

operations. And I would never question that right. But it is not the purview of the Congress, according to our history and Constitution and tradition, to interpose our will, our decisions, our timetables, on military commanders in the field.

I will close, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying that we do have but one choice in Iraq and that is victory. It is my hope and prayer that after much political debate here in Congress, we will give our soldiers the resources they need to achieve victory in Iraq and bring home a much-deserved freedom for those good people and another victory for freedom for the American people.

#### TIME TO REFOCUS EFFORTS IN THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my intention this morning was to come here and talk about the need to refocus our efforts in the war against terrorism out of Iraq and towards Afghanistan, because, after all, when we were attacked on 9/11, those who attacked us came from Afghanistan, not from Iraq. And President Bush in the very beginning and even now continues to confuse the American people by suggesting that the Iraq war had something to do with 9/11, which it did not.

However, I just listened to my colleague on the Republican side and I have to respond to him somewhat before I move on to the issue of Afghanistan. I want to commend the Speaker and commend the Democratic leadership for the supplemental appropriation bill that they are putting together and that will likely come to the floor next week. It was clear in the November election that the American people want a new direction in Iraq. They realize that the war in Iraq was begun for the wrong reasons, that it was not a response to 9/11, that a lot of the information that was provided to this Congress when the vote was taken to authorize the war was misleading and inaccurate. The fact of the matter is that Congress does have the power to declare war and Congress also has the decision as to whether to fund the war. And this is a supplemental appropriations bill that is going to fund the war and provide the funding for the troops. But at the same time Congress needs to point out that this war needs to move in a new direction and that it is not acceptable to simply give the President a blank check and say, okay, you can move ahead with your surge and essentially escalate the war.

We had a majority in this Congress, including a significant number of Republicans, who just a couple of weeks

ago voted on a resolution that said that the escalation and the surge was a mistake, that we are opposed to that. And so there has to be some effort in this spending bill, which is our prerogative, to indicate why the war has gone in the wrong direction and what needs to be done to end it and ultimately get our troops out of there. That is what we are doing as Democrats and I believe we will have a consensus to achieve that and I think that it will lead in a very short period of time to us getting out of Iraq and leaving the Iraqis to decide their own fate. It is time for that at this time. We shouldn't be sending the resources and we shouldn't be sending our soldiers into a situation where they no longer belong.

My intention today was to come to the floor and talk about, rather than sending our soldiers to Iraq and all the resources we are sending to Iraq, that we should be focusing more on Afghanistan, because that's where the Taliban were and they continue to be. That is where al Qaeda began and continues to exist, including those who were in charge of al Qaeda. And we are not doing enough in Afghanistan. There is a new offensive now on the part of the Taliban which began last month in February and we are trying to counteract that. But we're not focusing on that because we're spending too much time focusing on Iraq in terms of our resources and our troops.

Now, the President finally came to the realization a few weeks ago that this was the case and he started to talk more about what we needed to do in Afghanistan. He sent Vice President CHENEY there. Vice President CHENEY made the point. He also went to Pakistan because Pakistan has this border area where we believe al Qaeda and the Taliban are headquartered and where they simply hide out and regroup before they begin their attacks from Pakistan into Afghanistan. Vice President CHENEY went to Pakistan as well and made the point to President Musharraf that this is unacceptable, you cannot continue to harbor these terrorists, you have to do something to make sure that they are driven out of Pakistan and that they are not being supported by those local authorities or those within the intelligence service in Afghanistan that seem to be providing support to al Qaeda and to the Taliban.

But we need to focus on the issue of Afghanistan in terms of our resources, not only in terms of our troops but also in terms of reconstruction efforts. The Taliban are essentially being financed by increased production of opium and ultimately, of course, heroin. That's how they are financed. We need to deal with local reconstruction projects that will allow the Afghans and particularly the farmers to do things that are not related to the opium trade so they can grow crops other than opium and sustain themselves. This is a major effort that we have to concentrate on and not enough is happening.

I would point out that in the supplemental appropriations bill, we do provide more money for this effort, because the Democratic leadership, as Speaker PELOSI realized, that we are neglecting the war in Afghanistan where the terrorists began. Let's refocus on that. But this supplemental bill is the answer to the problem and it brings us in a new direction.

#### ENERGY SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 2002, in a Wall Street Journal editorial, former CIA Director James Woolsey described the central challenge we face in the global war on terrorism as the United States' dependence on imported oil. My colleagues, this dependence is providing our enemy with so much leverage that defeating terrorism has become significantly harder.

Let me quote from Mr. Woolsey: "We are at war. We should start by asking what we can do as soon as possible to undercut our enemies' power. Other considerations should now follow, not lead. If we do not act now, we will leave major levers over our fate in the hands of regimes that have attacked us or have fallen under the sway of fanatics who spread hatred of the United States and, indeed, of freedom itself. For all of them, their power derives from their oil. It is time to break their sword."

In order for the United States to effectively fight global terrorism and win in Iraq, we must first reduce our dangerous dependence on imported oil. Energy is the lifeblood of the United States and global economy. U.S. economic prosperity is closely tied to the availability of reliable and affordable supplies of energy. Since 1973, U.S. energy production has grown only 13 percent, while U.S. energy consumption has increased 30 percent. Even when significant increases in efficiency are taken into account, significant increases in demand are projected.

According to the Energy Information Agency, the United States, by 2025, is expected to need 44 percent more petroleum, 38 percent more natural gas, 43 percent more coal and 54 percent more electricity. The Department of Energy predicts by the year 2025, U.S. oil and natural gas demand will rise by 46 percent, with energy demand increasing 1 percent for every 2 percent increase in GDP.

Perhaps the most critical of all energy sources is oil. Just as President Bush said in his 2006 State of the Union speech, America is addicted to oil. A look at the numbers supports his claim. Currently, the United States imports about 60 percent of its oil. The Department of Energy projects this number will increase to 73 percent by

the year 2025. Furthermore, world oil demand is expected to grow significantly over the next three decades, from 80 million barrels per day in 2003 to 98 million barrels per day in 2015 and then to 118 million barrels per day by the year 2030, according to the Energy Information Administration. This will place further strains on our quest for energy independence. To make matters worse, much of this imported oil is imported from unstable, anti-American countries, such as Venezuela, Algeria, and even Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, 26.5 percent of the United States' total supplied product comes from OPEC countries, accounting for 42 percent of the total amount imported. Thus, over a quarter of the United States oil product is controlled by an unaccountable cartel of unstable, oil-producing dictatorships.

Alarming, according to the Heritage Foundation, three-quarters of the world's supply of oil is controlled by unstable or hostile regimes, most of which are unsympathetic to investor and property rights. Fifty-seven percent of world oil reserves are in the Middle East, 11 percent in Russia and Venezuela and 6 percent in Africa. The People's Republic of China just erected its first oil rigs in Cuba territorial waters in the Gulf of Mexico, barely 45 miles off the Florida coast of Miami.

The national security implications of having such a large amount of oil controlled by OPEC are great and serious. For example, in order to force changes in U.S. policy, OPEC countries could cut production, thereby raising the price of oil. The resulting political and economic pressure could force us to alter our policies in order to better suit the needs of these OPEC nations. U.S. dependence on imported sources of oil and gas has far-reaching economic and national security ramifications.

Some are willing to use oil as a tool to threaten United States national security objectives. Proclamations by al Qaeda and other terrorist groups that U.S. and western economies and their oil lifelines are legitimate targets make it clear that the oil and gas infrastructure is in peril. As James Woolsey said, we are aiding our enemies at the same time we are fighting them.

#### TOWARD A MORE ENERGY EFFICIENT FUTURE WITHOUT BEING PRICE-GOUGED ON WAY THERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the Chair.

I am going to continue the discussion the previous Member started with perhaps a little different orientation and, that is, our dependence upon oil. I would agree with the gentleman that we need to break our dependence upon imported oil. We need to look toward a more energy-efficient future. That is going to mean new sources of energy,

new technologies. I am on a number of bills to make those investments. But more immediately, I want to talk about the situation we are in today. On the path to that more energy-efficient future, we don't need to be fleeced by the oil cartels, which is what is going on now. I am not just talking about OPEC but I'll get to them in a moment, but I'm getting to the big oil companies—ExxonMobil, record profits last year, \$3.2 billion a month, \$40 billion for the year, \$109 million a day, \$4.6 million an hour of profits for one corporation. Throughout the industry, it was repeated.

Now, the President, an oil man, a failed oil man, and the Vice President from Halliburton, another oil man, say there's nothing they can do about it, nothing the government can do about it. This is just market forces. Market forces.

Hmm. Let's see. You make gasoline out of crude oil so if the price of crude oil goes up, the price of gasoline goes up. Yeah, I understand that. That's good. The price of crude oil is up a whopping 3 percent over last year. That is about inflation. That's not too bad. That's today on the market. Unfortunately, the price of gasoline on the west coast is up 20 percent. Now, where did the rest of that market force come into play?

No, what we have here, plain and simple, is price gouging, market manipulation and collusion. A number of years ago there was a famous memo in the industry that said, you know, the refineries are not particularly profitable, but if the industry were to engage in mergers, buy out the independent refiners, close them down and decrease the refinery capacity in America, that could become a very profitable sector. It is. In fact, profits in the refining sector because of collusion by Big Oil are up 250 percent. It isn't the guy at the corner gas station who's making the money. It's the corporate execs in a vertically integrated industry which they're manipulating. The same way that Enron manipulated the energy markets in California to drive up the price, Big Oil is doing it and they're doing it in the western United States right today and across America. They're building up toward that orgy of price gouging that happens every year around Memorial Day and during the summer driving season. And they say, "Oh, these are just market forces." These are not market forces and this government needs to address this in a number of ways.

We need to file a complaint against OPEC. The gentleman before me mentioned them. They get together, they collude, they decide to constrain the price and drive up the price of crude oil. That's where this all starts. Well, it just happens that a number of the major OPEC producers are in the World Trade Organization. Our President, a big free trader, wants rules-based trade. Well, guess what, the rules don't allow OPEC to do that. But will this

President file a complaint against OPEC? No. I have written to him a number of times and said, President Bush, they're violating the World Trade Organization. File a complaint. People complain about the United States there all the time. Why don't we use that tool to benefit our consumers. No, the President refuses to do that. My bill would force the President to file legitimate complaints and break up the OPEC cartel. That would help. But then we have got to go after the big oil companies themselves. Impose a windfall profits tax on these companies, unless they are investing in expanding refinery capacity—which they cut in order to increase the profitability—exploration or alternative fuels. Make our vehicles more efficient. Give incentives to consumers to buy more efficient vehicles. Mandate new fleet fuel economy standards. Put a ban on more mergers by the oil industry. In fact, my bill would name a commission to investigate the market power of Big Oil and maybe we have to think about breaking them up and turning this back into a somewhat competitive industry.

Yes, we need to move toward a more energy-efficient future, but we don't need to be price-gouged on the way to that goal. And that's what is happening today.

So I am introducing a package of bills oriented toward market manipulation, price gouging by Big Oil and OPEC, and also bills that would give consumers an incentive and actually help consumers to purchase more efficient vehicles in the interim and also push Detroit and other manufacturers toward making more efficient vehicles. They won't go there until we push them. We had a big fight over fleet fuel economy standards. I am very sympathetic to American workers. I remember the guys in from Ford, and they said, You don't understand. The execs told us, if you make them make more efficient vehicles, they'll lay us off. Guess what: They all got laid off because Ford didn't make more efficient vehicles.

It's time for some action on the part of this Congress and this government to defend American consumers and lead us toward a more energy-efficient future without being price-gouged on the way there.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR) at noon.