whether you believe that we need to do something about energy because of this national security concern, what you are going to do is essentially the same thing, because what you need to do, if this is just a national security concern, is to free ourselves from the dependence on foreign oil. That is exactly the thing you have to do. If you believe that we have reached peak oil, you have to free ourselves from the dependence on oil, most of which is foreign oil. In the former, if you just think it is a national security concern, we may

muddle through that and come out okay. If you think that it is a peak oil issue, then there is no way of muddling through that, because unless you forcefully and intelligently approach that problem you are going to have some big problems.

The next chart shows us how this term originated, and we need to go back about six decades to the 1940s and the 1950s when a scientist by the name of M. King Hubbert whose name is widely known. I was reading an article just today. Without ever telling the readers the derivation of the term they were talking about Hubbert's Peak. Well, in 1956, Hubbert as a result of his analysis for nearly two decades of the behavior of oil fields made the prediction that the United States would peak in oil production in about 1970. As it turned out, he was right on target, we did peak in 1970.

He made that prediction because, as he noted, the exploitation and exhaustion of an individual oil field followed a typical not surprising or unsurprising bell curve, that it went up and up as you pumped a field until you reached the peak, and then at that peak about half of the oil had been pumped, and then the last half was more difficult to get and so you came down the other side of that typical bell curve, and that has come in the literature to be known as Hubbert's Peak.

This smooth green line is his prediction for the United States. The rougher green line with the heavy symbols indicates the actual production of oil. What you see, it roughly followed his prediction. The red curve here is for Russia that had more oil than we. They peaked after us. But when the Soviet Union fell apart, you see that they did not reach their potential, and they are now experiencing a second smaller peak that does not show here but it is a peak about like so.

If we look at the next chart, we see where we got the oil from in our country. I am going to spend a couple of minutes just to say what peak oil is, and I have got several colleagues that are going to join us. This shows where we have gotten the oil from in our country, Texas and the rest of the United States and Alaska and natural gas liquids. Notice the small contribution that Prudhoe Bay made, a big source of oil. We were starting down the other side of Hubbert's Peak. Remember, he said we would peak in 1970, and right on target that is when we peaked, and the big Prudhoe Bay oil field was a little blip in our downward coast on Hubbert's Peak. I am sure you can all remember the fabled oil discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico which was going to save us for the future. That is this yellow here. That is all that amounted to. There are 4,000 oil wells out there, I think, and that is their contribution to oil in our country.

The next chart shows the world situation, and this is a too busy chart. It is like reading a textbook. There is really a whole lot of information there. They