

happen. Those massive valves that sit on the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico called Christmas trees, that are made in Houston, Texas, by the way, they shut down. That crude oil was not allowed to escape and there was no environmental damage.

But still we hear this hue and cry. We can't drill safely. There is pollution. Crude oil will pollute our shores. Let's look at some facts instead of hysteria.

Pollution from crude oil. Here is where it comes from off our shores. Mother Nature is the biggest culprit. 63 percent of the pollution of crude oil that comes a shore is from Mother Nature.

The second is boating, 32 percent. Tankers cause 3 percent. And if you look at that little bitty line over there on the end, Mr. Speaker, 2 percent comes from offshore drilling. Mother Nature is the culprit, not offshore drilling. We can drill offshore safely.

We need to take care of ourselves. If we allow the opening of the Outer Continental Shelf, two good things will happen. Those oil companies will have to pay a lot of money for the right to drill offshore. That brings revenue into the Federal Treasury, to the taxpayers. And we ought to let States that do allow offshore drilling, no matter which State it is, get a portion of that offshore lease revenue, and let them use it in their states for whatever they wish, like education, transportation, health care, whatever they wish.

Secondly, thousands, literally thousands of high-paying jobs will be created if we allow offshore drilling, plus we will have the crude oil, then the gasoline and be able to reduce the price. That is not the only answer, offshore drilling, but it is one of the answers.

And we are not doing anything. Like my grandfather used to say, when all is said and done, more is said than done. And we haven't done anything this week. We could be 1 week up on offshore drilling if we just took the handcuffs off of America and allowed offshore drilling.

\$425 million dollars a day goes to Saudi Arabia from the American taxpayers to buy crude oil. \$425 million. That money needs to stay home. We need to take care of ourselves.

And that's just the way it is.

SETTING A FIRM TIMETABLE FOR IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT

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, support is growing, finally, for setting a timetable for the responsible redeployment of American troops and military contractors from Iraq. Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki supports a timetable. A majority of the Iraqi Parliament supports a timetable. Both Houses of Congress have voted for a timetable. There

is growing evidence that the majority of the Iraqi people support a timetable. And the American people certainly support a timetable.

Even the administration, which has spent more than 5 years turning a deaf ear to the American people, can finally hear the steady drumbeat of support for a timetable. Last week the administration agreed to what it called a general time horizon for meeting aspirational goals in Iraq. This kind of statement is actually better than "stay the course," which we have heard like a broken record from the White House for years. And it represents a victory for those who have been demanding a new direction in Iraq.

But the administration's position still falls far short of what is needed. A general time horizon for meeting aspirational goals is far too vague. When would the time horizon be reached? Nobody knows.

What is an aspirational goal? Nobody knows.

I believe the fuzzy wording is deliberate. It is obvious that the administration wanted to say something that sounds like a withdrawal but isn't a withdrawal. The loopholes in the administration's position are big enough to drive a truck through. I am afraid that a general time horizon for meeting aspirational goals may just be another way of saying "permanent occupation."

Mr. Speaker, we need clarity in our policy. We need to set a firm timetable for redeployment and a firm date for complete redeployment. These dates should be set in a way that ensures the safety of our troops and guarantees that the redeployment will be orderly and responsible. And we need a clear statement that there will be no permanent U.S. bases in Iraq.

A firm timetable for redeployment will accomplish many important goals. It will return full sovereignty to the Iraqi people. It will give the Iraqis incentives to step up the pace for political reconciliation. It will hasten the day that the Iraqis are capable of taking full responsibility for their own security. It will take an enormous strain off our own military, which has been stretched to the breaking point by the occupation of Iraq. It will relieve the strain on our overburdened military families. It will help to stabilize the Middle East, and help the United States to be a more effective broker in peace talks between the Israelis and Palestinians.

□ 2000

It will allow us to focus on a solution for Afghanistan, a solution that can win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. It will allow us to take billions of dollars that are being spent on the Iraq occupation and use that money instead for domestic needs and to help the American people deal with current hard times.

It will open the door for regional and for international partners to come into

Iraq and to help with the reconstruction of that shattered nation. It will restore America's moral leadership in the world, and it will make us a more credible leader in the fight against terrorism. It will send a signal to the rest of the world that America is ready to be America again. That means a nation which respects the rule of law, that has compassion of the people of the world and that prefers peace over war.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's time horizon isn't enough. After more than 5 years of occupation, the only thing that should be on the horizon is a firm timetable for redeployment. That's what the American people and the Iraqi people want.

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

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

OIL EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the Third Congressional District of California. It is in the Greater Sacramento area. I live in a wonderful community called Gold River along the American River, near the site of the finding of gold in the 1800s, which began the great gold rush in California.

When I was home in my district over the last several weekends, I had an opportunity to speak to a number of people in that district, and the issue that they were most concerned about was that of energy.

This is of some interest to me, not only because of the legitimate concerns of the people of my district—the problems that are besetting them as a result of the higher and higher prices of energy, particularly with respect to gasoline, the embedded transportation costs and many other things, such as food—but because, before I moved to that area some now 20 years ago, I for most of my life lived in Long Beach, California, and I'd had the privilege of representing that area and the adjoining areas for 10 years in this Congress during my first tenure here. Although I was not involved in the energy industry nor were my parents nor were other members of my family, I did go to school with a number of people who were either involved or whose parents were involved in that industry.

The community of Signal Hill is completely surrounded by my hometown of Long Beach—Signal Hill, one of the longest producing oil fields in the United States. As I grew up, I saw

offshore drilling, some very close to shore on the manmade islands in San Pedro Bay and Long Beach Harbor, where the drilling of a resource that had been counted to be, perhaps, as large as 2 billion barrels of oil was a reality during the years I grew up, and it continues to this day.

As a matter of fact, every school district in California benefited from that as they got a bit of the royalties that were achieved because these are considered State lands, tidelands.

I also saw some rigs further out off the shores of the Long Beach and Huntington Beach areas that I represented, and I noted that we didn't have problems with oil seepage or with the loss of oil to any measurable amount during those years that I saw it there.

I also understood from those who worked in the fields and from those who worked in the refineries that this is tough work, difficult work, but it is proud work, hard work, blue-collar work, American work. I remember some of my friends having parents who were called wildcatters. It wasn't a derisive term at the time. It was a term of some pride. These were people who took risks to go out and attempt to find oil, not only in California but in other places around the United States, and somehow during the period of time or from the period of time that I was a child to the present time, these people have gotten a bad name, that somehow anything that is touched by the oil industry is dirty and befouls the environment.

Yet what we have seen over the last 30 to 40 years is a remarkable improvement in technology and tremendous attention to detail with respect to the protection of the environment. So it not only surprises but it saddens me that on this floor we can't have debate about bills that would allow us to discover, uncover and produce the natural resources that are available to us at this present time for ourselves, for our children and for our grandchildren.

We are here on a Thursday evening once again. We are not here for a 5-day week but for barely a 3-day week, coming up next week for our last week before we leave for the August recess, and we have not had one serious piece of legislation dealing with increased supply. We've had shell game legislation like today's legislation on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We'll remove some now, put it back later. The net result is no increase in supply worldwide, and that is the answer, in part, to the energy problem.

I have supported wind, and I have supported solar, and I have supported nuclear, and I have supported geothermal, and I have supported hydroelectric. I continue to support that, but the fact of the matter is, if you look at the real world, we very much rely on oil, natural gas and oil, and we have tremendous reserves in and around this country that we have put off limits. It doesn't make sense. It makes less and less sense every day, and yet we fail to move.

I would just hope that, before we leave next Friday, we would at least have a single vote on this floor to open up greater areas for exploration and for the production of American oil produced by American men and women for American men and women.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF BRUNSWICK

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the City of Brunswick, one of the "10 Best Towns for Families" in the United States.

The City of Brunswick has been recognized by Family Circle magazine from over 1,850 communities as one of the "10 Best Towns for Families." But this is hardly a surprise for anyone who lives there.

With family-friendly neighborhoods and child-friendly parks, like Mooney Park, where hundreds of boys and girls fill summer evenings playing baseball and softball, we have long known that Brunswick is one of the best towns for families.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the rest of America will know about the vision Brunswick's community leaders and their citizens have pursued to create a community of excellence.

Communities throughout this Nation can look to Brunswick for examples of how to green their communities. With their Tire Adoption program, over \$25,000 was raised to recycle 20,000 tires, converting old junkyard into park land.

In addition, the Brunswick Art Works recently held the second annual Eco-Arts Chalk Festival in North Park. At this event, children not only competed in chalk art sidewalk drawing contests, but they also made their own rain collection barrels out of recycled plastic drums.

Let us not forget that the Nation's first LEED-certified grocery store calls Brunswick, Ohio in the Brunswick Town Center its home.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I am so pleased to honor Brunswick, Ohio, part of my district, as one of the 10 best towns in America for families.

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 Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE FIGHT FOR OUR FUTURE

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in the days after the 9/11 attacks, politicians, journalists and assorted experts rushed to claim that America and the world had entered a new era and that the battle with al Qaeda would define the first decades of the 21st century.

As the fight against al Qaeda has continued and intensified, we have come to see the impact of that fight on a key national security paradigm of the post Cold War era: the quest for energy security in an industrializing and ever-flattering world.

The United States has long recognized that our global leadership and economic strength depended on cheap, abundant energy from the Middle East. Disruptions to that supply as a result of the 1973 oil embargo, the Iranian revolution of 1979 and the 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait had demonstrated our vulnerability to events halfway around the world. Rather than taking the steps necessary to wean ourselves from Middle East oil, we sought to create stability in the region by aligning ourselves with pro-Western autocrats whose powerful internal security forces kept restive populations in check.

Capacity and price, the first high and the second low, stayed our hand. Cheap and plentiful oil powered the American economy to preeminence while solar, wind and biomass energy were expensive. Environmental concerns, including increasing evidence that the burning of fossil fuels was altering the Earth's climate, were relegated to secondary status.

All of that has now changed. The 9/11 attacks and the Iraq war have highlighted the seething political instability in the Middle East. The rise of China and India have increased competition for oil even as the global supply has remained stable. Finally, the Earth's climate is changing more rapidly and more profoundly than many scientists had forecasted, leading to a global consensus that humanity must take immediate steps to curtail the emission of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses.

This confluence of political, economic and environmental factors is one of the greatest challenges that this Nation has faced in its history, but just as we have risen to meet other challenges—from the Revolution to the Civil War to the Great Depression and the totalitarian dictatorships of the 20th century—I am confident that we will emerge from this crisis stronger and better positioned than our economic rivals to prosper in this new world.

As for the other problems that we have faced, finding a solution will require us to put our faith in American ingenuity and in our enormous capacity to fund and focus research and development efforts. In the last 2 years,