

Today, I had three young Iranians in my office, and they verified that next year there will be an election and Ahmadinejad, who is in political trouble over there, is being enhanced by our militant conversation we have here, threatening of blockades, and with this plan or possible plan to actually bomb Iran. But the other side argues, well, no it is all the Iranians' fault. They are testing missiles.

The testing of missiles came after there were war games by Israel testing whether or not they had the manpower and the airplanes to travel that particular distance. So the saber rattling is not one-sided, and we cannot say that it is all the Iranians' fault.

This H. Con. Res. 362, the authors claim it is not a blockade. But what it does, it demands inspection of all imports of petroleum products, vehicles, ships, planes, trains and cargo. They use word "prohibit" and impose stringent inspection on all of these items.

Now, the question I would like to pose here for our Members is this: How would we as Americans and how would we as a government react if a strong government came and did that to us? What if another government came and said we are going to restrict the importation of petroleum products and we are going to inspect all vehicles, ships, planes, trains and cargo? We wouldn't know what that would mean. How could they do that without an embargo? This is militant language, it is just looking for trouble, and it will not help solve the situation.

There is nothing wrong with talking to people. We talked to the Soviets in the midst of the Cold War. They had 40,000 nuclear weapons. Now they are talking about, well, maybe the Iranians might get a weapon later on.

Quite frankly, this talk about this violation, the Iranians were asked by IAEA not to resume enrichment. They had voluntarily stopped enrichment for peaceful purposes. They have every right under the Nonproliferation Treaty to enrich for peaceful purposes. In the last year, there have been nine unannounced inspections of the Iranian nuclear sites. They have never once been found in violation.

This does not make them angels. This does not make them not want to desire to defend their country. But think about it: How many countries have nukes around them? Pakistan has nukes, India has them, Israel has them, the United States has them, China has them, the Soviets have them. And they are being threatened. War games are being practiced, with the potentiality of us being a participant in bombing them.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to take a deep breath and reassess our position.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss two very important national issues that are unrelated.

First, I consider national defense to be one of the most important and most legitimate functions of the National Government. Yet even I am astounded at sometimes the waste and inefficiency of the Defense Department, and I think the primary reason is that almost every defense contract is some sort of sweetheart or insider type deal.

Just yesterday in the Washington Times, I would like to read a portion of a story that the Times carried yesterday. It says: "Similarly, Edward C. 'Pete' Aldridge, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics at the Pentagon, left the agency to join the board of Lockheed Martin, the Pentagon's largest contractor. Weeks before he left the Pentagon, Mr. Aldridge approved a \$3 billion contract to build 20 Lockheed planes. That decision was made after he criticized the plan and threatened to cancel the contract. While serving on the Lockheed board, Mr. Aldridge was picked in 2004 to chair the Commission on the Implementation of U.S. Space Exploration Policy, a decision that drew criticism only from Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, now the presumptive Republican Presidential nominee, who said Lockheed was one of NASA's biggest contractors and called for Mr. Aldridge's removal because of a conflict of interest. His criticism went unheeded."

Madam Speaker, the problem is that all of the defense contractors hire all the retired admirals and generals, it has been referred to as the "revolving door at the Pentagon," or all the high level Pentagon employees, and then they come back to these same people and they get these multi-billion dollar contracts. In this example, this man awarded Lockheed Martin a \$3 billion contract, the same contract he criticized at one point. But then, surprise, shock of all shocks, he approved this contract, and then a short time later joined the board of Lockheed Martin.

This is just one example. I could give examples day after day of similar types of things. All of these defense contracts going to companies that hire all the re-

tired admirals and generals, and it should be stopped.

The second issue, a very important issue but very unrelated, is the issue of energy and gas prices. I would like to read part of a column by Charles Krauthammer a few days ago. Mr. Krauthammer is very respected by both sides of the aisle.

He said, "Gas is \$4 a gallon, oil is \$135 a barrel and rising. We import two-thirds of our oil, sending hundreds of billions of dollars to the likes of Russia, Venezuela and Saudi Arabia. And yet we voluntarily prohibit ourselves from even exploring huge domestic reserves of petroleum and natural gas."

Mr. Krauthammer continued: "At a time when U.S. crude oil production has fallen 40 percent in the past 25 years, 75 billion barrels of oil have been declared off limits, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. That would be enough to replace every barrel of non-North American imports for 22 years." That is nearly a quarter century of energy independence.

Mr. Krauthammer said, "The situation is absurd."

George Will wrote a column a few days ago and he said this: "One million barrels is what might today be flowing from ANWR if in 1995 President Bill Clinton had not vetoed legislation to permit drilling there. One million barrels produce 27 million gallons of gasoline and diesel fuel."

And Robert Samuelson, who is not really considered a conservative or Republican columnist, he is a columnist for the Washington Post, he wrote a few weeks ago this. He said, "The truth is we are almost powerless to influence today's prices. We are because we didn't take sensible actions 10 or 20 years ago. If we persist, we will be even worse off in a decade or two. The first thing to do, start drilling."

Madam Speaker, I am one of the very few Members who has been up to Prudhoe Bay in Alaska twice. I have been up there to this frozen tundra. There are millions of acres without a tree or a bush on that entire expanse up there, 19.8 million acres, 36 times the size of the Great Smokey Mountains, part of which I represent. They want to drill on about 2,000 or 3,000 acres of this 19.8 million acre refuge. It takes a survivalist to go in there. In fact, Time Magazine said 4 years ago it only had about 200 visitors a year.

It is ridiculous that we do not drill in an environmentally safe way. Most environmental extremists, I have noticed over the years, they come from very wealthy or very upper-income families. Perhaps they can afford gas to go to \$5 or \$6 a gallon. They have said for years they wanted gas prices to go higher so people would drive less. But I can tell you this: They are hurting a lot of poor and lower-income and working people in this country, and they are shutting this country down economically.

We heard in the Highways and Transit Subcommittee a few weeks ago that

935 trucking companies had closed in the first quarter of this year, and they only counted trucking companies with five trucks or more. Two weeks ago we heard in a hearing of the Aviation Subcommittee that eight airlines had shut down, had ceased operating in the last year-and-a-half, and one more was in receivership.

We are at a very dangerous point. We don't have to produce all of our oil or all of our energy, but we have got to start producing a little bit more, or these foreign energy producers are going to know they can keep on raising these prices, and as I say, they are going to hurt a lot of working and ordinary Americans in the process.

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

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

ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES FACING AMERICA

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, last week the House went on recess to spend time in our districts commemorating our independence as a Nation. These celebrations every 4th of July are always a time to remember and honor the history of this great country. We think of the great moments when the United States of America shone as an unparalleled leader in liberty and achievement; the brave men who stormed the beaches of Normandy, followed by the Marshall Plan and the Berlin airlift; the Wright Brothers becoming first in flight; or, of course, Neil Armstrong taking that giant leap for mankind.

Perhaps above all, though, Madam Speaker, America's great moments have been expressions of great ideas. Our Nation was born out of the ideals of the Declaration of Independence. It established an enduring national philosophy based on the truth that we are all created equal and endowed by our Creator with inalienable rights.

Since that beginning, bold ideas have defined our Nation; the idea that government must be of the people, by the people, and for the people; the idea that checks and balances must be built into the very structure of government to ensure its responsiveness to the American people; the idea that every man, woman and child has the right to freely practice their faith; the idea that all ideas should be allowed to be freely expressed. This is our history and our heritage.

But Independence Day is not just a time to reflect on our past. It is also an opportunity to consider where we are headed. I believe that today, we as

Americans are currently grappling with very fundamental philosophical questions, and answers to these questions will present complex challenges in their implementation.

A central question is how to apply our core principles to the new challenges that we face. How do we secure ourselves against new threats without diminishing the civil liberties that we hold dear. How do we wage a war against Islamic extremism without appearing to treat those of the Muslim faith with the very intolerance that fuels extremism. How do we end the scourge of illegal immigration, while continuing to be that shining city on the hill to the many legal immigrants who have always helped to make this country the great Nation that it is.

□ 1745

How do we engage in the worldwide marketplace while ensuring that Americans can successfully compete in a very dynamic economic environment?

Madam Speaker, there are those who say that America is bitterly divided today over these questions. It is certainly true that there is great diversity of opinion in how to address the security and economic challenges that we face. But if we are willing to engage each other in honest and open debate, this diversity of opinion is our great strength, not our weakness.

We as a Nation are facing substantial new challenges that demand a great clash of ideas, just as our Founders intended. Unfortunately, the recitation of inflammatory talking points has supplanted sincere and honest debate. The shrill voices of talking heads are no substitute for true engagement.

I believe Americans have grown weary of politics as usual, of the endless fighting that takes place here in Washington. But not because of the existence of opposing views. Americans have grown weary of the obstinacy, the hardened positions and intolerance of differing opinions, the refusal to truly engage in an open and substantive way.

Madam Speaker, in a country of over 300 million people, there will never be uniformity of opinion, but there can and should be a deep respect for that clash of ideas and an interest in reaching broad consensus on the great issues of our day. This is the essence of the United States of America, and it is the essence of why we last Friday celebrated our Nation's independence, the freedom of ideas, all ideas, to be debated, debunked, or developed in this messy process of democracy.

Madam Speaker, I truly believe that our country will rise to the challenges we face today, just as we have always done. And we will accomplish this through open, sometimes heated and passionate, but always respectful debate. The celebration of our independence is always at least a temporary unifier of America. But this year, we cannot afford to confine this unity to one day, the Fourth of July. I believe we should use this time to renew our

belief in a country that is bound together, not driven apart, by the clash of ideas out of which our great country was born.

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

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her 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. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELLER of Illinois 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. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHUSTER 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 Georgia (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia 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. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIRK 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 North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MYRICK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania 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 Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.