UPHOLDING TRADE REMEDY LAWS IN HONG KONG

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of the World Trade Organization's ministerial meeting in Hong Kong, and it is critical that the U.S. maintain its upper hand in pursuing its goals of a successful Doha Round and also exercising leadership in the global trading system.

I recently led a bipartisan group of my colleagues to Brazil to participate in a study trip to help strengthen the bilateral relationship between our two countries. During our time there, we met with top Brazilian negotiators to discuss key trade issues that we expect will be addressed next week in Hong Kong.

At our meetings, my colleagues and I drove one critical message, and that is our government's unwavering commitment to the utilization and protection of our trade remedy laws.

There is no doubt the U.S. employers rely on these laws which serve as a fundamental line of defense, an opportunity to police our markets against unfair trade and to preserve domestic industries that otherwise would be at risk. There is no question that it is the responsibility of Congress and the administration to ensure that our firms have the proper tools to fight illegally traded goods and services.

While we are committed to opening our markets, and have done so historically, reducing trade-distorting subsidies and eliminating non-tariff barriers to trade, we are not willing to give up appropriate tools that we have to police our market for illegally traded imports.

To reinforce this, I introduced a resolution, H. Res. 577, calling on U.S. negotiators to stand firm in the face of international pressure and uphold our trade remedy laws during the WTO's Doha Development Agenda Round. Many in the Doha Round, particularly the so-called friends of antidumping negotiations, have targeted U.S. antidumping and countervailing duty measures as distortions to trade. They claim they are antifree trade, and yet the fact remains that our participation in a free trading system is contingent on our ability to have access to these remedies.

These laws, as I said, are the last line of defense, and eliminating or weakening them is not a solution to making sure that they work appropriately. Nor is, in this political climate in Congress, weakening or watering down the ability of the U.S. to utilize its appropriate trade remedy laws in any way a viable position.

The time has come for Congress to draw a line in the sand and take a much tougher stance with our trading partners to ensure that they fully abide by the rules-based global trading system.

We will not stand by and let other countries try to use negotiations to undermine the intent of our domestic trade remedy laws. America will no longer tolerate unfair trading practices at the expense of our workers. Our trade laws have a fundamental purpose and are used only when others break the rules. Congress will not allow this last line of defense to be compromised in any way, and our negotiators need to recognize that.

My resolution will make very clear what our position is and in the process fend off any attempts to derail our trade laws and put the House on record opposing any multilateral agreement that will weaken these important U.S. trade protections. Senators CRAIG and ROCKEFELLER have introduced a similar resolution which was included in the Senate's tax reconciliation bill, adopted overwhelmingly by the U.S. Senate. This week our Chamber voted on our own tax reconciliation measure. We are making one step closer to having this resolution become law.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to our resolution and join me in working to ensure that the Craig-Rockefeller initiative is included in Congress' tax reconciliation package as we move to a final package. And as we move closer to the trade talks in Hong Kong, which we hope will be successful, we must carefully monitor the progress of the Doha Round and specifically the rules negotiations to ensure that we do not resign ourselves to agreements that would in any other way impede American producers from policing the domestic market.

This is a fundamental issue for a country that recognizes that our future is in engaging in the international trading system, but also that we need to be prepared to reflect back and at least provide the fundamental guarantee to American companies and American workers that the rules will be followed.

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

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

PEAK OIL

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress how important it is for the United States to take a bold new approach to our energy supplies. Our economy and way of life depend on cheap oil. In many ways, cheap oil is responsible for our prosperity. Since oil provides about 40 percent of the world's energy, a peak in global oil production will be a great turning point in human history. Oil and natural gas literally transport, heat, and feed our country. Therefore, we must summon the political will to act immediately, diversify our energy supplies, and mitigate the negative changes that will undoubtedly accompany the world peak in oil and natural gas production.

Peak oil is a fact, not a theory. Oil production has now peaked in 33 of the world's largest 48 oil-producing nations.

□ 1630

A recent Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee hearing showed that a growing number of energy experts agree that a peak in world oil production is either imminent or likely to occur by 2015. The United States demand for oil continues to increase by about 2 percent per annum. As global demand has increased faster than production, the once substantial cushion between world oil production and demand has decreased. This phenomenon has increased the price of oil. Consequently, huge amounts of American money, up to $25 million per hour, go abroad to pay for foreign oil. Middle eastern countries, flush in oil dollars, help fuel the terrorism we are fighting. Some say market forces will solve the peak oil problem. They argue that as we approach or pass the peak of production, oil prices will increase and alternatives will become more competitive.

However, no alternative currently available will make it more competitive. However, there is no alternative available anywhere near ready to replace oil in the volumes we use it today. What is more, even today's oil prices do not accurately reflect the full social costs of oil consumption. Currently, Federal and State taxes add up to about $0.40 per gallon of gasoline. A World Resources Institute analysis found that fuel related costs not covered by drivers are at least twice that much. Oil prices do not include the full cost attributed to road maintenance, the financial risk of global warming or threats to national security from importing oil. Without these externalities in the market, significant private investment in alternative technologies will not occur.

Over the past hundred years, fueled by cheap oil, the United States has led

a revolution in the way the world operates. Replacing this resource in a relatively short time is an incredible challenge, an imperative to the survival of our way of life. The United States has faced such challenges in the past. In response to great challenges and inevitable threats, we pooled our resources and ingenuity to build an atomic bomb in just a few years and put a man on the moon in a decade. We can and must do this again. We must commit to a bold new initiative.

To eliminate our dependence on foreign oil and develop a new economy based on renewable, non polluting energy, we need a massive, long-term investment in research for both basic and applied science. We must produce effective policies that create a new generation of scientists devoted to changing the way we produce energy. Additionally, we must commit to decreasing our demand for oil. We can start by increasing efficiency. Transportation in the United States accounts for 16.5 percent of the world's oil consumption. Transporting goods and people by rail is at least five times as efficient as automobiles. We must revive and reinvest in our passenger and freight rail system. Looking at our automobile fleet, modest increases in fuel efficiency, using existing technology will decrease our oil usage by about 1 billion barrels per year. However, the turnover rate for the automobile fleet is 10 to 15 years, therefore, we must start immediately.

The buildings in which we work and live are terribly inefficient. We could easily reduce their energy consumption by one-half. We must immediately weatherize and make more energy-efficient tens of millions of buildings. Our bold new initiative must instill these ideas into the American consciousness. The sooner we start, the smaller our sacrifices will be.

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

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

THE WAR IN IRAQ

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to assume the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in August of 2002, 2 months before Congress voted for the war in Iraq, Dick Armey, then our Republican majority leader, gave a speech in Des Moines, Iowa. He said, ''I don't believe America will justifiably make an unprovoked attack on another nation. It would not be consistent with what we have been as a Nation.''

The very popular conservative columnist, Charley Reese wrote, before the war, that it was ''ludicrous'' to believe Iraq was any kind of threat to us. Mr. Reese added, ''This is a prescription for the decline and fall of the American Empire. Overextension, urged by a bunch of rabid intellectuals who wouldn't know one end of a gun from another has doomed many an empire. Just let the United States try to occupy the Middle East,'' Mr. Reese said, ''which will be the practical result of a war against Iraq, and Americans will be bled dry by the costs both in blood and treasure.''

The conservative columnist, Paul Craig Roberts, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under President Reagan wrote, before the war, that a ''U.S. invasion of Iraq is the beginning of World War IV.'' He considered the Cold War as World War III.

Mr. Roberts added that going to war in Iraq ''will not solve the Israeli-American conflict with militant Islam. On the contrary, it will widen it.''

Jack Kemp wrote before the war, ''What is the evidence that should cause us to fear Iraq more than Pakistan or Iran. Do we reserve the right to launch a preemptive war exclusively for ourselves or might other nations such as India, Pakistan or China be justified in taking similar action on the basis of fears of other nations?''

Mr. Kemp said, based on the evidence that he had seen, there was not ''a compelling case for the invasion and occupation of Iraq.''

James Webb, Secretary of the Navy, under President Reagan, wrote a column for The Washington Post, before the war, saying if we invaded, we would have to occupy Iraq for 30 to 50 years and that American soldiers would ''quickly become 50,000 terrorist targets.''

He added, ''These concerns and others like them are the reasons that many with long experience in U.S. national security issues remain unconvinced by the arguments for a unilateral invasion of Iraq. Unilateral wars designed to bring about regime change and a long-term occupation should be undertaken only when a nation's existence is clearly at stake.''

Many other conservative columnists, such as Doug Bandow, Pat Buchanan, Joseph Sobran, Steven Chapman, the late Sam Francis, and many others, wrote columns opposing this war before it started.

Later, William F. Buckley said if he had known in 2002 what he knew then, in 2004, he would have opposed the war.

Lewis Lapham, writing in Harper's Magazine, before the war, said, ''the Iraqi Army, never formidable, is less dangerous now than when it was routed in the 4 days of the Gulf War, Iraqi Air Force of no consequence, the civilian economy too impoverished.''

U.S. News and World Report in October of 2002, before the war, carried a lengthy article entitled ''Why War, Why Now?'' and said, ''Many question the rush to attack.''

Fortune Magazine, long before the war, carried an article entitled ''Iraq, We Win. What then?'' The article said a ''military victory could turn into a strategic defeat'' and that an American occupation would be ''prolonged and expensive,'' and ''could turn U.S. troops into sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists.''

When they found out I was against the war, the White House had me and five other members down for a briefing by then National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, George Tenet and John McLaughlin, the two top people in the CIA.

I asked how much Saddam Hussein's military budget was in comparison to ours. I was told a little over 2/10 of 1 percent.

I asked if you could get by the traditional conservative positions of being against huge deficit spending and making the U.S. the policeman of the world and placing almost all of the burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on our people, was there any evidence at all of an eminent threat?

Mr. Tenet said no, there was not. And he later confirmed this in a speech at Georgetown University the day after he resigned.

According to Bob Woodward's book on the war, the President received a briefing from these same CIA officials on December 21, 2½ months after the Congressional vote and responded with words to the effect, ''Is that the best you've got. That will never convince Joe Public.''

Quoting Charley Reese, the conservative columnist again, the war in Iraq was ''against a country that was not attacking us, did not have the means to attack us, and had never expressed any intention of attacking us, and for whatever real reason we attacked Iraq, it was not to save America from any danger, imminent or otherwise.''

Many conservative leaders and columnists were against this war from the beginning because it went against almost every traditional conservative position and there was nothing conservative about this war.

The traditional conservative position was stated many years ago by Senator Robert Taft who said, ''No foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted to the protection of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty.''

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

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