

with Iraq represents a radical departure from two centuries of U.S. defense and foreign policy and it should be the subject of Congressional hearings and a vigorous public debate.

Also of concern are a number of arrogant and ideological statements made by other Bush administration officials over the course of the last couple of weeks. Especially troubling are those suggesting that the President already has the authority to attack Iraq at will and doesn't need to consult with and get the approval of this Congress by virtue of the 1991 resolution authorizing the use of force in Desert Storm and last fall's resolution supporting the war on terror. At best, this is simplicity without reason, and reason enough to make the U.S. Constitution "required reading" for presidential appointees.

Without ambiguity, the Constitution vested in Congress two powers, among others—the power of the purse and the power to declare war. And the War Powers Resolution of 1973 clearly calls for collective judgment of both Congress and the President in time of war. The act gives the President the authority to act alone only when there is an emergency, an act of defense against a threat; examples would be Pearl Harbor and the September 11th attacks. In others cases a Declaration of War or Statutory Authority must be issued.

President Bush has said that Iraq is governed by evil forces who possess weapons of mass destruction but he has not insisted on an immediate resumption of unfettered weapons inspection by the United Nations as one way of proving his point. Secretary Powell's call for U.N. inspections is a hopeful sign that the Administration is reconsidering. The President and his team should follow the example of his father and make the case to the American people, their Representatives and Senators in Congress, and to the world community that Saddam Hussein poses a real and dangerous and verifiable threat—not only to his own people and Iraq's neighbors in the Middle East—but to the United States and world peace.

From such an exercise, the President could rebuild and perhaps strengthen the coalition of nations that successfully prosecuted the Gulf War, dealing with Iraq from a position of unquestioned strength—based on a broad international consensus. This path also has the virtue of assuring that all other methods to resolve the situation have been tried and there is no other alternative. It's worth noting that this is the same strategy President Bush followed in getting other nations to join us in the fight against terrorism. He would be well advised to follow the same course as he ponders what to do with the Iraq situation.

On the face of it, it may seem easier to make war than to create peace, but it's worth remembering history's lesson that the costs of war are high—in human lives, resources, domestic needs left unmet and other global challenges, while the rewards of peace are far greater, measured by the savings of what would otherwise be lost or wasted—as the Bible says, "Blessed are the Peace-makers."

Mr. President and Mr. Vice President, "Blessed are the Peace-makers," and war should be the last resort, not the first. If you have exhausted all best efforts to resolve the conflict with Iraq by all other means—by prevention, not pre-emption—without success, then the Congress, the American people and the world will give you the mightiest weapon to

be had in an arsenal: the moral authority to exercise leadership and prosecute a war that serves the common interest of humanity and advances the noble cause of world peace.

RUSSIAN/UNITED STATES ENERGY COOPERATION

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to encourage our colleagues to support a new direction for America as outlined by both our President and the President of Russia, President Putin.

Later on this month there will be a major energy summit in Houston, Texas, sponsored by the U.S. Energy Association. It will have the major energy players in our country and Russia come together to see ways we can cooperate.

This follows on with recommendations that many in this body took in a document that we produced last fall entitled, "A New Time, A New Beginning" which one-third of the House and Senate joined together in supporting. One of our major tenets was that we should work together with Russia on their energy exploration and development. The reason this is so critically important is, obviously, America's dependence on Middle Eastern crude and the problem it causes us as evidenced by the current crisis in the Middle East. Russia has huge supplies of energy. We have a need; we have the technology. We should be working together.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of initiatives under way. I am circulating a memo in the House which I would encourage our colleagues to sign which is a joint statement that will be signed by both Members of the Congress, the House and the Senate, and members of the Duma and Federation Council. This document is followed through in a piece of legislation that I will introduce this week; and hopefully we can have that bill on the House floor before we adjourn at the end of September. In fact, my intent is to have the Duma ratify the document at the end of September. Eight hours later in Washington, the Congress will ratify the same document that calls for an expanded U.S.-Russian cooperation on energy.

Mr. Speaker, that document and the joint statement are as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS AND R.F. FEDERAL ASSEMBLY ON NEW ENERGY AND TRADE COOPERATION BETWEEN TWO NATIONS

On behalf of the U.S. Congress and members of the Russian Federal Assembly we strongly support the recent decision by President Bush on June 6, 2002 to extend market status to the Russian economy. The granting of market status is one of many mutually beneficial measures our two governments should continue to pursue to promote long-term engagement and integration of Russia into the world economy. A key component of new engagement is mutual ef-

forts to bring greater stability to world energy markets and to support sustained economic growth in Russia and the United States.

Russia, with its vast oil and gas resources, a growing and diverse number of private sector companies, and a renewed commitment to investment by international energy companies, offers a unique opportunity to provide stability to an often volatile and insecure world energy market. We recognize that Russia and the U.S. can play a critical role in supporting energy development among the resource rich countries of the former Soviet Union (FSU).

In the coming months we will revitalize the work of the Duma-Congress Study Group on energy policy and coordinate our efforts with our respective Parliaments as well as efforts now underway by the government agencies of the United States and Russia. Among the specific legislative and other measures we commit to pursue are:

U.S. Congressional action to remove trade and economic barriers, including outdated laws no longer applicable to this New Time and New Beginning, such as the review provisions contained in the Jackson-Vanik Amendment of the 1974 Trade Act.

Duma action to strengthen investment incentives in the Russian energy sector, such as full implementation of Production Sharing legislation, encouragement of regulatory reform, and other measures to attract international investment into the Russian energy sectors. Of specific concern are legislative and related policy measures to permit full implementation of projects on Sakhalin Island and in the *Timan-Pechora* region, all of which offer unique opportunities to increase world and U.S. supplies of petroleum.

Regulatory and investment frameworks to expand Russia's oil and gas export capacities.

Joint parliamentary support for Russia's ascension to the WTO.

High level and sustained exchanges on energy development between official entities and private sector companies of Russia and the United States.

As our two governments proceed with this important Energy Dialogue we call upon them to consult widely with interested parties to promote exchanges and to seek support from the broadest cross section of our business and civil societies. Among the important non-governmental groups we value highly and whom we will continue to consult with are the Moscow International Petroleum Club, US-Russia Business Council, American Chamber of Commerce in Moscow, Russian-American Council for Business Cooperation, American-Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other related entities that can play a critical role in policy assessments and promoting private sector exchanges. We will encourage the government agencies of Russia and the United States to consult widely with these groups.

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas the Russian Federation, with its vast oil and gas resources, a growing and diverse number of private sector companies, and a renewed commitment to investment by international energy companies, offers a unique opportunity to provide stability to an often volatile and insecure world energy market;

Whereas on June 6, 2002, Russia was granted market status economy [by the United States?];

Whereas the granting of market status is one of many mutually beneficial measures that the Governments of Russia and the United States should continue to pursue to promote long-term engagement and integration of Russia into the world economy;

Whereas a key component of new engagement is mutual efforts to bring greater stability to world energy markets and to support sustained economic growth in Russia and the United States; and

Whereas both Russia and the United States can play a critical role in supporting energy development among the resource rich countries of the former Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) in proceeding with [this important energy dialogue?] the Governments of the Russian Federation and the United States should consult widely with interested parties to promote exchanges and to seek support from the broadest cross section of business and civil societies; and

(B) the United States should remove trade and economic barriers [with respect to Russia?], including provisions of law that are no longer applicable, such as chapter 1 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (commonly referred to as “Jackson-Vanik”); and

(2) Congress—

(A) supports the actions of the Russian Duma to strengthen investment incentives in the Russian energy sector, such as full implementation of production sharing legislation, encouragement of regulatory reform, and other measures to attract international investment into the Russian energy sectors;

(B) supports the actions of the Russian Duma to permit full implementation of [energy?] projects on Sakhalin Island and in the Timan-Pechora region, all of which offer unique opportunities to increase world and United States supplies of petroleum;

(C) encourages regulatory and investment framework in Russia to expand Russia’s oil and gas export capacities;

(D) supports the accession of Russia to the World Trade Organization (WTO); and

(E) supports continued high level and sustained exchanges on energy development between the Governments of Russia and the United States and between businesses in the two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I would also call my colleagues’ attention to a speech being given at the National Press Club this Thursday by Senator CONRAD BURNS. In that speech he will focus on the need for America to move toward joint U.S.-Russian energy cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, one final point, I will be contacting the administration tomorrow because the upcoming summit on October 1 and 2 in Houston is critically important, but to this date my understanding is it does not have a large focus on the legislative process as part of the energy initiative. And, obviously, we cannot have a joint energy relationship unless both bodies in both countries are directly involved. So I would call upon the administration to provide a provision in that conference for Members of the House and the Senate, members of the Duma and the Federation Council to speak to the issues of importance that will allow us to implement the ideas and the proposals of both President Bush and President Putin on ways that we can expand the cooperation between the U.S. and Russia in the energy arena.

UNITED STATES SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN UNITED NATIONS WORLD SUMMIT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned this last week from participation in the United Nations World Summit for Sustainable Development. It was truly an amazing experience, Mr. Speaker. It was the largest conference ever conducted by the United Nations. It was attended by over 100 heads of state who took part in the summit, joined by over 21,000 people, 9,000 delegates, 8,000 representatives of a variety of nongovernmental organizations and 4,000 members of the press. It was something that I will remember for a variety of reasons.

In one respect it was interesting in terms of the context in which the summit was taking place. Amidst news of drought, forest fires, devastating storms and flooding around the world, millions of people had been displaced in Asia, there were disastrous floods in central Europe, everybody that I met with and I had the opportunity to visit with the representatives of over two dozen countries, there was not one person when did not feel that the terrible ecological disasters that provided the backdrop in the news were not somehow connected to the cavalier treatment that we have accorded to the environment. There was virtually no skepticism expressed on behalf of the concerns for global climate change, for instance.

Now, while personally embarrassed that the United States did not have a greater presence, and somewhat overwhelmed by the environmental challenges we face, I returned from that experience with a greater sense of optimism than I would have thought possible just a month ago.

Now, make no mistake about it, I fear the United States was the big loser at that summit. I mention that there were 104 heads of state, not the President of the United States, who was staying on his ranch in Crawford, Texas, and participating in various fund-raising events around the country, allowing the United States to be portrayed as an obstructionist or uninterested in a conference to which most other countries sent their leaders. I found a certain amount of irony when the United States, at least some members of the administration are beating their drums for a potential action against Iraq, when a number of people noted the need if we are going to be moving forward to have a global alliance similar to that which was assembled by President Bush’s father when he was involved with the war against Iraq with Operation Desert Storm. It seemed particularly ironic that the head of our government, who had an

opportunity to meet with our global partners, strengthen bonds, and obtain support for difficult policies that require international cooperation was not there. It had a number of other spill-over effects. Frankly, we did not get credit for many of the more positive developments that we were involved with.

For instance, during the negotiations on the plan of implementation, which was the international agreement produced at the summit, the United States negotiators opposed most of the specific targets in the plan dealing with climate change and energy. The United States opposed language that would have set a goal for industrialized countries to increase their use of renewable energy by just 2 percent over the next decade. It is kind of hard to believe that the United States, with all of its resources and technology, its leadership, with a public that understands the need for energy independence and not being further reliant on unstable energy sources in the Middle East, hard to believe that our administration thinks it is not possible that the United States could meet the challenge of increasing our use of renewables in the next decade by just 2 percent.

It was disappointing that the United States seemed to avoid any discussion of global climate change, our contribution to the problem, and meaningful solutions.

The United States did finally support the summit goal to cut in half the number of people living without basic sanitation, matching our objectives for clean water, drinking water. This was important, Mr. Speaker, because by linking those two goals together, we have the opportunity to increase 300 percent the effectiveness of our investments. And I was pleased that at the last minute the United States abandoned its advocacy of destructive language that would have undercut women’s reproductive health and freedom. It was a little embarrassing for a while that our partners in the fight for reproductive women’s rights were those coming from the Arab states. In its original form it would have been a declaration that the Taliban would have felt comfortable with.

□ 1945

But as I say, this was one area where we were able to see some changes that took place.

Mr. Speaker, I have some other thoughts and observations relative to the experience here; but I note that I have been joined by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Los Angeles, California (Ms. SOLIS), and I yield to the gentlewoman to make some comments, a woman who is deeply concerned about environmental issues and provided leadership internationally and at home for herself in California.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would like to also thank the gentleman from Oregon for putting this discussion here before the public.