

“Rally to Stop Genocide.” The murder, rape, and torture that have occurred—and still occur—in Sudan must stop.

In July of 2004, the House of Representatives and the Senate declared that the atrocities occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan constituted genocide. On September 9, 2004, Secretary of State Colin Powell declared that “genocide has been committed in Darfur, and that the government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility.” It is estimated that 200,000 people were killed by government forces and militias from 2003 through 2004, and an additional 200,000 people died as a result of the deliberate destruction of their homes and livelihoods.

Nevertheless, almost two years later, these atrocities continue unabated. The government of Sudan continues to carry out air strikes against civilians in Darfur, and the Janjaweed militias, with the support of the government, continue to terrorize the people of Darfur.

Earlier this year, I traveled to Sudan as part of a bipartisan congressional delegation led by my good friend from California, Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi. We visited the camps. As far as the eyes could see, there were crowds of displaced people who had been driven from their homes, living literally on the ground with little tarps just covering them. It is unconscionable that this should continue.

Our delegation also met with Sudanese Vice President Taha. He was unapologetic, he was arrogant, and he was uncompromising on their position in Darfur. Sudanese government officials don’t like the use of the word “genocide,” but Vice President Taha admitted that they had funded the Janjaweed in order to retaliate against the rebels of the south who were resisting the Sudanese government.

There can be no doubt that what is taking place in Darfur is genocide, and the government of Sudan is responsible. There are two million displaced people in camps in Darfur and another 200,000 in camps in neighboring Chad. Each month, it is estimated that another 6,000 people die.

On April 5, 2006, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. This bill imposes sanctions on the government of Sudan and blocks the assets and restricts travel for individuals who are responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity in Darfur. I urged my colleagues to support this bill, which passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 416 to 3. This legislation was long overdue.

The world stood by and watched the genocide that occurred in Rwanda. The world has noted over and over again the atrocities of the Holocaust. Yet we cannot seem to get the international community to move fast enough to stop the genocide that is taking place in Darfur.

The world cannot continue to turn a blind eye to genocide when it is staring us in the face. We must put an end to these atrocities, or millions more will die.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to encourage and support the work done by advocacy groups such as Teens Against Genocide and to continue legislative action to stop these crimes against humanity.

ENERGY PRICES IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the privilege to address you. In addressing you, I recognize the American people’s ears are tuned as well. It is a precious right we have, our freedom of speech we have in this country, and we exercise it on the floor of this Congress on a regular basis, and I appreciate it on both sides of the aisle.

I came to the floor this evening, Mr. Speaker, to address the energy situation that we have in the United States of America. We have watched our gas prices go up to \$3 a gallon and more in the last few weeks. There was a time when it was headed in that direction, and it headed back down again, and now it is back up, and who knows where it is going to stop. We never know where it is going to stop.

The American people are concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, and they should be. We have debated energy on this floor many, many times, and we have kicked back and forth issue after issue that has to do with how we are going to provide an adequate energy supply to keep this economy churning.

This economy is churning, Mr. Speaker. It is churning consistently. It has got some really unprecedented growth. Ten of the last eleven succeeding quarters have had more than 3 percent growth in our gross domestic product. That is a growth rate that one has to go back to the early Reagan years to match.

Yet this growth rate that we have in this environment, this more than 3 percent growth of our gross domestic product for 10 of the last 11 succeeding quarters, or preceding quarters, is matched back to those Reagan years. But in those years, we were under high inflation, high unemployment and high interest rates.

□ 1900

It was a lot harder to make a predictable profit back in those early years than it is in this environment. Today, this is 3 percent growth-plus. It is more than 3 percent growth, but we are doing this in an environment of relatively low interest rates and lower unemployment rates and lower inflation rates. So this economy has had perhaps the longest run and been the healthiest economic environment I have seen in my lifetime.

I am thankful President Bush stood up and took the lead after the bursting of the dot-com bubble, which sent the United States toward a recession. As the dot-com bubble burst, we had speculators that were investing in our new technological ability to store and transfer information faster than ever before without regard to what that value was worth in the marketplace. And so the economy, the dot-com bubble burst, and that sent us towards a recession, and some will say in a recession.

And then right in that recession we saw the September 11 attack on the United States, on our financial centers, on the Pentagon, and of course on the plane that crashed in the field in Pennsylvania. And that was an attack, again, on our financial centers with an attempt to cripple our economy. Well, not only did it hit a difficult hard blow to our economy but, at the same time, this Congress made the decision to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in homeland security, so we also had to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in our Department of Defense funding to carry out this global war on terror.

So we increased our spending in defense, we created a Department of Homeland Security, and we dramatically grew the spending in homeland security all at the time when our economy was being compressed and reduced because of the hit on our financial centers of September 11 and because of the bursting of the dot-com bubble. And the vision of President Bush was that we had to cut taxes to stimulate the economy, and so we did that.

We did that in two rounds here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. And we said today that last year our revenue increase by 14½ percent greater than anticipated, and this year it is going to be double digits again, greater than anticipated. These tax cuts have worked. They have brought us out of this recession that was caused by the bursting of the dot-com bubble and the September 11 attacks.

But into the middle of all of this we have the energy issue, the energy issue that has gas prices up to \$3 a gallon or more as it becomes closer and closer, potentially, to an energy crisis. Now, someone once asked, what is the solution to \$3 gas? All of America is asking that question today. What is the solution to \$3 gas? And some wag responded, well, \$3 gas is the solution to \$3 gas. Now, I am not sure that \$3 gas brings us the answer to this, but I do believe \$4 or \$5 or \$6 gas will bring solutions to a lot of our energy problems in this country and energy problems around the world.

We have been, really, beneficiaries of a fairly cheap fuel over the years. We have had good access to resources here in the United States; and our oil companies, especially American oil companies, have gone overseas, developed the oil supplies in the Middle East, for example, the Libyan oil fields and the Iraqi and Iranian oil fields, and the list goes on. Our American companies have been integral to the development of the oil supply that is coming to the United States today, and that oil is coming out of the ground cheap, and it came to the United States cheap.

Not very long ago we had gas at a \$1.07. I don’t remember anyone in America saying since we have such cheap gas prices, we ought to pay a little extra to these oil companies that have invested their capital to go out and drill and explore around the world so that we have an adequate supply of

energy. No, American consumers did what consumers do: they pumped the \$1.07 gas in their cars, they drove a little more, and maybe bought a car that burned a little more gas and got a little less mileage than they might have otherwise and looked at that as something that was going to go on, cheap gas into perpetuity.

But we know that those situations have a way of coming home to roost. We are the beneficiaries of an energy policy that was driven globally by capital investment of American oil companies and the people who invested in those American oil companies. And the import oil that was coming in was coming in to America cheap. But today it is a different environment. That environment has turned.

And as we saw our prices go up during Katrina and Rita, when our refineries were shut down, down in the gulf coast, a good number of our platforms were wiped out in the hurricanes in the gulf coast and a large percentage of America's energy supply was shut down during and in the aftermath of Katrina. It took us a while to get back on line, and it is going to take us a while longer to get our production back up to where it was prior to Katrina. Some of the refineries are not back up to speed yet; and some of the platforms, I understand, are not quite up to speed yet either.

So we don't have the American supply of either oil or natural gas coming that we had prior to Hurricane Katrina, and yet there is work to be done. We passed some energy bills here in the last couple of years. We passed two that I recall. One of them addressed the situation of not having enough refineries. But in the United States we have not built a new oil refinery since 1976. Now, that works out to be 30 years, Mr. Speaker, without building a refinery.

It is true we have expanded some of the ones we had, but we have also shut down a significant number of those that we had. Our ability to refine our oil for our consumption here in the United States has diminished to where we cannot meet that demand of refining all of our own today. And that is an important component. It is important we are able to refine all the oil that we consume in America, that we produce and consume in America. That gives us at least a modicum of independence from the price of foreign oil.

So we took some steps here in this Congress to site some new refinery locations and to provide so that we could build those refineries and get them up on line. It takes a little while to do that. We just initiated that, and along came Rita and Katrina, and it set us back again. So we find ourselves in this situation where our domestic supplies have been reduced at the very time that the threat of violence around the world has slowed down some of the oil supply that is coming through, and it has diminished the optimism of the investor market.

I look at what is going on in Iran, for example, and the nuclear threat that they have become. They have clearly stated to the world over and over again, we are going to enrich our uranium, and they claim that they have. They put on a play where they had dancers dancing around on the stage each with a vial of enriched uranium to demonstrate that their 164 centrifuges are now producing this enriched uranium. And they need dozens and perhaps hundreds more to be able to produce a large enough quantity to produce a bomb.

But if they are telling the truth about their ability to enrich the uranium, and I believe they are; and if they are telling the truth about their conviction to move forward to develop a bomb, and I believe they are, then it is just a matter of time. And the time question is whether it is months or years before they get to that point where they will be able to have a nuclear weapon.

It was just announced this morning that they have purchased the means to deliver it, a means that would give them as much as a 2,000 mile range if they could put a nuclear warhead on top of the missiles that they allege and announced today that they have acquired from North Korea. So this is a serious threat to the world, and not just the peace of the world. It is a threat to the survival of Israel. And that, Mr. Speaker, might be another subject; but it is a threat to the entire energy production and delivery system of the world.

So we have a rogue nation, an evil empire, if they are not quite an empire yet, Iran, which is sitting on those massive supplies of oil and developing nuclear capability because, they claim, at least they used to claim, that they need a nuclear capability to generate electricity in Iran. That an oil-rich nation would develop a nuclear capability to generate electricity never was a believable allegation, especially when you are considered a nation that doesn't have the ability to refine its own crude oil for the gas that goes into the cars they drive around in cities like Tehran.

One would think, if they wanted to move into the future world, they would do so by building refineries so they could refine the crude oil that they pump out of the ground in Iran, burn the gas and the diesel fuel in the nation of Iran, and export a refined product rather than a crude oil product. But, no, Mr. Speaker, their priorities went towards developing a nuclear capability.

It has put the world on notice that we are at great risk today, and that risk is missiles that will soon be aimed at, if not today, aimed at places like Tel Aviv, probably not Jerusalem right away. But the threats to annihilating Israel will force them, I think, to take action if there isn't some other solution.

Well, the energy world is looking at this volatile situation in Iran, and they

understand that Israel cannot, if they are going to survive as a nation, sit back and wait and walk through this diplomatic jungle and allow Iran to have a nuclear capability. They cannot wait. And we here in the United States must also take a responsibility to eliminate a nation's ability to conduct a nuclear strike against their neighbors. This cannot be tolerated.

Yet as the world markets look at this, they understand also the risk that there will be some military action someday in Iran. If that action takes place, and some say when that action takes place, there is a high risk that the oil production out of that region between Iran and potentially Iraq could be shut down. If that is shut down, there will be a tremendous impact on the energy prices all over the world.

That tremendous impact will affect the global prices for oil that are now at all-time highs and have gone from, not very long ago, \$15 a barrel to, the last I checked, \$75 a barrel. And you think how can we have \$3 gas? Well, think in terms of \$75 a barrel and there is 42 gallons in a barrel. When it gets up to \$84 a barrel, if you have 100 percent gas out of a barrel, then you would still be at \$2 just to purchase the crude. Then you would have to go through the refinery process and peel out the oil and the diesel fuel and pay for the energy consumption that it takes to crack out a gallon of gas. But \$3 gas is not a price gouge if you are buying the oil at \$75 a barrel.

I will say, in defense of the oil companies, that they have invested their capital. They have done the research and development. They have done the field exploration. They have identified their reserves of oil. And when they have done so, that has been their capital that was invested. They had to invest on the prospects of being able to find new oil fields and then expand their wells into those and set up a distribution system that could come back to the market. And in this process of doing that, they need to make a profit if they are going to have the capital to do any more exploration.

So I am not one, Mr. Speaker, that would say that we should put a windfall profit tax on the very people that are producing the most oil for us, because they are the ones that are contributing to the overall supply of energy. And those that contribute to the overall supply of energy are the ones doing the most to keep the price down, Mr. Speaker.

So a windfall profits tax acts in the opposite direction. If I am Enron, for example, and I made \$10-something billion in a quarter, and if we are making noises from the floor of this Congress like, way to go, Enron, you produced a lot of oil and we know you made some money; we hope you invest that back in oil exploration in places in the world so that there is a supply for us this year, next year, a decade from now, a generation from now, so that oil comes

back to the United States and we can consume it. We need this energy supply. If we just go out there and starve the goose that lays the golden oil, or golden barrel of crude oil, eventually we will find the prices of crude going up higher and higher and higher because there will be less supply.

So we have done some things in this country that were not very smart, and it has been because our hands have been tied here and over in the Senate by environmentalists. It isn't so much that they are concerned something is going to happen to the environment. I have a difficult time looking around the oil fields and finding damage to the environment. It is more, I think, just a belief system, almost a religion, if you will, Mr. Speaker, that if you label it green, more than half the Members of this Congress will vote against oil exploration or oil development or energy development. If you label it something green is against, I should say. If you label it renewable, then they are for it, whether it is practical or whether it isn't.

We need to do a lot of things in this country; and when I look around at the oil exploration in America, it has diminished dramatically. The offshore drilling in America is almost shut down entirely, and that is for both oil and natural gas.

Now, we have developed our natural gas fields in the Gulf Coast, around New Orleans and the coast of Texas. But when you go east and start along the Mississippi and Florida and Alabama, I need to get those people in there, you find that the panhandle of Florida runs along the Gulf Coast quite a ways. But to drill for even natural gas offshore in Florida, even 199.9 miles out offshore has been blocked and banned by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans from Florida, a coalition of Democrats from America, and some people that have jumped on board there that are northeastern Republicans that don't seem to understand that their homes need to be heated, their cars need gas in them, and their factories need natural gas.

□ 1915

If they are going to produce anything from a factory standpoint, they need natural gas to fire that. And the food that they eat is all grown with nitrogen, Mr. Speaker, and our nitrogen fertilizer that is the backbone of our corn-producing industry in America, 90 percent of the cost of our nitrogen fertilizer is the cost of the natural gas that it takes as a feedstock to produce the natural gas.

So as we shut down our exploration and drilling here in the United States under the misguided notion that somehow we are protecting an environment, an environment that, let me say, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the world, of all of the offshore wells that have been drilled or the onshore wells that have been drilled for natural gas, I cannot find a single incident where there has

been a pollution caused by that gas that came from the drilling. Not offshore or onshore.

We saw natural gas escaping down off the gulf coast of New Orleans. As it bubbled out of the water, only two things can happen. One is it evaporates into the air and dissipates. And the other is if you strike a match to it, you will burn that gas off. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not a pollution to our environment.

Yet the environmentalists want to block all of the drilling that we can possibly provide here in the United States. They want to block it on land and on sea. And if we could find some natural gas in the air, they would try to block that, too.

There is enough natural gas beneath the nonnational park public lands in America to heat every home in this country for the next 150 years, and yet there is an environmentalist barrier into tapping into that natural gas. There are 38 trillion cubic feet of natural gas up on the North Slope of Alaska, in the oil fields that we have already developed, those oil fields that feed the Alaska pipeline. That is 38 trillion cubic feet already developed oil there. We need to build a pipeline to run that down to the lower 48 States, and there is more undiscovered gas up there without a doubt, and it is right next door to ANWR.

But I mentioned a little earlier the delegation from Florida, and with a coalition of Democrats and Northeastern Republicans, they have blocked all drilling offshore for natural gas and oil. But the Outer Continental Shelf, that area from the shoreline to 200 miles out, which is where we make claim to the mineral rights, out to 200 miles, the people who are the tourist trade in Florida are afraid that if someone goes out there to drill a well way beyond the line of sight of anyone sitting on a beach in Florida, the mere mention of that will, even though it is beyond the line of sight of people sitting on a beach in Florida, will keep people from going on vacation in Florida.

You know, they have to burn something in their homes to heat them. They have to do something to generate electricity in Florida. I am told, and I have not verified this to my satisfaction or I would tell you that I know it to be factually correct, but conceptually I believe it is, that there are 33 electric generating plants planned for the State of Florida for this year, and that 28 of them are natural-gas-fired; natural-gas-fired electrical generating plants sitting in a State that is surrounded by natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf, but we cannot tap into that gas, Mr. Speaker, because someone might find out that we drilled a well offshore out of sight of the beaches and not go to Florida to sit on the beach. That is the rationale that is going on.

There is no threat to the environment, none whatsoever. Historically there has been no damage at all.

Mr. Speaker, 38 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the North Slope of Alaska and 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States. That is 406 trillion cubic feet, and a lot has still not been properly inventoried.

So we have this massive supply of natural gas. We have seen our natural gas prices go up as many as five times the retail price. I will say it has gone up five to six times in the last 5 to 6 years is the best way to describe that.

So we are all paying the price of high natural gas. We are paying a price for higher fertilizer in the Corn Belt. It is costing us more to heat our homes, and it is costing us a lot more to produce our plastics, which require natural gas in their production. The list of the burden on the economy goes on and on.

Every component of this economy, everything that we sell and buy in America, all has an energy component. It takes energy to produce everything that we do, and it takes energy also to deliver it; that is, the transportation component. So if you are going to produce a widget, it is going to take energy to produce the widget, and then you have to ship it to a warehouse and to a retail outlet. You have to send a salesperson, and that takes energy. If you just do this by telephone and over the Internet, assuming you can compete that way, that takes energy as well.

Here sits the United States of America, the number one consumer of energy and the number one producer by almost every broad measure that there is, and we have not provided to produce an adequate amount of energy in the United States of America when we are sitting right on top of it.

Listening to me talk, Mr. Speaker, one would think that I am for drilling in ANWR, drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf; and, Mr. Speaker, I am. I will go back to ANWR in a little bit, but I want to add that I am for another concept here entirely, and that is we need to grow the size of the energy pie.

But on the ANWR issue with the crude oil aspect of this, the environmentalists will say, no, there is not enough oil there to bother to poke a hole, so we are just going to block it here on this floor.

I remember we had a vote here on the floor on an energy bill a couple of years ago. The vote was on whether we would allow drilling in ANWR. The language read that they would disturb no more than 2,000 acres of ANWR. I read that language, and I think about 2,000 acres conceptually. I am from farm country, and I look at a square section of ground or a 40 or an 80, whatever it is, and I think in those terms.

In my mind's eye when I think 2,000 acres, I think three sections, a little more. But with only 2 minutes left on the vote, I had Members come to me and say, This is drilling in ANWR, and it is limited to 2,000 acres. You are from Iowa; how much is 2,000 acres? Excuse me. How much is an acre? That

was the first question. How much is an acre? It is 208 by 208 feet, or the same size as a country school. This list went on. I tried to describe it some other ways. None of that seemed to register.

Well, what is 2,000 acres, they would ask me. I said, it is not even a big farm in Iowa anymore; a little more than average, but not big. They seemed to absorb that information, go down and put their card in and vote "no" on drilling in ANWR. That was the information and research that seemed to be a deciding factor.

They did not want to disturb 2,000 acres out of 19.6 million acres, and this is just going on the 2,000 acres of the coastal plain itself. You do the calculation, and it turns out to be the 2,000 acres just of ANWR. Not even doing the calculation of all of Alaska, but just of ANWR is 0.01 percent. That is 1/100th of 1 percent of the ANWR region. Of the 19.6 million acres that is the ANWR region, that is all that would be disturbed to pull out of it this massive supply of oil that I happen to have on this chart.

Now, this is the reserve that is ANWR. All of U.S. proven reserves total a little more than 21 billion barrels of oil. When we add ANWR to this, it adds another 10.4 billion barrels of oil. That adds another 50 percent to the supply, and this piece up here would go almost off the charts. If you can add half again to the U.S. oil supply, why wouldn't you do that?

If anyone went up to the North Slope of Alaska and would see where we developed the oil fields and see where we set up the Alaska pipeline and pump that oil down here for years now, and that began in 1972. Yes, 1972 is when the construction began. So we are 34 years into this. We have been delivering oil for 30-plus years down here to the United States, and we have had a spill of a tanker. We have had a couple of small spills on the ground, all cleaned up. I have not heard the news about it being anything else. It has been a good, sound environmental approach that came up there in Alaska, and they created a lot of the science and technology. The environmental compatibility has been developed up there.

If you look at the North Slope of Alaska, the identical topography of ANWR, it is right next door, what I see up there is you have to show somebody where the oil fields are. The oil fields on the North Slope of Alaska, people are thinking they are going to go there looking for pump jacks sitting there pumping, and maybe see an oil derrick, and maybe they are thinking of oil spilling out of the pipe. They do not see it as a neat, green, environmentally friendly region.

But on the trip up there to the North Slope when we flew over those North Slope oil fields, and I have worked in the oil fields, I looked down, and they said, we are over the oil fields now. I said, I do not see them; can you point them out to me? They had to point them out to me.

It turns out there are no roads that go to these wells. You cannot see the collector lines that are the smaller pipelines that have to be collecting this oil from the wells that go to the main terminal, or collection stations before they go to the main terminal. What you will see from the air if it is pointed out to you is a work-over pad that is perhaps white rock, limestone rock. I am not sure what kind of rock it is up there, but it is piled 2, 3, 4 feet above the Arctic tundra. It is perhaps 50 feet wide, 150 feet long. But it is a small pad. That is all that designates where the well is. There is not a derrick sitting there. There is not a pump jack sitting there. These are submersible pumps. There is zero clearance, and there is nothing that sticks up out of the ground. That pad is there so in the wintertime, if they need to work on a well, if a pump fails or they want to do some maintenance, they build an ice road in the wintertime.

It is easy to come by ice in the wintertime in that country. They send the trucks out, they pull the truck over on the pad, set up the work-over rig, pull the pump out, fix the pump or replace it and drop it back down in, trip the pipe in, hook it back up, and they are good to go. They have quite a few months of the year that they can work there, but they do not go into that region and work during the period of time when it is a thaw. So it is a very environmentally friendly oil field on the North Slope.

ANWR would be even more environmentally friendly because we have the ability to directionally drill. So we can set up on one of those pads, set the drill rig out, and we can drill out in directions in a radial pattern, however the geology directs it to be drilled, and pull a lot of oil into one location without having to go set up a pad here and a rig there and without having to disturb some tundra.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of disturbed tundra, I would add also that I saw some tundra that had been disturbed, and we are told by the environmentalists that it cannot be reestablished. Once you put a track in the tundra, with a bulldozer or a truck or a caribou, that that track is there in perpetuity; that it never comes back again; that it is such a fragile environment that any damage to any plant life, any depression that would be pushed into the thawed surface of the tundra is there almost forever.

Well, if that is the case, I do not know how they can tolerate allowing caribou to walk across that country because they definitely put tracks in there and leave those tracks behind them. Mother Nature has a way of recovering from these things.

The president of the corporation that represents the city of Kaktovik up in ANWR right on the shore of the Arctic Ocean told me that they have reestablished tundra. They will go out there and drag it smooth. They can seed it. Actually, the soil has seed that is al-

ready in it, and in 5 to 6 years that tundra is reestablished and grown back. I saw some of that. It had a little brighter green than the older tundra, just like new seeding in your lawn has a little brighter green than the more established seeding of a lawn that has been there for awhile. But we have not damaged any tundra. Any bit we have has been reestablished.

The risk to the wildlife is non-existent. That has always been a farce. The caribou herd that is on the North Slope that everyone was so concerned about was 7,000 caribou back in 1972. Today it is over 28,000 caribou that are there.

One reporter told me of course there are all those caribou, the pipeliners shot all of the wolves. Well, I guess you can reach a long way to make an argument if that is what you want to make, Mr. Speaker; but, no, the pipeliners did not shoot all of the wolves.

I was signed up to go up there. It was a difficult contract that one had to agree to.

□ 1930

They sent only men up there into that region back in 1972. And there were some pretty tough rules that one had to live by. One of them was no alcohol. The other one was no guns. The other one was no gambling, and the other one was no women. So you know with those kinds of restraints on there, they had to pay a lot of money to get people to go up there and work, and they did. It was a good-paying job then. But no guns was part of it. They didn't want violence to erupt up there in the camps. So with no guns it is kind of hard to shoot all the wolves. In fact, it is kind of hard to shoot a wolf anyway if you are busy trying to make a living and working seven days a week as was scheduled there.

And so the caribou herd now has gone from 7,000 to 28,000 head and the environment, if it were damaged at all, if there was any proof of it all, you can bet we would have heard about it on the floor of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. But we did not. And we didn't hear about it because there hasn't been significant damage.

And so here we have a north slope oil field that is winding down, and a pipeline coming down from Alaska that needs to have oil in it. If it doesn't continue to have oil in it, eventually, if it sits empty, it will degrade. And if sits empty very long, it will degrade to the point where it has to be replaced.

It is to our interest to keep oil flowing through that for a lot of reasons. One is just to keep the pipeline up so that it doesn't degrade and require us at some point to either replace it or simply demolish it or abandon it. But the other reason is we sit here with an ability to add another 50 percent to our overall American supply of crude oil, half again more; this 21 billion going to 31.4 billion, up to the top of the chart, Mr. Speaker. And we are watching this exploration of U.S. oil diminish, diminish, diminish because of regulations,

because of environmentalist concern, because of limitations on the U.S. going out and leasing larger tracts of regions to be explored, particularly offshore. We lease them a small tract instead of a large tract. And so if a company goes out and leases a tract for oil exploration, and they are looking at their competition that has surrounded them with their leases, and they all speculate and get a little grid here and a little grid there, if you are sitting there and you have got a grid that is maybe, say, 5 miles by 5 miles, and I am just pulling a number out here, and your neighbors are all around you like a checkerboard, if you drill down and you find a massive supply of oil, the people that are your neighbors are going to capitalize on that without the risk that you have taken to do the wildcat exploration in that area. They will realize, well, there is an oil find in that section. And they will set down around you and drill the oil, and they will be able to take advantage of the things that you have learned by taking the risk as a single oil company.

So the incentive to put millions and billions of dollars into oil exploration is diminished significantly because the opportunity to capitalize a good find has been diminished because of us leasing smaller tracts of land. Not so in a lot of other parts of the world where there are large areas that are leased out to large oil companies, and they can go in there and drill and come up with a find, and that returns then for them because they can continue to develop an entire field of oil.

Australia, for example. I happen to know of some drilling that goes on down there in the Bass Straits between Tasmania and Australia and high currents there and thousand feet deep water, American companies down there drilling for oil, not drilling here in the United States, not drilling up in ANWR, not drilling offshore of the United States because regulations, environmental concerns, small leases, all those things have shut down the incentive for exploration in America. So our highly competent, highly technical, highly capitalized American oil companies are exploring everywhere else that they possibly can in the world, and they are contributing to our oil supply, and we should be grateful that that helps keep the price down.

Now, if there is actually price gouging, and if there is actually a level of ethical corruption, yes, we need to find that, and we need to use the law to enforce it. But if it is supply and demand and people are working above board, a windfall profits tax on our oil companies will work against the interests of the United States. It will ultimately diminish the supply of energy here in the United States and perhaps in the world, and it will ultimately raise the price of gas, not lower the price of gas.

We have got to have more energy in this country, not less energy in this country. This supply and demand re-

minds me of a story that Steve Simms of Idaho told years ago, I believe from this floor, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, and that is the story about, shortly after our Constitution was ratified in the post-1789 era, we didn't have crude oil at that time. We were using whale oil to light the lamps in our houses, and that is what we read by. And so Americans were sensitive to the price of whale oil. And the whalers went out from places like Nantucket and brought the whales in and extruded the oil, processed the oil off the whales, and then packaged that up and sold that around the country. You buy a little bit of whale oil, bring it in your house, fill your little container in your lamp, light the wick on your lamp and then you could read into the night. But that price of whale oil went up and up and up due to scarcity of whales.

So Congress met and they had a bill before them that suggested that they would cap the price of whale oil, Mr. Speaker. And so they had an intense debate here on the floor of Congress. And the question was, should we limit the price of whale oil so that people can continue to afford to be able to buy the whale oil to light their lamps?

What they did, Mr. Speaker, was they came to their senses. And the debate finally won out that, no, they would let the price of whale oil go up because if it went up, there would be people who would use some alternative fuels. Some of them would just simply blow out the light and go to bed and get up with the chickens in the morning. But those that had to pay more would find another alternative.

Well, so the price of whale oil continued then to go up. And not very many years after that, oil was discovered in Pennsylvania. And you can guess what happened then, Mr. Speaker, to the price of whale oil. Once oil was discovered in Pennsylvania, there was a ready supply, a tremendous amount of oil available, and far more oil than they really had a use for in those years. And so it became very cheap to light some of that Pennsylvania oil. And the price of whale oil then dropped clear out the bottom because the demand disappeared because an alternative source of energy was discovered underground in Pennsylvania.

That is how supply and demand works. And there will be other alternatives of energy that are developed if we provide for competition to help drive this and help us come up with solutions.

So I want to talk about a solution here, Mr. Speaker. And this I consider to be a picture that gets us started on the solution. I have said for a long time, Mr. Speaker, that we can talk about one component of energy or another component of energy. But there is an overall demand for energy in quadrillion BTUs, and we should measure our overall supply and consumption of energy in quadrillion BTUs. And this is kind of how it is broken up today in the U.S. domestic supply. This

is the energy that we supply in America. It is not our consumption. That is a different chart. But the domestic supply. And it is broken out here, as you can see. Of all the energy that we supply, that we produce here, 10.8 percent of the BTUs are crude oil; 2.3 percent of the BTUs are natural gas. Nuclear is 8.1 percent. Our hydroelectricity is kind of frozen in place. We haven't been able to expand that in 30 or more years, but 2.7 percent. Biomass is a growing component of this, matches our hydroelectricity at 2.7 percent. The geothermal has a tremendous potential for us, and that technology is growing. I think, significantly and dramatically $\frac{3}{10}$ of 1 percent is all. Our solar is $\frac{1}{100}$ of a percent, a very small sliver, and that has good potential too, although it will take a while and a lot of capital.

And our wind, $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent. That also is a very much growing supply of energy. Our coal, we have been burning more and more coal, 23 percent. And this natural gas, 18.7 percent. So we have a couple of different components here, the natural gas and our crude oil again at 10.8 percent.

This is, Mr. Speaker, this illustration, this is the energy pie. The size of this circle demonstrates the overall supply of BTUs, or British thermal units, of energy that we produce here in this country. Now, our alternatives become this. Energy prices are high. And of these different kinds of energy that I have talked about, the price of crude oil has gone up dramatically. The price of natural gas has gone up dramatically, both of those being, of course, the hydrocarbons.

Then the rest of these supplies, coal has gone up too. The freight on that coal has gone up dramatically in some cases. But overall, if you put more crude oil into the market, someone will decide, well, I am going to generate electricity with diesel fuel, for example. So they will decide if crude oil is cheaper, they might generate more electricity with crude oil. And this size, this percentage of the overall pie gets a little bigger. If the price of natural gas goes up, there will be people that will decide, well, I am going to go over here to this coal alternative. And I happen to know of a case where natural gas has gone so high that they are building an ethanol production plant that is going to burn coal to generate the heat, rather than use the natural gas which we have done in the rest of those that I am aware of.

Now, as we look at this, we have also the subject matter that comes up of biodiesel and also ethanol, those two big pieces. And I will talk about those a little bit too. But our overall mission, we need to understand, is this: We need more energy in this country. We need to grow the size of the energy pie. We need to make this circle a lot bigger than it is today. When we have more BTUs that are available, the supply will lower the cost of our energy. Supply and demand, whether it is whale oil versus Pennsylvania crude

oil, or whether it is this more complicated equation that we have today, the overall supply, if we can increase it, we will lower the overall cost of energy.

Now, some will be more competitive. Some will be less competitive. And as technology develops, it will change that as well. But growing the size of the energy pie is an essential thing for us here in America. We need to work on it every way we can. And that is why I say we need to drill in ANWR. We need to drill in the Outer Continental Shelf, both places, for gas and for oil.

We need to expand our ethanol and our biodiesel dramatically. And we have been doing that, especially in my district. And I am quite grateful and proud of the work that has been done there. The industry essentially has been developed, home grown. We looked at ADM and Cargill and would like to have had them taking the lead on ethanol production in America, and they have producing ethanol for quite some time. They are actually, at least one, and perhaps both, building a new plant or two around the country, perhaps more than that. But they didn't jump into this with the idea that they were going to create a market and then supply that market of ethanol or biodiesel.

And so, seeing the vision of this, and watching the brain child grow from within the region of the country that I come from, I happen to have shook the hand of the man who pumped the first gallon of ethanol in the United States of America the other day, State Senator Thurmond Gaskill from Corwith, Iowa. And I know they worked on that for years and years before they could get to the point where they could pump the first gallon of ethanol.

And now, in this congressional district that I represent, we are sitting there either in production for ethanol, under construction or on the planning stages and soon going into construction, we will be at, by the end of next year, 14 ethanol production facilities in the 5th Congressional District, the western third of Iowa. We will be at least five biodiesel production facilities in the same district in those 32 counties.

Now, those 14 plants will pretty much have the whole region, then I will say polka dotted with those locations where they can draw the maximum amount of corn to those plants. And we have an ability perhaps to go up to, I will say, a third or maybe even as much as a half, half of our corn crop going into ethanol. But the balance of that comes back in the form of feed. So you will see a truck come in to an ethanol plant with a load of corn on it, and he will go through and dump that load of corn in the pit; and while he is sitting there dumping that load of corn, as it is being augured out, right in the next bay you will see a truck pulling in to load a load of DDGs, dried distillers grain, high-protein feed stock

that is a by-product that comes out of the ethanol production. And that goes off to the feed lots to be fed to livestock.

Then there is also CO₂, a by-product that also gets marketed for an industrial market. So we capture almost everything in there. And the corn comes in. And then out of that corn we take, make the ethanol out of the starch; and we send the protein to the feed lot in the form of dried distillers grain, and capture the CO₂ as a by-product and market that in the industry; and that process goes over around and around again.

Now, you have University of California Berkley and another institution joined together, or at least had concurrent reports that said that the production of ethanol takes several times more energy to produce than you actually get out of a gallon of ethanol.

□ 1945

And I looked at that. I did not actually read the study. It was not worth my trouble to do that. And I wondered why anybody would go to UC Berkeley to get some answers on ethanol when you could come to the Iowa State University or the University of Iowa or University of Northern Iowa or some Minnesota institutions where we have experience with ethanol, where we actually understand what goes on there, and we can give you some empirical data on the cost of the energy to produce ethanol.

So I began to ask those questions, and one of them is how much energy does it take to produce a gallon of gasoline from crude oil? And it works out that if you are going to measure the BTUs, for the BTUs that would be in a gallon of gasoline, you only get eight-tenths that much out of it when you process and crack that out of crude oil. So does it take a gallon of gas to produce a gallon of gas? No. It takes a gallon of gas to produce 80 percent of a gallon of gas is the way they would calculate that.

And ethanol works out far better. Once the corn is at the plant, and you have that in storage, and you process that through, if you consume the quantity of BTUs that are in a gallon of ethanol, you will produce 3 gallons of ethanol with it. Just a skosh less than that, but the numbers are coming right at 3.

So the return on energy is far more efficient to produce ethanol than it is to produce gas even out of crude oil. And all the energy has a composition component like that. It costs something to put it into a commodity that one can transfer, put into a tank and efficiently get a burn.

So, Mr. Speaker, the goal here is let us lower our energy prices in America by growing the size of the energy pie. Let us expand the utilization of our clean-burning coal technology. We have an almost unlimited supply of that. Let us dramatically expand our ethanol. Let us take the entire Corn

Belt and build out ethanol production all the way across the Midwest and as far south as they can compete in the corn production down there, and then, on top of that, continue to build our biodiesel production facilities out. The five that are in my district, that can go to 10 or 12 or 13 plants within the next 4 to 5 years. I actually expect it will go there. And the biodiesel production that we produce, every time we do that, it shuts off another shipment of crude oil into the United States from the Middle East.

But I would say grow the size of the energy pie. Change the size, the proportion of the pieces. Let us shrink this piece, 10.8 percent of crude oil. Let us shrink this piece of natural gas, but let us grow the supply of natural gas dramatically so we can afford to grow it if we need to and save our fertilizer industry, which is very close to have all been pushed out of the United States because we are unwilling to develop our natural gas supplies. So we put Hugo Chavez in a situation where he could potentially be controlling the food supply in the United States by controlling the fertilizer that is made down there out of the natural gas that they have. Now, thankfully, we have some U.S. companies that are set up in Trinidad, Tobago, and as long as that would remain stable, they will be able to supply us fertilizer there more reliably and more stably than they would have out of Venezuela.

But then, as I said, expand the coal, expand the biodiesel, expand the geothermal. Expand the solar to the extent that it is economically feasible to do that. We are continuing to expand the wind. That is a renewable resource. And as our technology goes forward, we get a lot better return out of our capital investment there. This biomass, of course, is ethanol and biodiesel.

The hydroelectricity, I would love to build a few more dams in America, but I just cannot see a way that we can crack that environmentalist nut at this point. But at least maintain this, expand it if we can, because that is a renewable resource. It is as clean as any energy that you get.

Our nuclear capability, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that it has been over 30 years, that I know of, that we have at least begun the construction on a new nuclear production facility in the United States. Those facilities are coming off line, and some of them are starting to reach the end of their life. We need to develop more nuclear energy, generate more electricity with nuclear. It is safe technology. It is the safest technology from a statistical basis than anything that we produce in America. You cannot generate electricity out of diesel fuel or natural gas or coal with as low an accident rate as you have out of the nuclear, Mr. Speaker. So I would say expand this percentage of nuclear.

Reduce the natural gas for electrical energy, but expand it for fertilizer production so our food supply is up, and

that fertilizer production feeds the biomass. And when the biomass goes from corn and soy diesel and the other parts of the biomass that produces diesel fuel to the cellulosic version, which we are 5 to 6 years away from becoming an effective means of producing ethanol, then our fertilizer supply out of natural gas becomes an essential component to our biomass up here. And one day not very far down the line, I want to see the size of this pie grow dramatically.

And I will be putting together a formula for this, Mr. Speaker, as time goes by and bringing it to the floor of this House and advocating to the Members of this Congress how important it is for us to grow the size of the energy pie and to change the proportions of the pieces of this pie so that there is a future for the economy in America. We can do a lot of it with renewable fuels. And the efficiencies that we have provided there, another one that is false information that seems to come from other parts of the country is that we cannot get very much ethanol out of a bushel of corn. Well, I do not know anybody who is producing ethanol at least in Iowa today that is not getting 2¾ gallons out of a bushel of corn, and that number is creeping up as our enzymes get better, our efficiency gets better. And we will be able to adapt to the cellulosic as well.

This region that I have the profound honor and privilege to represent in the Upper Midwest is a region that when the pioneers came, they settled, they turn the sod over, and they set up their farms, and they raised livestock and row crop and hay, and they were in the business of raising food and fiber for America. And that is the case from Canada down to the gulf coast, coast to coast. The agriculture communities in America were always in the business of raising food and fiber.

But today we are in the business of raising food, fiber, and energy, and I live in now an energy export center where 5 years ago there was not much sign of any of this energy production. When you drove along, if you saw some steam along the skyline, you would assume that it was smoke from a fire somewhere, and you would wonder why it had not been put out. Today you will see the vapors going up. Some people think it is smoke. It is the cleanest of water vapor coming out of the ethanol plants, and we recognize them on the horizon: Well, there is an ethanol plant there, there is one over there. And in between there are hundreds and hundreds of wind chargers sitting on the ridges.

An energy export center in western Iowa, a place where we have never been able to drill a successful oil well, but it will not be long before we will be producing far more energy out of that region than we are getting out of some of the oil fields across the United States. In fact, today I believe we are producing a lot more energy out of ethanol and the biodiesel.

Grow the size of the energy pie, Mr. Speaker. Do this for our economy and do this for America's security. And do so with the idea in mind that the places in the world where we are buying our oil are far too volatile for us to bet our economic future on.

Now, I have another chart here that helps illustrate that. It is really not all of the countries that we purchase oil from, Mr. Speaker, but it tells us a few things. What I see missing on this chart are countries like Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, the large oil-producing countries. But it tells us what is going on in Libya, 36 billion barrels of oil. And then here we are with ANWR at 10.4, a third of the reserves of Libya. And some of the other countries here: The Congo, a small amount; Nigeria, a large supply, not that stable a place to be, but there is a lot of oil there, and I think their reserves might have been discovered some more since this chart was made.

Here is the United States with a respectable reserve of oil, 21.9 billion barrels. But we can add that to 10.4 here out of ANWR. It takes us up here in this stratosphere in the area of Libya. It does not take us into the levels of countries that are not on this chart, three, four, five countries that have more oil than this, and they are not listed here, Mr. Speaker. But what this tells us is if we go buy our oil from Nigeria, it is unstable, and we work for their stability.

Australia's supplies are far lower than one might think, although there is more discovery going on there all along.

Any of these other countries, Indonesia, Egypt, think about the stability. Brazil, for example, they do not have all that much.

Kazakhstan is a pretty good friend to us. There is a pipeline now being put together from Kazakhstan and into China, and so a lot of that oil is going to go into China. There is the China reserves there, 18.3 billion. And China is increasing their consumption of oil at a rate seven times the increase that we are here in the United States. So at the rate they are going, they will be the world's largest consumer of energy down the line somewhere.

But I cannot find too many places along on this list where I think I would rather trust the future of the economy of America to them and the lack of stability there than I would trust the future of America to an energy-independent America.

We can get there, Mr. Speaker. We need to work to get there, and we have the formula to do that. And many of the countries that we are purchasing oil from today are countries also that are working against our national interests. And Venezuela, for example, is taking an ever-more-hostile position, teaming up with Fidel Castro. And the funding that is coming from that oil is helping to fund Castro and Cuba, and it is funding subversive activities all over South America. If we look at the ac-

tivities that are going on there, the elections that have taken place, country after country has had an election or a power change that has shifted more towards Marxism, away from freedom. And China is involved in the Panama Canal. They are invested down there, and we also have Castro who is starting to drill for oil 45 miles offshore of Cuba. And if you remember, from the lowest part of Florida to Cuba, it is 90 miles. So not having looked at the map, at least by those statistics, he has cut the distance to the United States in half, tapping into oil that we ought to be tapping into, at least very close to that same kind of region that is there.

How come we cannot, Mr. Speaker, look at this overall picture and realize that if we only do a little bit at a time, if we only decide we are going to open up a little bit of the lease down there near the Panhandle of Florida and drill for a little natural gas down there because the pressure on the prices are so high that we have to act like we are doing something, so we let a bit of drilling come in. And that little bit of drilling is the equivalent of just taking the lid off the pressure cooker just for an instant. So the pressure goes down, but the heat is still on, and the pressure will increase again. If we take the lid off a little bit every time, it is not enough to affect the markets. It is not enough to affect the market to the point where we are going to see lower energy prices. So energy prices creep up. We only do this incrementally.

We must be bold, Mr. Speaker. We must dramatically expand our ethanol production. We must dramatically expand our biodiesel production. America's farmers have stepped up to the plate with this. They are increasing their overall production of their grain. They have invested capital so that they can produce ethanol and produce biodiesel.

Let me add one more thing to this misinformation that has been going on around America, that the reason that gas is high because we have ethanol requirements in some of the gas that have just come on recently, and that the high price of ethanol is the reason that gas has gone up by 50, 60, 70 cents a gallon or whatever that number might be.

Let me point out that ethanol is 10 percent of a gallon of gasoline, and the spot market for ethanol, the highest I have seen is \$2.50 a gallon. But you are only putting in 10 percent; so in 1 gallon of gas, there is only going to be 1/10 of that in there. So 1/10 of \$2.50, you have to spread that across the whole gallon of gasoline is my point, Mr. Speaker. And it is not possible to take 1/10 of a gallon, add it to 9/10 of a gallon, and raise the price anywhere near the extent that is being alleged.

So it is not the price of ethanol that is driving up the price of gas, it is the instability in the world. It is the lack of building refineries. It is the lack of vision in an overall energy pie, Mr.

Speaker. And I urge strongly and powerfully for this Congress to step out boldly, grow the size of this energy pie, reduce the cost of energy, dramatically drive our economy, and take care of our security well into the future.

□ 2000

MILITARY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, our most important duty as Members of Congress is to ensure our Nation's security. National security is the single-most essential purpose of government. All of the other blessings of our liberty flow from it, our strength and vitality as a people depend upon it and, our economy and our way of life are reinforced by it.

A strong, bipartisan tradition has been at the core of America's national security policymaking for much of our history. A succession of American Presidents, from Woodrow Wilson to Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman to John F. Kennedy, guided this Nation through two world wars and some of the tensest days of the Cold War. Their leadership was based on asserting America's power in a way that advanced the ideals of our Founders and which made America a beacon to millions of people who were suffering under fascism and communism.

Most importantly, these men knew the limits of any one nation's ability, and they saw the wisdom of marshaling our strengths with that of other freedom-loving people, and they listened to the counsel of these allies abroad and Members of both parties here at home.

Harry Stimson, who served as Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of War throughout the Second World War, was a Republican. Harry Truman cooperated with a Republican Congress to pass the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, which were instrumental in rebuilding postwar Europe and halting Soviet expansion.

But unlike these giants of the 20th century, who put the Nation's security before chauvinism or partisanship, the current administration has too often believed that it had all the answers and did not need to pay attention to the ideas of others.

This refusal to listen to other voices and excessively partisan and ideological approach has resulted in an America that is more isolated than it should be and less safe than it needs to be. Around the world, among nations that should be our strong allies, we are often seen less as a force for good in the world, and this has jeopardized the cooperation that we need in the war on terror.

In Iraq, a stubborn refusal to commit enough troops to save the lives and

pacify the country in the months after the invasion has led to a protracted fight against Baathists and Islamic insurgents and increasing sectarian violence that has claimed more than 2,300 American lives and wounded thousands more.

At home we have wasted valuable time in making real strides to safeguard the Nation from terrorist attack. Most significantly, we have failed to reckon with the Achilles heel of our national security, our reliance on foreign oil to supply our energy needs.

Clearly, Americans want and deserve change. Last month, Members of our party from both the House and the Senate unveiled a comprehensive blueprint to better protect America and to restore our Nation's position of international leadership. Our plan, the Democratic plan, is called Real Security. It was devised with the assistance of a broad range of experts, former military officers, retired diplomats, law enforcement personnel, homeland security experts and others, who helped identify key areas where current policies have failed and where new ones were needed.

In a series of six Special Orders, my colleagues and I will share with the American people our vision for a more secure America. Two weeks ago, we discussed the plan as a whole and laid out the five pillars that make up that plan. I would like to go over some of these in summary before we turn to the pillar that we will discuss tonight.

These five pillars of security are the creation of a 21st century military, the successful prosecution of the war on terror, a more successful strategy to provide real homeland security, a way forward in Iraq, and the securing of energy independence for the United States of America.

One of the pillars of our Real Security plan focuses on the war on terror. It devises a strategy to destroy al Qaeda and finish the job in Afghanistan. It would have us double our special forces and improve our intelligence-gathering processes. It would eliminate terrorist breeding grounds. It would use preventive diplomacy and bring new international leadership, recognizing that we are strongest when we cause the world to join us in a cause.

Secure loose nuclear materials by 2010, this is one of the greatest vulnerabilities we have. You might recall in the debate between Senator KERRY and President Bush both acknowledged that the number one threat facing the country was that of nuclear terrorism. In fact, when we had testimony in the Nonproliferation Subcommittee, I asked Jim Woolsey, former director of the CIA, what was the most likely suspect if a nuclear weapon went off tomorrow in New York, Los Angeles or Washington? He thought about it for a moment and then he said, "al Qaeda."

I said, "I think that is exactly right. But if al Qaeda is the number one

threat, then the most likely delivery vehicle is not a missile, it is a crate, and why are we not doing more to secure those materials that al Qaeda has said they want?"

Osama bin Laden, who has called it a religious duty of Muslims to obtain the bomb and use it against the United States, who wants an American Hiroshima, at the pace it is going it is going to take years, if not decades, to secure the nuclear material in the former Soviet Union, and this makes our Nation at risk of calamity.

If you think the debates we have now over civil liberties and national security are difficult, imagine the world after a nuclear detonation here in this country or against our troops in the theater. All of that debate would be moot. This Nation would be a very different Nation. It would be one we would not recognize. It would certainly not be one we would want to live in.

All efforts must be made to deal with this threat, and too little has been done. Precious little has been done, and time is not on our side.

We must redouble our efforts to stop nuclear weapons development in Iran and North Korea. Too often the administration's policy in this area has been on-again off-again, as if we can only focus on Iran right now and we can take our focus off North Korea, where 6 months ago we could focus on North Korea to the exclusion of Iran, or we couldn't focus on either while we were focusing on Iraq.

The reality is we must continually focus on all of the above, and we must marshal the international community to stop this weapons program in Iran and in North Korea. Only through sustained and vigorous and dedicated efforts to pressure Russia, to pressure China and to bring that world community together do we have a chance to stop that nuclear weapons development in Iran and North Korea.

Let me turn to one of the other pillars of our Real Security plan dealing with homeland security. In the weeks to come, we will be going through the details of this pillar, which involves implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. We support the immediate implementation of those recommendations.

The 9/11 Commission, probably no other commission in the last half century has done a more valuable job, a more bipartisan job of analyzing the vulnerabilities of the United States and making good, strong and sound recommendations about what we can do to address them, many of which affect this body. In fact, it is an irony not lost to anyone here, or shouldn't be: those recommendations of the 9/11 Commission that affect how we organize our business in the Congress are the last to have been implemented. Most of them have not been implemented.

But a great many of their recommendations are being ignored at our peril, and, indeed, what I was talking