



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2001

No. 37

House of Representatives

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP CRITICAL ASPECT FOR PROMOTING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress determined that the Federal Government be a better partner in promoting livable communities, to make our families safe, healthy and economically secure. Government needs to lead by example, to set the tone and follow through. A critical aspect is our environmental stewardship.

I just returned from 4 days in Oregon and was, frankly, surprised at the intensity of the public reaction to this administration's lack of commitment to the environment. The sudden about-face from an explicit campaign promise to have mandatory reductions in carbon dioxide emissions has struck a nerve. The administration may think it is time to study global warming, but most Americans agree with the overwhelming scientific evidence that global warming is real and that we must do something about it.

I was struck by the continued deep opposition to the administration's proposal to drill for oil in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. For me the issue is not a question of whether the environmental damage may result, it is the funda-

mental question whether we should do it at all.

I was pleased to see a recent newsletter by the Rocky Mountain Institute which contained an article by Amory and Hunter Lovins asking that fundamental question. They point out, for example, that the State of Alaska's own recent survey forecast on the long-term oil prices suggest that the prices are not going to be high enough to make the operation profitable. Using our time and resources to recover this more expensive oil would result not only in a waste of money, but it would in the long run result in more oil imports as we ignore more cost-efficient operations other than the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

This also continues to ignore the reality that we, as a country, cannot and should not continue to consume energy the way that we currently do: six times higher than the world per capita energy consumption, twice as much as developed countries like Japan and Germany.

The irony is that conservation does work and would work better than a mad rush to exploit our oil resources. It is estimated that a mere 3-mile-per-gallon improvement in the performance of SUVs would offset the entire proposed oil production from the Arctic. And if we feel that we cannot single out these large and inefficient vehicles, then just a ½-mile-per-gallon efficiency improvement in the fleet overall would meet the production of the Arctic wilderness. It is a lack of will regarding the average level over the last 20 years that we have not reduced these mileage requirements. Last year was 24 miles per gallon, tied for lowest in the last 20 years. We can and we should do better.

Simple things like in California having roofs that are white and reflective would reduce air conditioning costs by approximately 30 percent. It would be far more effective for us to make that investment in conservation.

I started in politics during the last energy crisis some 25 years ago, and despite Ronald Reagan's efforts to gut and reverse the efforts, conservation over a period of time has saved a quantity of energy that is four times the entire domestic oil energy production. Conservation is the only alternative that will provide immediate relief to those of us in the West this year. It has no threat from terrorists, no risk of environmental damage, and conservation continues producing every year. That is why past efforts at conservation have made each oil barrel that we have today support almost twice as much of the gross national product as in 1975.

But last and most significant, it does not make sense to strategically drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge if we are worried about oil security for the United States. What could be more foolish than placing our bets on an aging 800-mile facility that is increasingly unreliable, that is wearing out, and is impossible to defend? The potential for disruption makes it an ideal target for a terrorist, a rogue state or a deranged person.

It is in fact a potential disaster waiting to happen if you are concerned about security. Far better than this rancorous debate over the potential environmental damage in the wildlife refuge is to work to reduce the waste of energy in the United States.

HEALTH CARE TAX DEDUCTION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just dropped a bill this morning, and I intend to talk about it. It is called the Health Care Tax Deduction Act. What it does is allow deductions for amounts

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H961