

THE GREATEST GENERATION

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

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most monumental battles of World War II took place in October of 1944 in the Pacific theater in the Battle of Leyte Gulf. One of those heroes who fought on Hell's doorstep in this battle was Major Alan McKean. Major McKean served in the United States Army and was among the millions of others who answered freedom's call in the largest armed conflict in recorded history.

When we consider generations of our past, no one exemplifies the essence of America better than those, part of what we now call the greatest generation. For this generation of Americans, like Major McKean, whose character and resolve was molded by the Great Depression, defeating Adolf Hitler and the Axis powers' reign of terror was just another call to answer. They performed their duty with honor. It was not theirs to question. It was simply expected. We will never forget their triumphs, and we will never forget those victories like the battle of Leyte Gulf which came at such a great cost. Few causes were as worthy. Few prices were as great. Perhaps Winston Churchill said it best when he said of this generation, This was their finest hour.

Men like Major McKean saved an entire world from tyranny and gave people the chance to live under flags of freedom by answering the call to service. To this day and forever, we recall these heroic deeds and we remember and honor those who liberated the world.

Like the soldiers of America's greatest generation, today's service men and women are in distant lands fighting the threat and horror of terror by spreading freedom and making our homeland more secure. America will continue to honor our past and present military because the triumph of its ideals resides in the actions of its heroes. I salute Major Alan McKean and all the service men and women who put themselves in harm's way so that we may live in freedom.

May God bless America, may He bless Major Alan McKean and his wife Dorothy, and may He hold them in the palm of His hand.

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

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

THE ROAD NOT TAKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, last month dozens of world leaders, including President Bush, gathered in Moscow to celebrate the 60th anniversary of V-E day. It was fitting and proper for the President and other heads of state to pay homage to the millions who died defeating Nazism and fascism and to commemorate the end of the Second World War.

The year 1945 also marked the beginning of the nuclear age, and even those who had become inured to the destruction that years of fighting had wrought were stunned by the devastation caused by the atomic bombs dropped on Japan. Nuclear weapons have been the dominant feature of the international security landscape ever since, and preventing their proliferation has been a central goal of American Presidents from Harry Truman to George W. Bush.

That is why I cannot understand the failure of the administration to take a leading role at the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty review conference that was held at the United Nations from May 2-27. There is near unanimity among policymakers and our Nation's political leadership that nuclear terrorism and the proliferation of nuclear weapons are the greatest threats to our national security. The President has said so himself. But the United States did not dispatch any senior officials to New York and downplayed the importance of the conference. This was shortsighted and dangerous, and the failure to achieve any concrete results at the NPT conference was a major national security setback for the United States as well as for the rest of the world.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which took effect in 1970, has for the most part been successful in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons beyond the original five members of the nuclear club, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, China and the United States. In 1960, John Kennedy wrote that he expected 20 nations would have nuclear weapons by the end of the 1960s. He considered this the gravest threat to world peace and set in motion the events and discussions that culminated in the NPT.

During the 35 years that the treaty has been in effect, only three nations are known to have developed nuclear weapons, India, Pakistan and Israel, and they are not parties to the NPT. North Korea is believed to have a handful of nuclear weapons, and Iran is engaged in a diplomatic game of chicken with the West in its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, after three and a half decades, the NPT is showing its age, and the review conference was held at a critical time for the international community's efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. In December of last year, a panel of experts convened by the U.N. issued a stark warning that we are approaching the point at which

the erosion of the nonproliferation regime could become irreversible and result in a cascade of proliferation. One of the members of that panel was Brent Scowcroft, who served as national security adviser to President George H.W. Bush.

The twin nuclear crises with North Korea and Iran have exposed flaws in the NPT's "grand bargain," which was first articulated in President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" proposal. In exchange for the commitment to forgo the acquisition of nuclear weapons and to agree to international safeguards and inspections, the NPT guarantees non-nuclear weapon states who are parties to the treaty the peaceful development and use of nuclear energy. The problem with this bargain is that it allows nations like Iran or North Korea access to fissile material and technological know-how that is the necessary precursor for a nuclear weapons program. When the state feels confident it is ready to proceed with a weapons program, it simply opts out of the NPT.

Had it chosen to do so, the administration could have used the review conference in New York to make it more difficult for states to access nuclear material and technology under the NPT and then walk away from the treaty by providing tough penalties for those who would try.

One proposal by a group of experts at Princeton and Stanford would bar parties withdrawing from the NPT to use fissile materials or production facilities acquired while they were parties to the treaty to make nuclear weapons. The German government also proposed preventing a party from withdrawing from the treaty if that state was in violation of that treaty.

But reinvigorating the NPT requires more than cracking down on Iran and North Korea. It also demands leadership from the declared nuclear weapons states which as part of the NPT committed themselves to reduce their own stockpiles significantly in exchange for non-nuclear states renouncing nuclear ambitions. Unfortunately, the five nuclear weapons states have not done enough, and General Scowcroft and his colleagues chided them in their report for their lackluster efforts.

Matters have not been helped by a State Department brochure handed out at the conference which listed arms control breakthroughs since the 1980s and touted reductions in the U.S. arsenal. But the time line made no mention of the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a pact negotiated by the Clinton administration and ratified by 121 nations but rejected by this President. The brochure also ignored the 2000 NPT review conference at which the U.S. and other nuclear weapons states committed to practical steps to achieve nuclear safety, including entering into the test ban treaty and negotiation of a fissile material cutoff treaty to ban manufacture and production of additional bomb material.

Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of World War II, the United States constructed a diverse set of international institutions to guarantee peace and better ensure a future for America and the rest of the world. By going to Moscow, President Bush honored the sacrifice of millions of Americans and other allied personnel to secure our present. But it was the road not taken, the one to New York, that would have helped to secure the future.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SIMMONS 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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL 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 Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS 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 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE 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 (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOSSELLA 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 gentle-

woman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENERGY POLICY

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 discuss climate change, one of the most important issues facing our planet today. Thankfully, the issue of climate change has been getting more coverage in the national media. While I know that there are many Members in Congress who are committed to taking action, the level of attention paid to climate change in Congress does not match either the urgency of the issue or the concern of the American public. Given the enormous implications for our economy and our environment, this must change. Climate change is real, and we must act.

The steps we must take to address the issue are a matter of great debate. There is a consensus that we must reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but how we do that is not as simple. I applaud my colleagues in the House as well as the Senate who have introduced or supported legislation to address climate change. I have, however, great concern that their proposals, while extremely well-intentioned and well-crafted, do not have sufficient support in the Congress and do not adequately address the economic challenges our country will face as we move toward a less-carbon-intensive economy.

It is my belief that we must take action now to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but we must do so in a way that would minimize the impact to our economy. We must implement an economy-wide, upstream, all greenhouse gas cap-and-trade emissions reduction program that provides some flexibility and a measure of certainty to those industries and businesses affected.

The National Commission on Energy Policy, a bipartisan group of top experts from energy, government, labor, academia and environmental and consumer groups, developed a set of sensible policy recommendations for addressing oil security, climate change, natural gas supply, and other long-term energy supply challenges. They advocate for a modest, certain and efficient proposal. Their recommendations have been endorsed by major U.S. businesses and labor groups.

One of the key components of their proposal is the concept of a safety valve for the cap-and-trade program. The safety valve essentially puts a price on carbon but provides for an unlimited number of allowances to be sold by the government. Since no one would pay more than what the government charges for allowances, this mechanism effectively controls the price of allowances.

□ 1430

When set at the right price, the safety valve would start the country down the path of slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions without causing economic disruption. While there may be less emissions reduction with a safety valve than without one, today we are doing nothing. And the safety valve creates a potential buy-in from those affected by the legislation.

Another component that I believe is important to integrate into any climate change policy is setting a prospective baseline on greenhouse gas emissions. A sound greenhouse gas emissions reduction policy must recognize that the buildup of greenhouse gas has been taking place over the last century. Since greenhouse gas concentrations are a cumulative measure, sharply reducing a particular year's emissions is substantially less important than the alternative, which is to start down the long-term path of gradually slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. This will also allow businesses to plan for a carbon-constrained world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe any climate change policy we implement must also tie our country's efforts to reducing greenhouse gas emissions to those efforts of the major developing countries. We must ensure that they make a similar commitment to our environment and that the United States is not unfairly burdened. It is a major concern of American business and labor that the developing countries participate in slowing the growth of greenhouse gases to a degree comparable to ours. Any program that does not link our emissions reductions to those of the major developing countries would not only be fundamentally unfair but could also reduce America's competitiveness, resulting in the loss of businesses and jobs in the United States.

And, lastly, Mr. Speaker, a climate change policy must also encourage the development of new greenhouse gas emissions reduction technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD two documents to supplement what I have said here today, an editorial and a letter.

The long-term resolution of the greenhouse gas emissions issues lies in the research and development of new technology.

Mr. Speaker, there is irrefutable scientific evidence to justify taking action on climate change. The long-term consequences of failing to act are sufficiently well documented, providing us with every incentive we need to act. I know many of my colleagues believe that the United States can and should adopt a greenhouse gas emissions reduction policy, but I believe that such a policy will only garner support if it is modest, efficient, and fair. Most importantly Mr. Speaker, we must begin the process. We must act and we must do so now. Otherwise, we are simply putting the future of our planet at risk.