

routes, causes soil compaction and erosion, impacts stream bank stability, and oftentimes confuses legitimate uses of trails on Federal lands.

There are so many trails on lands that people that are out there legitimately are looking for a way to get around the land, and they take these trails that the drug users have created and, of course, go off into never-never land.

The impacts of such fragmentation are perhaps most severe to breeding birds, many of which nest directly on the ground in short shrubs and trees on or adjacent to the network of undocumented alien routes. The continual disturbance to nesting birds during day and night typically leads to direct nest failure or abandonment of breeding birds. That leads to increased predation on active nests and keeps birds from maintaining egg temperatures and adequately feeding any young that do hatch.

Again, let me suggest that if this were happening anywhere else in the world, especially anywhere else in our country, there would be an outcry on this floor. There would be an outcry heard by every news outlet in the Nation. They would interrupt the report about the war to talk about the fact that some bird has been removed from its nest, or its nesting area has been destroyed by some sort of action taken by man. In this case, however, because it is an illegal immigrant, we will not hear a word about it.

There are high concentrations of human fecal material in heavily used undocumented alien pickup points in and adjacent to washes, rivers, and streams and in other heavily traveled routes. This also impacts wildlife, vegetation, and water quality in the uplands, in washes, and along rivers and streams. The human waste presents a health risk to all people.

Now, this is in a report that is provided to this body and to the United States of America, to the people in this Nation. We provide this particular information. And what happens as a result of it? I wonder if any of my colleagues have ever read it. I wonder if any of the news media that so quickly uses this kind of thing to pick up on when they say a report delivered today to Congress talks about environmental damage, talks about global warming, talks about how the world is changing as a result of man's interference with nature. Usually, that just gets snapped up like that if there is one sentence in any Federal report, scientifically supported, that draws attention to some problem with the environment, especially some problem that we can attribute to mankind. Well, we certainly cannot attribute this to anything else.

There is no way to say that what I have talked about here tonight is not a problem created by human beings. What we can say, however, is that this problem is not being solved. It is not being solved because there is not some technical solution, or maybe we just do

not have the right kind of pollution control device and/or we have not come up with the correct mix for gasoline to remove some of the pollutants.

□ 1930

We cannot say that is why this pollution is occurring in our national forests. We can say it is occurring because we do not have the will to stop it. We are destroying this land. It will be gone. Our children will never be able to enjoy it. Certainly their grandchildren will not be able to, and how will we explain this to them.

Will we say it was because we just did not have the technology, but there was an argument about whether or not it was really caused by man's interference or whether it is natural. No, that is not an argument that we can use in this situation. We know what has created this. It is millions and millions and millions of feet across this land every year. It is hundreds of thousands of vehicles coming across this land every year. And for what purpose? To enter this country, to do so illegally, to bring human beings or drugs into the Nation. That is the purpose. Because we find that so sensitive, so off the charts when we are talking about issues, we refuse to deal with it. It is amazing. We cannot get an argument about what the cause is. Not a single soul will stand up and argue about the cause here for this pollution. We know exactly what creates it; but we categorically refuse to deal with it because the subject is difficult to deal with because it is not politically correct to talk about it as a result of human traffic, illegal traffic into this country.

There are huge, huge economic benefits that accrue to certain groups, to certain businesses, to certain individuals to have lots and lots of cheap labor. There are political advantages that accrue to others to have lots and lots of immigration into the country. These two things, the political advantage, the economic benefit of cheap labor and illegal immigration, stop this from being addressed. It is a shame at least. It needs to be addressed. It needs at least to be debated.

Maybe I am wrong, maybe I am 100 percent wrong about what is happening. Maybe this report is just fabricated, just a bunch of lies that somebody wrote down because they have it in for immigrants. Go there yourself if you think I am exaggerating this problem. I encourage Members to go there themselves and observe it, observe the Organ Pipe National dump and see whether Mr. Eggle, Mr. Robert Eggle whose son was killed at Organ Pipe a year ago August, his son was killed there by two people who had come through after killing four other people in Mexico, part of a drug deal. They came into the United States and they came up against Kris Eggle. He was a park ranger, and he was not trained and he did not have the equipment to deal with terrorists. That is who they

were. And they cut him down with an AK-47. We went to where he was killed, and Bob said the following: "If they do not get the crime situation under control, they are not going to have any resources left to protect." That was quoted in *Outside Magazine* February 2003. His son lies dead. The environment is being destroyed. Hundreds of illegals are dead in the desert, all because we do not have the guts in this body to take this issue on.

Americans do, I assure Members of that. Poll after poll after poll will tell us that Americans believe we have to do something to control our borders, something to reduce immigration to a manageable level. I have a bill that would reduce immigration, annual legal immigration into the United States to 300,000 a year. That is far more than came into the United States during the heyday of immigration of the early 1900s. I am accused of trying to build a Berlin Wall.

And how can we create a bill for guest workers to come into this country legally, how can we say we have some sort of legal immigration number by say 300,000 or 3 million, how can we say that if the borders are porous? It does not matter how many the government says we will allow in or how many workers we will take in as a temporary basis. As long as the borders are porous, they will come at their will, not according to what our needs are. And they will pollute.

The only way to defend this Nation against the danger that exists as a result of terrorist activity, the only way to defend this Nation in terms of the drugs that are imported across this border every single day, the only way to defend the environment in this Nation is to put the military on the border to augment our border patrol and our Forest Service personnel and stop this degradation of the land and stop the invasion. That is the only solution to the problem. The only one. Nothing else will work.

We must use the military to defend our borders against the invasion until the Department of Homeland Security can effectively control this problem. Until then, the invasion goes on. Our homes are threatened, our lives are threatened, our environment is being destroyed. Let us not shy away from that on the House floor. It is our duty, it is our sworn duty to take on these kinds of issues, and I urge Members to do just that.

CONCENTRATED ASSAULT ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PORTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening while there is a battle raging in Iraq, one

that is well known to the American public, and I want to spend a few minutes this evening dealing with another battle that is taking place, a battle that is raging in this country that has potential risks that are every bit as great as that of international terror for the safety, health, and well-being of our citizens and, indeed, the citizens of the planet.

I am talking about a concentrated assault on environmental protections in this country. I am deeply troubled by the gap between what we have seen growing in terms of the political process with some of my Republican Members and people in the administration in terms of what environmental protection means, where we are, and where we should go.

Now, I come from the perspective as somebody who was part of an Oregon tradition of politics that was decidedly nonpartisan or, in fact, aggressively bipartisan when it came to environmental protection. My first assignment as a college student from a government official was from the legendary Republican Governor of Oregon, Tom McCall, who appointed me to his Livable Oregon committee. Throughout the years that I worked in Oregon politics on the State and local level, I was pleased to work hand in glove with a wide variety of people who put environmental protection first, and partisanship and special interests came later.

On the floor this evening, I must, I guess, acknowledge my dismay about the growing gap between the parties when it comes to environmental protection. I think this was crystallized for me when I received a copy of a widely circulated memorandum from the famous Republican pollster and political consultant, Frank Luntz, that was distributed to Republicans in Congress earlier this year. It was ironically entitled "Straight Talk."

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this memorandum has been given enough attention, and I hope to do a little bit of that this evening because I think it is very important to understand the differences between the two parties as they relate to environmental protection; and this memorandum is revealing strategy where some of my Republican friends, people in the administration and Congress, are advised do not use your ingenuity to develop more environmental protection, do not use your creativity and political muscle to put the money behind enforcing our environmental laws to try to extend the boundaries. Instead, the approach of this memorandum is to put the time and the energy into how you describe what you are doing, try and feather the impact, try and obscure the real record. I think there is no place it is going to be more telling for the American public this week than to look at the energy bill that is on its way to the floor.

There we see instance after instance where the bill that has been passed by the Republican majority is going to

put off our energy problems into the future for the next generation or maybe even the generation that follows them to deal with. There is a refusal to deal with global climate change.

In committee, I am sorry that the Republicans rejected both the bipartisan language that had been passed unanimously in the Senate as well as even the President's woefully inadequate voluntary climate change initiative. We will not find these in the energy bill.

We will find that the critical area of transportation, which consumes 70 percent of the United States oil consumption, indeed just to provide fuel for our automobiles, takes for the United States just our cars, and we represent less than 5 percent of the world's population, that consumes 10 percent of the world's oil production. But amazingly, the bill that is coming before us does not act on efficiency standards. Indeed, they are giving additional tax breaks, and it seems that my Republican friends in committee have yet to find a problem in this country that is so great that it cannot be solved by another tax break, tax deduction, or tax benefit.

But these tax breaks do not go to the 99 percent of the American public that arguably if we can afford tax reductions, and this will be the first time in war that we are proposing not sacrifice but tax deductions for those that need it the least, these tax breaks and royalty relief are to the interest of oil, gas, coal, and nuclear energy. Indeed, some of the provisions incredibly at this time would take away the payments that are due to the American public, royalties for energy sources that are extracted from public lands at a time of skyrocketing energy prices. Well, the proposal there is to reduce the royalties that would otherwise be paid to the American taxpayers.

When we speak of the environment, one of the strategies that is being suggested by Mr. Luntz is to hug a tree, to support open space and parks. Well, by reducing the money that otherwise would go to the Federal Treasury to provide support for our public priorities, one of the most important sources of the revenue that comes from the royalties would go to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which has been eviscerated under the President's budget.

Also in this legislation, there are proposals to again open the pristine lands in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, a land that was set aside for all time by Republican pro-business President Teddy Roosevelt. Instead, it is proposed that we open up this area even though, and here I will show a little bit of hometown favoritism, I quote from the Portland Oregonian from earlier this month which I think says it as well as anybody: "The oil beneath the refuge would not lead America to energy independence.

□ 1945

It would not allow the country to recede from Mideast policies. It will have no impact on current gas prices or any shortage that is caused by the war in Iraq, and it will take 7 to 10 years even to get the first drop of oil from the refuge."

And I could not agree with my hometown newspaper more. The irony is that having visited the wildlife refuge, Mr. Speaker, having looked at that fragile Arctic environment and weighing the costs and consequences, it is clear to me that this ought to be the last place in America that we drill for oil, not the first. And I note that the American public in survey after survey has sided unequivocally with the protection of the wildlife refuge.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we spend a little time focusing on that energy bill, because I am afraid as it comes rushing to the floor it is unlikely that we are going to have adequate time and energy to devote to it.

But I would reference one other in these times of very difficult problems that are radiating out from our military action in Iraq. When people are looking at the tremendous stresses on our military, they are thinking about ways that we ought to protect the ability of our military to be able to maintain its position as the mightiest fighting force in the world. We are seeing that there has been under the guise of military exigency an attempt by the administration to exempt the Department of Defense from protection of the environment, using the rhetoric of defense to cover up environmentally destructive actions, to exempt the Department of Defense from some of the most environmental protections. These exemptions seek to address theoretical encroachments to military readiness. There is no evidence, no sound science, showing that our environmental laws have hampered our troops' ability to prepare for war. Instead, these laws actually protect the health of families living on or near military bases and actually support readiness by sustaining and extending the life of training ranges.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Members of Congress are spending more time thinking about the condition of our military and how to maintain its effectiveness, that instead of attempting to eliminate these fundamental environmental protections that put our soldiers, their families, and surrounding communities at risk, we would think about being aggressive in terms of protecting the environment so that we actually coax more out of these resources.

I will be speaking more about that, Mr. Speaker, in the course of this hour. But I wanted, if I could, to take a moment to acknowledge that I have been joined by the gentlewoman from southern California (Ms. SOLIS), a woman I have known during her tenure in Congress to care passionately about the

environment, to work with her community at home dealing with issues of environmental integrity and environmental justice, working to try to make sure that the big picture is made. And, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague to speak to these issues with me this evening.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the opportunity to be here tonight to join him in helping the public better understand the decoding of the environmental rhetoric that we keep hearing from the other side. And for some time we suspected that the Republicans were speaking from the same talking points as we have on environmental policy issues. Now we have confirmation. The Republicans have been trained to use so-called straight talk; false language, distract people with personal stories, and muddy the issues with claims that the environment and the economy cannot coexist without measures that will cause dirtier water, fewer parks and polluted air.

In a memo that I saw recently circulated by the Luntz Research Company, Republicans are told that the environment is one of the most important issues that they are in fact very vulnerable on, and we know that. Some of us here in the House know that, and out there in our communities, and in order to combat this vulnerability, the Luntz memo, to use buzz words in their arguments, words like, for example, "safer," "cleaner," and "healthier." They are told to avoid the economic arguments first so that personal stories can be shared. The Luntz memo notes that Republicans should stay away from big words and provide examples about how Federal agencies are not protecting our natural resources. And we can see this rhetoric being used every day in policies that the GOP is offering.

In fact, I brought a copy of the memo that was outlined. It was circulated by the Luntz Research Group, and if I start reading from it, my colleagues would be amazed by what they would see.

And if I could maybe share of some of that, on page 132, Overview: The environment is probably the single issue on which Republicans in general and President Bush in particular are most vulnerable.

Secondly, indeed it can be helpful to think of the environment and other issues in terms of a story, a compelling story, even if factually inaccurate, and I underscore that, factually inaccurate, can be more emotionally compelling than a dry recitation of the truth. So here we are talking about falsehoods.

Let me go on, Mr. Speaker. This week we are going to be debating the energy bill, and this is a good example of how using rhetoric can be made publicly available to folks, but it is a bad policy for people and consumers and especially those that I represent in the State of California. The Republicans

claim that the bill is a fair balance between the environment and the economy, but the bill encourages our continued dependence on fossil fuels; drilling in the Arctic, the National Wildlife Refuge, and other ecologically sensitive areas; and it fails to create a comprehensive plan for renewable alternatives. My goodness.

And last year, as my colleagues know, California faced blackouts and price gouging. My constituents faced energy bills that rose upwards of 300 percent in a short 4-year span.

This bill that is being proposed will provide very little relief for the constituents that I represent, and I do not think it is a fair and balanced approach, and I believe that the Republicans claim that they are supporting development and advancement of technology. At least that is what they are representing. Yet the bill is loaded, loaded, with subsidies to the oil and gas industry, subsidies that do not necessarily require research and development, subsidies that reward pollution instead of innovation and technology and efficiency. These industries that the Republicans are subsidizing often put their plants in the center of districts like mine, in low-income, economically underprivileged communities. And I know that, because they believe that our community is not paying attention and that they can get away with planning and siting projects that are harmful to our water, to our air, to the environment, and to the people that we represent.

This is the case in the San Gabriel Valley, and I say that because many of these folks come into our district promising jobs, redevelopment, cleaning up the blight, giving jobs to poor people, and then they leave us with a blank check, nothing there, no jobs, pollution, and, in my district, four Superfund sites and little enforcement by EPA at this point to really do a better job of cleaning up the environment.

So I have a lot of questions about the message that the other side is using to say that they are now on the side of the consumer and the population about cleaning up the environment.

One last item I would like to talk about also is on the budget. Another example of effective messaging and lax policy is the Bush budget. The President and his supporters claim that the budget will create a "safer" and "cleaner" and "healthier" Nation. However, the budget uses creative accounting to raid the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a fund that has impacted hundreds of communities as they try to protect their natural resources through restoration and clean-up projects, projects that are directly linked to the health of our families, because we are talking about the very water that they drink.

And President Bush claims that he "preserves and protects" the environment; however, his budget request for the environment is slated for a \$1.6 billion reduction compared to fiscal year

2002, falling from \$29.6 billion to \$28 billion.

Projects on the chopping block, for example, are dealing with environmental education like lead-poisoning prevention, a serious concern in our district where many young children are affected by this particular additive that is very harmful to the development and puts many children, millions of children younger than 6 years of age, at risk for intelligence, behavior, and physical disparities that they will be affected by if they are exposed to lead. And we all know that but we are not doing enough to help address this. We are actually cutting back in that area.

And I say that it is time to do a better job. It is time to look at why water quality investments are also falling short. For example, in this budget, \$2.7 billion in FY 2002 to only \$1.8 billion in 2004, a loss of \$861 million, or more than a 32 percent cut. What in the world are the Republicans really saying? We want to protect the environment, we want to protect families and consumers, but at the same time they keep chopping, chopping, chopping.

So that is what the message, I think, tonight has to be, Mr. Speaker; that we clarify what our agenda is and whom we are standing up for. And I am very proud to represent the district that I come from, the San Gabriel Valley, where now people are having hardships. We have unemployment rates upwards of 11 percent, and this has gone on for more than 2 years.

People want clean drinking water. They do not want to be notified in the mail that their drinking wells have to be closed because they found rocket fuel in their water. We need to have more tools to do the cleanup. We need to go after the responsible parties, and we cannot afford to let people off the hook who are the polluters. That is what the Superfund law was all about, and that is what we should be here to enforce tonight and every single day that we are here fighting for our communities.

I would just say, lastly, that it is a privilege to be here as a Member of the House advocating for environmental issues, in particular environmental justice activities that affect not just my area but many corners of our country. And people need to better understand that environmental justice issues are issues of better health care, better education, and an opportunity to begin to clean up their communities and enhance economic development in a positive way so that everybody can grow and prosper, and children, whether they are rich or poor, can live in a clean environment.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the opportunity to speak tonight on this very important message regarding the truth about the environment and who is sticking up for environmental justice.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS). I appreciate her zeroing in on the notion of how to interpret, read between the lines. We have joked a little bit about having a decoder ring so that people can understand what is being offered, and her points about the disconnect between the budget, which really is a tangible expression of priorities; that is, a budget submission that is antienvironmental and has actually been made worse by the Republican budget resolution; the simple notion accepted by the American public to aid environmental cleanup by having the polluter pay that has been suspended, and abandoning the Superfund, making it very difficult to be able to continue the notion of environmental justice where we have put such a burden on people who often have no alternatives, who are unaware of what is happening, and how the administration is suggesting that we not initiate new activities but, in fact, we pull back from what we are doing now that is, in fact, inadequate. I appreciate her forthright expression of that.

I think it is important that we work together to have that decoder ring to understand. I hope that we are able to deal with the advice that Mr. Luntz has given to the Republicans. I think it is important that he points out that scientific consensus is against them, that the public is suspicious, but we hope that instead of trying to deal with semantics, rhetorical cover-up, that we can encourage people to go back to what we started with in terms of the Clean Water Act, which was actually from the Nixon Administration, to have an opportunity where people are embracing environmental values.

□ 2000

We have been joined this evening by the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL). I have been pleased to work with the gentleman on the floor of this House. I have been very impressed in my visits to his district, as the gentleman reflects the strong environmental values of the people of New Mexico, and we are honored the gentleman will join us this evening to join in this discussion.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much and thank the gentleman from Oregon for that very kind introduction.

Let me also say about our colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), who has been a real champion on environmental issues in California, she served in the California legislature and I think has been at one point written up as a Profile in Courage on environmental issues because she took on an environmental racism issue in her community and fought it for a number of years and passed a significant piece of environmental legislation. So what the gentlewoman says about these issues, I think she has lived and walked the walk.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has also been a key environmental leader on many, many issues here in the Congress, including energy, which we are talking about tonight. The gentleman has pushed for livable communities. The gentleman has tried to make sure that the Federal Government does everything it can to be a good partner in communities.

One of the things we see is the Federal Government owns a lot of the landscape; and because of one of the gentleman's pieces of legislation, we are trying to make sure that the Federal Government in fact is a good neighbor, and when they locate buildings or relocate buildings, that they visit with the locals in addition to going through the normal planning processes.

The gentleman has been to my community. I know many of the people very much appreciate the gentleman's efforts in terms of transportation and trying to make sure that we develop sensible transportation alternatives in our communities: allow people to bike to work, have mass transit, have alternatives that make sense from the perspective of energy, which is one of our big topics tonight.

I know that the gentleman mentioned earlier the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Rather than go directly into my comments, I wanted to say a few things about what the gentleman was talking about, because the gentleman said he has been there.

I have also been there. I just wanted to talk a little bit about how that is a very special place, and I think anybody that is going to vote in this body on this issue ought to take the opportunity to try to go up and visit it. When I say go up and visit it, I do not mean go to Kaktovik, the little village up on the very upper end, which is a community that has a lot of problems but does not represent at all the environment in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

What I did was I spent a week in this whole area, floating on a river by the name of the Hula Hula River, named after the whalers that came in the area hunting down whales, Hawaiian whalers; and they called the river the Hula Hula. In the course of floating out of this river, it floats out of the Brooks Range. It is probably one of the clearest, most pristine streams you have ever seen. We took the opportunity to stop and fish in the Hula Hula River for Arctic char. We saw a variety of wildlife. We saw grizzly bears, musk oxen, herds of caribou.

Coming back from that trip, and after experiencing that and camping in this area, I cannot think of any area that is more deserving of being a wilderness area than the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The argument is that we need to raid the oil that is there. In fact, what the situation is on the whole coastal area in Alaska is that 97 percent, 97 percent of that coast is open to exploration, is

open to oil production, and just a little part of it we are trying to preserve as a wildlife refuge.

It has been a wildlife refuge, it was put in many years ago under a Republican President, and we do not see that bipartisanship today on the environment, by the way. So I think the gentleman's remarks are right on point when it comes to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I also would like to say a few words about the energy bill that we are going to start debating this week, the Energy Policy Act of 2003. During the last Congress, the House spent countless hours debating a similar bill.

Unfortunately, one of the major provisions in the last energy bill on which Members could not agree was renewable energy. As my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, has said earlier, the Republicans are putting off dealing with our Nation's energy dependence problem and leaving it to legislators of a future generation. Their theme seems to be, "Why do today what we can leave for the next generation to deal with in the future?"

Last month I introduced legislation that establishes a Federal renewable energy portfolio and establishes standards in that area for certain retail electric utilities. There are some who say that a long-term sustainable energy plan is impossible, or that renewable energy and energy efficiency are just dreams and that the U.S. will never be able to break its reliance on traditional energy sources, like oil and coal.

I disagree, and I know the gentleman from Oregon disagrees; and now, in the post-September 11 world, as we are in the midst of a war with Iraq, the renewed conflict in the Middle East shows us that we cannot continue to rely on imported oil from that region.

When my father, Stewart Udall, was Secretary of the Interior, and this shows the dramatic change in our society, what happened in the last generation, the U.S. imported when he was Secretary of the Interior in the 60s 20 percent of its oil. My father argued that we should not import more than 20 percent because this was a national security issue if we were relying too much on one area of the world.

Our people may not know it, but today we import 53 percent of our oil, 47 percent which comes from the OPEC countries; and by 2020, the United States will import 62 percent of its oil unless we change the way we are doing business here in the United States.

Even more concerning, world oil production is expected to peak sometime in the next few decades, even some say as early as 2007. That means as energy demand increases more and more rapidly, the world's oil supply will be proportionately diminished.

Energy production has brought tremendous prosperity and allowed us to grow our economy at unprecedented rates. However, nonrenewable forms of energy are responsible for many of the greatest environmental threats to America's well-being.

For these reasons, I am particularly interested in a renewable portfolio standard. I believe that an RPS paves the road for development and investment in clean energy technologies and local economic development. RPS, in my mind, clearly serves as a model for tomorrow's small and medium businesses to draw a profit from their own environmental responsibility.

As a Nation of what I call "petroholics," we claim only 2 percent of our electricity is generated by non-traditional sources of power, such as wind, solar and geothermal energy. Instead of pushing for the exploration of oil development and contributing to this country's addiction to oil, we should be pushing for the exploration of renewable energy development. I believe this bill goes a long way to develop a strategy for putting renewable energy into place.

With that, let me just say to the gentleman from Oregon that I think we need to focus as a country on renewable energy. We obviously need a strong domestic industry, the production of oil. But as many of us know, that peaked in the 1970s; and we are headed down. The rest of the country and the rest of the world, in particular the rest of the world, are going to be going after more and more limited supplies of oil. So the further we can get ahead of that curve, the better off we are going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for providing leadership on this, for being on the floor and fighting for these issues; and I hope that on some of these battles we can be victorious in the coming weeks.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the gentleman's, I think, really far-seeing bill on renewable energy; and I am hopeful that the leadership in this Congress will have the foresight to allow it to come to the floor and to allow a spirited debate. I am convinced that if we put it to the Congress and to the American public that that legislation will pass.

As I was listening to the gentleman describe the experience we both have shared in the Arctic wilderness, I had in the back of my mind, I think I said Teddy Roosevelt designated it. It was another Republican President, President Eisenhower, who made the designation.

If I said Roosevelt, I was there dealing with the pristine jewel, Yellowstone, which was the creation of then-President Teddy Roosevelt, which we are now seeing under assault, where the administration is proposing that the place in America with the worst air, not L.A., not Houston, it is in Yellowstone Park, where we see park rangers forced to wear gas masks because of the pollution, and we see the rule on restricting the use of snowmobiles being rescinded. I guess I got a little ahead of myself. I apologize if I said that.

I appreciate the gentleman focusing on the opportunity to truly make us energy independent, dealing with renewable energy sources, particularly the nontraditional: the fuel cells, wind, geothermal. As we look at how these will be treated in the energy bill that will find its way to the floor, we will find that there is but a tiny fraction of the attention, the resources, to be able to accelerate those developments. Again, it is a disconnect between the "green" rhetoric that is being couched by the Republican pollsters and pundits and what could have been actual accomplishment.

The bill will fall terribly short, as the gentleman mentions, in terms of environmental stewardship. It will fall short in terms of our meeting our international obligations and opportunities, and it will be a fiscal disaster. It is interesting, the Taxpayers for Common Sense and others in the Green Scissors Coalition are going to come forward to point out how this is a lost opportunity that is going to cost the American taxpayers billions and billions of dollars.

It is sad that a country with less than 3 percent of the recoverable supply of the world's oil, and as we have talked about, much of it in ecologically important areas, we are going to be focusing on trying to extract every last drop and avoiding things that will put us in a positive position.

I would like to acknowledge that we have one of our other colleagues who is with us here this evening. Time is winding down, but we could not not acknowledge the leadership and advocacy of our colleague, the gentleman from the Puget Sound area of Washington (Mr. INSLEE), from the Seattle area, a gentleman with whom I was pleased to take a tour of the Arctic, as we saw what was on the line.

I say to the gentleman, welcome. I would yield to the gentleman for some comments about this critical area that I know the gentleman has spent so much time and effort to provide better alternatives for the people on this floor.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to briefly talk about the Arctic, because we were on the banks of the Ivishak a couple summers ago. I have been to Yellowstone, I have been to Glacier, I have been to the Grand Canyon; and this area is the most biologically dynamic place I have ever been, one of the most beautiful places I have ever been in my life, and certainly it will not solve our energy needs.

People sort of feel about the Arctic the way they feel about the Mona Lisa. They may not get to see the Mona Lisa. The advocates of drilling are saying it is going to be a small footprint, just a relatively small oil production facility. I think that is a little bit like putting a small mustache on the Mona Lisa.

□ 2015

It is small, but it is still disfiguring, and Americans do not want it.

I hope that we will have an opportunity to offer a new approach to energy in this year's debate that is akin to a new Apollo energy project for America that will be as bold as the Apollo project that John F. Kennedy stood in this Chamber in 1961 and challenged America to go to the Moon in 10 years. We think the U.S. Congress ought to be challenging America to go to a future of self-reliance in energy to break our addiction on Middle Eastern oil, to adopt and embrace a goal of reducing our global warming gas emissions and, in fact, grow jobs in America.

That is what we need, a visionary, bold, creative energy policy; not one that relies just on the technologies of the past, but one that will, in fact, engage the American talent and that can-do spirit.

We know that Americans have the most creative talent in the world. We have created most of the technologies of the last century. Now it is time for us to create the energy technologies of the next century. We know the world will beat a path to the door of the country that does this. We do not think we should give these markets of wind turbines to Denmark, or the market for fuel-efficient vehicles to Japan, or the market of solar power to Germany. We believe those jobs should be right here in the United States.

So we hope to offer, and in fact, we will be going to the Committee on Rules tomorrow, to offer America a new Apollo energy project which will, in fact, attempt to use all of our sectors in a creative way; to do research on coal to see if we can find a way to sequester the climate-changing gases of coal emissions; to help both consumers in the auto industry to get more fuel-efficient cars; to help our local domestic auto manufacturers with tax breaks for the retooling expenses they are going to need to make fuel-efficient vehicles; to help improve some of the productivity of some of our oil wells in our domestic facilities now. Because we believe that America ought to adopt the can-do spirit of a new vision of energy, rather than simply relying on the old, the old types of technologies that we have used.

So I appreciate the opportunity to talk with the gentleman. In fact, we may be back tonight or tomorrow to talk some more about that.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I hope we are able to. I appreciate the gentleman focusing on the fact that we have had a tremendous technological series of advances in this country, and it is time, first of all, to make sure that we do not lose control of some of those, and that we blaze a trail for the future. It is stunning to me that we have an opportunity to give a little nudge to some of the promising technologies, some of the fledgling enterprises, all across the country. And I know the gentleman has been visited by people from our own Pacific Northwest who are on the cutting edge of

being able to give a little bit of a push, a little bit of incentive, to have the government step up and lead by example.

Our Department of Defense, for instance. I had been talking earlier about my personal dismay that this administration is bent on somehow exempting the Department of Defense, the largest manager of infrastructure in the world, and, sadly, the source of some of the most serious pollution. Rather than encouraging, rather than giving the resources to clean up after themselves, they are talking about exempting from the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act. I know the gentleman from Washington has given thought to the notion of what will happen if we gave a little bit of the money we are giving now to the Department of Defense, almost \$1 million a minute, if a little of that were devoted to making sure that we had the most energy-efficient military in the world.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a minute, I am glad he brought this point up, because we out in Washington State think the administration's effort to essentially gut, and it really is gutting, five major environmental bills for the Department of Defense activities is seriously misguided. The reason I say that is out in Washington, we have a whole host of military establishments. We have the Akamai Firing Center in eastern Washington. In my district we have the Bangor Nuclear Submarine Facility. We have the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard. And at every single one of those sites, we have had the Department of Defense work with our local communities and we have solved some of the environmental challenges without any great failure of training or security.

The Department of Defense has worked with these local communities to solve a problem with the sage grouse at the Akamai, to solve the problem of water quality in the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, to solve a salmon habitat issue at the Bangor facility. And this proposal to gut these environmental protections is really a solution looking for a problem, because the Department of Defense in the State of Washington, one of the most heavily defense-oriented places in the country, has not experienced any particular qualm or difficulty in solving this problem.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I think that is telling. There is already, as the gentleman well knows but unfortunately the public is not aware, there are opportunities in the case of national defense exigency for the suspension of this legislation. But the gentleman raises a point that mirrors my experience time and time again. The characteristics, the leadership, the training, the commitment, that makes our men and women in the Armed Forces the finest fighting force in the world also makes them uniquely qualified to solve problems. And when they are given an opportunity, whether it is

building a green building, whether it is solving an environmentally difficult problem, if we give them the order, the resources, the clearance, I am stunned at the progress that can be made.

I am likewise troubled, and the gentleman comes from the State that probably more than any in the country bears the scars of past shortcuts environmentally. We could talk about an area the gentleman is well aware of in terms of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation where we were in a rush to develop nuclear weapons before the Nazis, but now we are spending billions of dollars a year to clean it up.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is true. And the Hanford site, this is going to be a 50-year recovery effort.

But some of the problems in the State of Washington, perhaps less known, but every bit as concerning, are water quality issues now, of some of the toxic chemicals that have been, by necessity, associated with the Department of Defense sites. And I can say without hesitation that the people of Tacoma and Federal Way and Paulsville, Washington do not believe it is necessary to allow a degradation of their drinking water standards in their kids' drinking water in order to have the most secure Nation we have. And the reason they are confident of that is they have seen the dedicated men and women of the Army and Navy work with these communities to solve these problems.

So they cannot understand why this administration would come in for what appears to be simply ideological reasons and gut the protections that have assured citizens that their Federal Government is not going to let tetrachloride or some of these other heavy metals get into their drinking water. It just does not make any sense to them when we have been able to solve these problems because of the flexibility that the gentleman alluded to.

So we hope that this effort will be beaten back and that the common sense that has been used, both by the Department of Defense and our local towns around this country, will prevail.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman raises very important points from his own experience.

I had been working on areas of military toxins and unexploded ordnance, and have been frankly amazed at the breadth of the problem, in every State in the Union, coast to coast, areas right here in the District of Columbia. Eighty-five years after the conclusion of World War I, there are still cleanup operations taking place on the American University campus, which was the site of American chemical weapons production and testing during World War I. We have yet to clean that up, not because the men and women in the military do not know how to do it, but it has been a failure of commitment on behalf of several administrations, including this one. Congress has been

missing in action. At the rate we are going right now, it is going to take potentially 500 to 1,000 years or more to clean up from the problems of the past.

We have some signature areas. The Massachusetts Military Reservation, there is water pollution that threatens all of the water for the Martha's Vineyard area, but it is almost every district, every single State. Right now, we do not even know how many million acres are polluted, for instance, with unexploded ordnance.

I think the gentleman's point is well taken. I am hopeful that we do not suspend these five critical environmental laws. Not only will it put the health of the American public at risk, but it also threatens the men and women in the military who are around these areas.

And, last but not least, we face a situation now where there are some problems of military readiness. There are fewer and fewer areas that the military can train by going in, treating them right, cleaning them up, solving environmental problems. It is going to save the military problems in the long run, and it is going to extend the life of these scarce areas where important training takes place that is critical to military readiness.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, he just prompted a thought.

One of the problems on this sort of assault on environmental protection by this administration is that it is not just one front, it is a multifront assault on environmental protection. One that the gentleman just alerted me to is the attempt to weaken our ability to successfully prosecute Superfund toxic waste dump cleanups, and the gentleman may have talked about this this evening, I do not know. But in my district, I live right across the harbor from a site called the Waco Creosote Plant. It was an old creosote plant, where a lot of the lumber they brought in, in fact some I think may have gone to the Panama Canal construction project, was created there. Creosote is really effective at killing little bugs that might get into your pilings, but it is very, very toxic. It has some very, very nasty chemicals in it.

That stuff is on a point at a harbor right across the bay from where I live on a little island just west of Seattle. That Superfund site now, to clean it up, is costing tens of millions of dollars to successfully clean up that creosote, because it is leaking into Puget Sound now, and that stuff is a carcinogen and we believe it has caused some pretty awful things to happen to the fish that a lot of people like to eat. In fact, the shell beds, the shell beds are closed around this area. You cannot eat the clams and oysters and the like.

But the administration, despite the ongoing demand to clean up not this one, but thousands of toxic waste dumps around the country, has decided not to fund those by canceling the tax that would pay for this cleanup. That are now paid by the polluters. Before

we have had a policy that the polluters will pay to clean up this pollution, rather than John Q. Citizen. This administration wants to take the cost of the cleanup of this creosote toxic waste dump, and there are thousands arose the country, and take it off of the polluters who put the creosote in the ground, who should be morally, ethically, and legally responsible for that, and put it over on the taxpayers, so the taxpayers have to pay for this cleanup.

Well, I can tell the gentleman that my neighbors do not think it should be their job to clean up the creosote that these companies put in the ground, because they were not following the law for decades. And we believe the administration is flat wrong in trying to take care of these special interests by putting that enormous cost of these cleanup efforts on to people who are playing by the rules, earning a paycheck, paying their house payment, and they are now having to pay their taxes for that Superfund cleanup.

Mr. Speaker, it is one manifestation of how special interests here in this Chamber have got their way when they should not get their way. These cleanups ought to be borne by the polluters. Not only is it an equity issue, but the clear fact of the matter is that because of the costs associated, these are billions and billions of dollars, one little cleanup on my little island, it is about 16 acres, is going to cost something like \$20 million or \$30 million, and we need to repeat that across the country to keep this stuff out of our water. If we do not keep that polluter-pays concept, these jobs are not going to get done.

So this is related to the issue, and I just want to point out that it is not the only assault that we suffer.

□ 2030

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I appreciate his leadership and look forward to working with him on energy, on defense, and on the areas generally of making sure that we are strengthening, not weakening, our environmental protections.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I know the time is about up, I know you will be disappointed, but I want to summarize because it is important for us to be working with friends like the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and others to focus on actions, not just rhetoric.

And one of the things that I have found most disconcerting as I have watched what this administration has done is taking Mr. Luntz's advice to not be rolling back regulations but, as they call it, updating Washington's rules on the environment. Now, he has been encouraging Republicans not to attack the principles behind environmental protections, but to try and shift things around in terms of the regulatory configuration. Well, the Bush administration has made significant and far-reaching changes to environ-

mental protections since the President assumed office. But not through outright legislation, not putting it before the American public and having a discussion about what our values are, what we are trying to protect and how best to encourage more environmental protection.

We have been having a series of late Friday afternoon rule changes and clarifications at a time when asthma and cancer rates are on the rise. When people in Alaska are seeing tropical insects, when we are having roadways buckle, permafrost is disappearing, the public knows that we should be strengthening, not weakening, environmental laws. We are not just seeing a broad depth and breadth of changes, but we are seeing them done under the radar screen. For example, we have seen a series of rollbacks occurring on Friday afternoons, during the holiday season, when Congress is not in session and when the public's attention is diverted. For example, the EPA announced its biggest rollback of the Clean Air Act since its inception on the afternoon before Thanksgiving and another on New Year's Eve calculated to try and shield the action from the public.

Three of the most egregious rollbacks occurred first earlier this year when we had proposed changes to the Clear Water Act that will have sweeping impacts on 20 million acres of wetlands across the country. Now, these rules changes were in response to a Supreme Court decision that very narrowly interpreted the Clean Water Act and brought attention to what bodies of water the act should apply to.

Now, instead of advancing clarifying legislation that would make clear we want to protect these precious wetlands, half of which are gone already, some communities have lost 90 percent of their wetlands, deteriorating the quality of water, increasing threats to flood, instead they have proposed leaving out lots of, these appear to be de minimis efforts, they want to talk about creeks, small streams, natural ponds, types of wetlands like bogs, marshes, prairie potholes. These will all be waterways no longer protected by the Clean Water Act. They sound de minimis, but they are part of the critical green infrastructure that has protected our communication for generations. Now they will all be vulnerable to dredging, filling, and waste dumping.

I mentioned earlier the confusion surrounding the snowmobiles in some of our country's most beautiful national parks. During his Presidential campaign, candidate Bush spoke of protecting national parks as an ongoing responsibility and a shared commitment of the American people and their government. The budgets, I will mention, cut funding to this ongoing responsibility. And even though the public has spoken out again and again in favor of banning snowmobiles from areas like Yellowstone, the administra-

tion announced last November a proposal to increase the number of snowmobiles in both Yellowstone and Grand Teton National parks by 35 percent.

Now, against the wishes of the American public, the EPA, the National Park Service, the administration has decided to jeopardize the health of the park's ecosystem and employees in areas that President Bush in the campaign referred to as "silent places unworn by man."

Finally, I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, the environmental rollback that will have a significant impact in my community in the Pacific Northwest, the national roadless policy. Near the end of his term, President Clinton restricted logging and road building in almost 60 million acres of national forest. This was after the most extensive public input process in the history of our national park system. There were over a million and a half public comments. Over 600 public hearings. Well, a district judge in Idaho placed an injunction on the rule. The Bush administration did not choose to contest it. Luckily, in one of the few victories that those of us who care about the environment have had recently, the 9th Circuit Court has upheld the roadless rule, which will effectively protect it for the time being. But this reckless degradation of our Nation's air, water, forest, and soil protection will have a severe and long-term impact on the planet, leave a far greater legacy of environmental problems that our children, not us, our children will be left to manage.

And I hope that the American public will focus on what Republican consultants like Frank Luntz are suggesting, understand the significant impacts of environmental rollbacks proposed, and understand that there are significant opportunities, not just for the American public and the environmental community, but significant environmental opportunities like I mentioned this evening in terms of environmental clean up with the Department of Defense that will save tax dollars, that will protect the environment for generations to come, that will improve military readiness, and not be at the expense of the health of our communities or our men and women in the fighting forces.

I hope that instead of greenwash, instead of rhetorical flourishes, instead of dodging the issues and obscuring the record, I hope that the administration will join with people on both sides of the aisle who care about the environment and give the American public what they request in terms of livable communities, protected open space, clean air, and clean water. It is within our grasp. It is within our budget. I hope that it is within our will before we adjourn.

WHY WE NEED AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under the Speaker's announced