

for the refugee crisis. He said, "Our obligation was to give the Iraqis new institutions and provide security. We have fulfilled that obligation. I don't think we have an obligation to compensate for the hardships of war."

This is the kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that has destroyed America's reputation and credibility around the world. We must reclaim our moral leadership. We can start by helping the Iraqi refugees. It's the right thing to do. It's the right thing to do as we bring our troops home.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

ON IRAQ, WE NEED LEADERSHIP, NOT INEFFECTIVE COMPROMISE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are aching for our leadership to end the war in Iraq. Instead, they find the President and his enablers in the House and Senate doing everything they can to block legislation that would require him to bring the troops home by a date certain. Each day seems to bring some new proposal that purports to be progress.

Upon examination, however, they leave the President free to pursue his discredited policies and serve his diversionary tactics by politicians searching for cover. One proposal calls for the President to submit a plan by mid-October to narrow the use of U.S. troops in Iraq to fighting terrorists and securing borders and U.S. interests. It won't bring home a single American serviceman or woman.

Another proposal seeks to "change the mission" of American forces, but doesn't guarantee when or even if their redeployment will begin. Supporters of "changing the mission" claim it would result in troop reductions, but they offer no evidence of that. Americans will remain the targets of violence, and U.S. policy will continue to sow resentment in the Muslim world. In my opinion, "changing the mission" is the war supporters' latest excuse to avoid decisive action to bring the war to a conclusion.

This is not the leadership the American people expect and that our national security demands. The failure of the President's surge strategy means he has lost the ability to shape events in Iraq in a positive direction. Only by redeploying our forces from Iraq can we rebuild our depleted military, restore our global reputation and redirect resources to fight al Qaeda.

Just last week, the National Counterterrorism Center reported that al Qaeda has regrouped in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, enabled by the President's diversion of resources to Iraq.

I opposed the Iraq war from the start and take no comfort in the fact that many of my most ominous predictions have proven true. In a September 6, 2002, op-ed in the Portland Press Herald, I predicted that the war would be fought "in city streets filled with civilians, making precision bombs useless and casualties high. It will cost billions to wage the war and billions more to rebuild."

America has suffered nearly 30,000 casualties, including more than 3,600 combat deaths. The war has cost half a trillion dollars, resulting in huge deficits that will burden our children's future.

On October 8, 2002, during the House debate on the war resolution, I said, "If the U.S. acts unilaterally or with just a few other nations, there is a far higher risk of fueling resentment in Arab and Muslim nations and swelling the ranks of the anti-U.S. terrorists." Unfortunately, this is exactly what has happened.

I voted against the war and have been an outspoken critic of the case made to justify it, the mismanagement of the occupation and the failure to hold the administration accountable for its so many mistakes.

More than 18 months ago, I called for a deadline to redeploy our forces. A firm deadline was, and is, the best way to end the U.S. involvement in Iraq and force the Iraqis to assume responsibility for their own security. As former Maine Senator George Mitchell demonstrated in his Northern Ireland diplomacy, a firm deadline can be a very effective way to get parties in conflict to compromise their differences.

Nothing but the force of law will move President Bush to alter his stay-the-course strategy. Nonbinding resolutions are not sufficient to compel a real change in policy and get us out of

Iraq. This President is stubbornly determined to delay the inevitable at the cost of additional precious American lives. More than 600 of our troops have died since the surge began.

The other costs include greater hatred of the U.S. in the Islamic world, more terrorists inspired by that hatred and, with our Armed Forces stretched to the breaking point, great insecurity for our Nation.

Unless Members of Congress who supported President Bush's war policy steadfastly for 5 years stop looking for cover and do the right thing, the President will prevail and our troops will remain in Iraq.

Our Armed Forces have done all that we asked of them and have performed their mission with great skill and courage. President Bush will keep our troops in the crossfire of the Iraqi civil war until Congress sets binding dates for their redeployment. That action represents the leadership needed to bring our troops safely home.

CLEANING UP FEMA

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 3rd of July in my hometown of Memphis, Tennessee, I discovered there was ice being disposed of by being dumped on a driveway, more or less, at Spottswood and East Parkway. What that was about was FEMA dropping and disposing of ice.

FEMA had purchased thousands and thousands and thousands of pounds of ice after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita when they didn't have enough ice. To try to compensate, they bought way, way, way too much ice.

I have discovered that FEMA spent in purchasing, in transporting and in storing ice in 23 different American cities, Mr. Speaker, \$67 million of our taxpayers' money, and FEMA is now spending nearly \$4 million to dispose of that ice over a period of 11 months. That means over \$70 million of American taxpayer dollars going down the drain. That is not the way an American government or any government should work, any business should work, or what Americans should expect of their government.

Fortunately, this Democratic Congress is doing what legislative branches are supposed to do; oversight. We have lacked oversight for the last 6 years, Mr. Speaker, and faults of the administration have gone unnoticed. But as I deal on the subcommittee that deals with FEMA, I will see to it on August 29th when that subcommittee meets in New Orleans on the second anniversary of that horrendous event, Hurricane Katrina, that we will ask the director of FEMA and the others about their programs, of why they buy excess commodities and excess ice, of why they spent \$70 million of American taxpayers' money on an ice folly, and why

they didn't try to dispose of that ice during the period of time when it had a useful shelf life and give it to 501(c)(3) charities, Federal, State or county institutions, so it could be used and utilized by American people who could have used that ice to save some money.

The same thing happens with commodities. Chairman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the chairman of that subcommittee, had a hearing on food distribution of commodities where FEMA had wasted other precious commodities and dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this needs to stop. Our tax dollars are valuable and people expect their government to do right with their tax dollars. I will not stand by. When I see incompetence, when I see inefficiencies, when I see ineffective use of tax dollars, I will speak up. I am fortunate to be on the subcommittee to ask the questions on August 29th of FEMA.

It seems like the horrendous events that we had when Brownie didn't know what he was doing and the people in New Orleans were left in a tragic circumstance are replicating themselves. FEMA has not been cleaned up.

We will try to see that FEMA spends our money properly and responds properly. They haven't responded to the American people and they haven't responded to Congress. This is a wrong that needs to be righted.

□ 1900

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

MR. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, just in the last couple of days a very important report that was asked for by the Energy Department has been made public. This is the fourth entity that has been asked to study this subject. One of these entities, SAIC, the large prestigious international corporation, has submitted really three reports but they are just one organization. They are called the Hirsch reports. Later this evening I will note some quotes from the Hirsch Report. This was in February 2005.

In September 2005, the Corps of Engineers in response to a request by the Army issued a report, *Energy Trends and Their Implication For U.S. Army Installations*. When you read that report, you might substitute the "United States" or "world" instead of "the Army" and it would be just as applicable. Clearly our Army is a microcosm of the United States and the world.

And then there was a third study which came out in March of this year and this was a study done by the Government Accountability Office. Through my position on the Science Committee I asked for this study and it was completed and it was made public March 29, 2007.

All three of these studies had the same message. A little later we will look at some of those messages. Well, I have one here from the Hirsch Report. "World Oil Peaking is Going to Happen. The world has never faced a problem like this. Without massive mitigation, more than a decade before the fact, the problem will be pervasive and will not be temporary. Previous energy transitions, wood to coal and coal to oil were gradual and evolutionary. Oil peaking will be abrupt and revolutionary."

In common, everyday English what these three studies have indicated is that peaking of oil is imminent, present or imminent, with potentially devastating consequences.

Just in the last couple of days there has been a fourth entity that has published a report, this one requested by the Department of Energy, as was the first one, the Hirsch Report. This one was by the National Petroleum Council. The National Petroleum Council has done a very large study involving a lot of experts in the world. They have just issued their report.

Today I was very pleased that several of the key members of this study came to my office and we had a very productive discussion of their report. My concern was that although one could not argue with any specific sentence in the report, that the report certainly was not in my view, and I think the view of any casual reader, was not the clarion call for action that the other reports were. But we will have a chance this evening to look a little more at that report.

There was a talk given 50 years ago, the 14th day of last month, by the father of our nuclear submarine, Hyman Rickover. He gave this talk to a group of physicians in St. Paul, Minnesota. You can do a Google search and just ask for "Rickover" and "energy" and this talk will come up. It is called "Energy Resources and Our Future" and it was on May 14, 1957, a little more than 50 years and one month ago.

There is nothing man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuel reserves, he says. They were created by solar energy 500 million years ago and took eons to grow to their present volume. In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuel reserves are finite, the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect: The longer they last, the more time we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources.

There have been a number of interesting articles in the public media in the last few weeks. One of them was in the New York Times on June 30. "Oil Giants See Some Strains in the System." This is Mr. Mulva who is the chairman and chief executive officer of ConocoPhillips, one of our large oil companies.

The question he was asked was: According to the Department of Energy, the United States will consume 28 percent more oil and 19 percent more nat-

ural gas in 2030 than it did in 2005. Where will we find all that oil and gas?

And this is his answer. "I question whether the supply will be developed to meet these demand expectations. I believe demand is going to be constrained by supply."

What he is saying is the future is not going to be like the past because in the past we always have been able to find additional production when we needed it. There was only one time when that was not true for a little while and that was in the 1970s when the OPEC oil-producing companies were limiting their exports to us, and that created not only in this country but worldwide a recession as a result of that temporary restriction in providing the full amount of oil that the world's economies would like to use.

On March 25 in the Washington Post there was a very interesting article. It was entitled "Corn Can't Solve Our Problem." You know there has been a lot of interest in corn ethanol, E-85 and putting 10 percent in our gasoline and so forth. They made the observation that if we took all of our 70 million acres of corn and planted and used that corn to produce ethanol, and recognize the fact that there is a big fossil fuel impact into producing the ethanol, and if you discounted the energy contribution from the ethanol by the fossil fuels it took to produce it, it would displace 2.4 percent of our gasoline. And they wryly noted in the article that if you tuned up your car and put air in the tires, you could save as much gas.

I believe it is in the same article that they talk about what we might do with non-corn land in planting, and they thought there was maybe 60 million acres of that in the conservation reserve. This is not as good of land as we are planting now. It is land that is kind of marginal for crop production, and so with some incentives from the government, our farmers have put that in what is called conservation reserve. If we took that out of conservation reserve and planted it to a mixture of grasses, they estimated this might produce as much ethanol by cellulosic ethanol production as we would get from our corn. Because there would be less fossil fuel input to this, the net might be greater. It might be as much as 10 percent or so. But I don't know if they looked at the sustainability of this because if you look at a patch of weeds, to at least some extent and in places to a very large extent, this year's weeds are growing because last year's weeds died and are fertilizing them.

We see this dynamic really exhibited in our rainforests which one would suspect would represent the product of really good soils because there is so much growing in our rainforests. But when you take all of the trees, vines and so forth that are growing in the rainforest away, you've taken almost all the nutrients away and you have very thin soils in many places that bake hard in the sun. They are called