

But let us say we like giving the oil companies \$37 billion. Should we not at least pay for it? The Committee on Rules has prohibited any amendments to make this bill pay for itself. As a result, all the bonanza for the oil companies comes right out of the Medicare trust fund. Wake up. We have a new economic situation, a new President and there is no surplus except the Medicare surplus.

Finally, the Committee on Rules has decided not even to allow California and the Western states a chance on this floor to ask to change our clocks and use daylight saving time in more creative ways. There is nothing in the bill for conservation and everything for the oil companies.

AMERICA'S NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY PLAN

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, to this date, America has not had a comprehensive energy policy. The results were expressed last year when President Clinton's Energy Secretary Bill Richardson admitted, "It is obvious that the Federal Government was not prepared. We were caught napping. We got complacent."

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that these problems do not happen overnight and they cannot be solved overnight, but with Americans now facing rising utility bills, high gasoline prices and rolling blackouts and brownouts, I believe Congress must act to pass President Bush's far-reaching plan which is balanced and responsive in addressing America's energy needs.

The President's plans offers 105 specific recommendations to address America's current energy shortage and provides reliable and affordable supply for the future. It starts with conversation and includes friendly changes to increase our domestic supply, improve delivery, reform outdated regulations and encourage energy diversity.

It is unnecessary that nearly 60 percent of America's oil is imported. It is unbelievable that large portions of our oil and gas are in hands of Mommar Quadaffi and Saddam Hussein. It is outrageous that Members of this House choose to put politics before the people.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt the President's energy plan.

ENERGY SECURITY ACT INCREASES ENERGY PRODUCTION

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, the Energy Security Act helps America ad-

dress its energy problems by increasing our energy production on existing Federal sites. It helps us get more oil from our existing oil wells, more natural gas from our existing natural gas wells, more hydropower from our existing Federal dams.

It looks for ways to produce more energy from wind, sun and geothermal heat, all from Federal lands. It also allows careful, gentle oil development of 2,000 acres in the Arctic by using the latest technology and adherence to the strictest environmental laws.

The Energy Security Act does what we need to increase our production of energy, and together with bills from other committees, will form a comprehensive package that emphasizes vigorous conservation, more research, more reliance on clean and renewable energies, and the wise increase of energy production. As for California, its problems will not be solved until it changes its attitude with regard to energy production and changes its political leaders.

SUPPORTING A BALANCED AND COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY BILL

(Mrs. WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today is an important day in the House. We are going to bring forward an energy bill, the first comprehensive energy bill we have had in this country for almost 20 years.

It is a long-term, balanced approach to energy policy that includes increases in both production and conservation. But I have to give credit to both sides of the aisle here because this House decided to start with conservation.

The bill includes a measure that will save 5 billion gallons of gasoline from SUV and light truck production over the next 6 years. That is the equivalent of parking the 1999 production of SUVs for 2 years and not even driving them.

It includes standards for televisions and appliances and energy efficiency, accelerating the clean coal program and tax credits for solar homes. Those tax credits in that bill do not go to big oil. They go to people like me and others like me who live in solar heated homes in the Southwest.

This is a balanced, comprehensive approach that includes input from many rank-and-file Members of this House, and I commend the leadership and the bipartisan majority that will pass it today.

EPA ASSAULT ON HUDSON RIVER COMMUNITIES

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on one of the infamous days for the citizens of New York's 22nd congressional district, a district that I represent.

That is because yesterday, regrettably, the EPA Administrator leaked to the press her decision to dredge over 40 miles, 2.6 million cubic yards, 100,000 dump-truck loads of sludge from the bottom of the Hudson River.

□ 1030

This is after much debate and much study but, more importantly, after weeks of negotiation where we sought to bring the parties together so that we could find an amicable and immediate solution.

This decision will wreak havoc on the citizens of the 22nd Congressional District. I would ask my colleagues to imagine, imagine finding out that your life has been turned upside down through a press leak; imagine knowing that this could lead to the seizure of your home, of your property, a change of your quality of life; imagine for 20 years, fighting on an issue in which almost every public-appointed and elected official has abandoned you, and then having this occur to you.

Mr. Speaker, shame on the EPA, shame on the administrator. I vow to continue this fight on behalf of the citizens of the 22nd Congressional District.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY ACT OF 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 216 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 216

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of each of the following Committees: Science, Ways and Means, and Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in

the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. No further amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting H.R. 4 with Senate amendments thereto, it shall be in order to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and request or agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 216 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001. The rule provides 90 minutes of general debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of each of the following committees: the Committee on Science, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Resources.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It also provides that the amendment printed in part A of the Committee on Rules report accompanying the rule shall be considered as adopted and makes in order only those amendments printed in part B of the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution.

The rule further provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the

report, may be offered only by a member designated in the report, and shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, the rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions, and provides authorization for a motion in the House to go to conference with the Senate on the bill H.R. 4.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we have an opportunity to advance the important work of securing America's energy future. Earlier this year when the administration's comprehensive energy plan was unveiled, President George W. Bush said, and I quote, "America must have an energy policy that plans for the future, but meets the needs of today, and one that develops our natural resources and protects our environment at the same time," end quote.

Thanks to extraordinary hard work by the members of four different committees, we have before the House today legislation that accomplishes both of these critically important goals. At a time when America's dependence on foreign resources of oil is at an all-time high and when domestic sources of energy are increasingly off limits, it is important, more important than ever, for this House to face the challenge of reversing these trends in ways that respect the public's understandable desire to protect our country's abundant natural resources. This bill does that.

In addition to increasing our supplies of energy, we must continue to make even greater strides in the area of energy conservation, and H.R. 4 does that also. Greater support for energy-saving technology, as well as tax incentives and other measures aimed at encouraging energy conservation, are among the centerpiece provisions of this bill.

I am particularly pleased that H.R. 4 includes support for the development of proliferation-resistant fuel for the next generation of nuclear reactors. Nuclear energy is a clean energy source that can provide substantial new electrical generation capacity without adversely affecting our air quality. And like hydropower and many other renewables, nuclear energy adds no additional greenhouse gases to the atmosphere.

Specifically, H.R. 4 authorizes R&D to develop a new type of fuel that may be recycled in order to reduce waste and radioactive life of spent nuclear fuel, while ensuring that this new fuel will be proliferation resistant. I believe it is imperative that the administration move ahead aggressively on this new initiative and that it seek to identify as soon as possible an appropriate

facility such as, for example, Fast Flux Test Facility at the DOE's Hanford site, that could be used to test and evaluate potential new recyclable fuels.

By including a promising new program to address one of the most substantial objections to additional nuclear power, the authors of this legislation should be commended for taking an important step toward the goal of securing America's energy future.

Mr. Speaker, this is a large and complex piece of legislation reported by four different committees. In seeking to craft a fair rule for its consideration, the Committee on Rules considered a very large number of amendments proposed by Members of the House. My Committee on Rules colleagues and I are pleased to report that we were able to make in order 28 amendments to various sections of the bill. We are particularly pleased to have been able to accommodate almost all of the requests made of the committee by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader.

In fact, on July 20, the minority leader and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), wrote to the Speaker requesting that when H.R. 4 was brought to the floor, that the Committee on Rules make in order seven specific amendments as well as a Democrat substitute to the bill. I am pleased to report that today, the rule before us makes in order fully five of those seven amendments requested by the minority leader and makes in order no Democrat substitute, simply because none was ever submitted to the Committee on Rules.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and balanced rule which will provide Members ample opportunity to consider a wide range of proposed changes to the bill. At the same time, it is a rule that ensures that the House can complete action on this important legislation in a timely manner in order to give the American people the balanced energy policy they need and they deserve.

So accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both House Resolution 216 and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There are 51 billion reasons to be against this rule. That is how much the Treasury has announced it is borrowing to finance the tax rebate passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. The President and this Congress are now party to borrowing from Peter to pay Paul because we just cannot afford to pay for those \$300 and \$600 checks that are now in the mail out of the money we have in the bank.

In fact, there are an additional 33 billion reasons to defeat this rule. That is

because this rule makes in order \$33 billion in energy tax cuts that are not paid for. The Republican majority has, by recommending this rule, begun a head-long rush into a raid on the Medicare Trust Fund. The Republican leadership simply refuses to pay for their policies up front and in cash. Instead, the Republican majority wants to put everything on the national credit card. Mr. Speaker, this is a world turned upside down, because it seems the Republican Party has now become addicted to deficit spending, and it is Democrats who are now the party of fiscal responsibility.

Case in point. Two of the leading conservative Democrats in the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), joined with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) to ask the Committee on Rules to make in order an amendment to this bill which would pay for those \$33 billion in tax cuts. Liberals and conservatives alike understand that if we are to have meaningful energy tax policy, we have to pay for it. We believe the benefits will far outweigh the costs.

So, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) proposed that the recently passed tax cuts which we are already having trouble paying for, be adjusted to allow for those energy tax incentives to fit into a fiscally responsible framework. They also reformatted the tax incentives to divide them equally between production incentives and conservation initiatives that will benefit consumers rather than tilting the entire tax package towards production and special interest provisions.

But early this morning, again, under the cover of darkness at about 12:30 a.m., the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule that denied the House the right to decide if we should act responsibly when it comes to energy tax policy. At about 1 o'clock this morning, the Committee on Rules reported a rule that specifically denied the Markey-Sandlin-Stenholm amendment the right to be considered on the floor. Thus, the Republican majority on the Committee on Rules and the Republican leadership in the House have chosen to raid the Medicare Trust Fund instead of acting in a fiscally responsible and prudent manner that would allow these tax breaks to be paid for.

Mr. Speaker, the administration of George W. Bush, ably assisted by the Republican majority in this House, is making the exact same mistakes as those made by the first Bush administration. The current Bush administration, just like the last one, is hopelessly addicted to deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of conscientious conservatives on the Republican side of the aisle who do not

like deficit spending any more than the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) and a host of other Democratic Members. Let us hope that today the real fiscal conservatives on the Republican side of this Chamber will stand up to their credit card-wielding leadership and vote to reject this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me rise in support of the rule and acknowledge that the Committee on Rules had an awesome task, with as many as 140 requests for amendments on this very comprehensive energy package; and I will acknowledge that the Committee on Rules has literally made in order the most important debates that occurred in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and which obviously still concern many Members in terms of how this bill will eventually be resolved.

For example, the bill makes in order the contentious debate over CAFE standards. The base bill which we produced contains a remarkable compromise moving forward CAFE standards on SUVs and minivans, but others want to go a lot further. But that amendment will be in order, and we will debate it on the floor.

We will have a very good debate over the question of oxygenates and whether or not oxygenate standards ought to be waived for California. That was a great debate in the committee. It was settled against that amendment, but we will have that debate again on the floor.

There was another contentious debate over price caps, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) will have an opportunity to renew that debate on the floor.

We will have a debate on ANWR, which was voted on in the Committee on Resources by a very large vote in support of that proposition, but we will again debate that proposition on the floor.

The Committee on Rules has made most of the really contentious issues in order for debate here today. In addition, many of the amendments that were suggested have been incorporated in the manager's amendment, which I will offer, if this rule is adopted, as the first item of business.

We have also, in the rule, set the stage for debate on what is the first comprehensive energy package produced by four of our major committees since the Jimmy Carter years, an en-

ergy package that deals with all the elements of our energy equation and literally responds to the extraordinary and building crisis in energy in our country that was exhibited last winter when natural gas fuel bills in the Midwest went up 73 percent. They went up 27 percent in the Northeast when gasoline prices shot up 40 cents, 50 cents, in some places 70 cents a gallon this summer, the beginning, if you will, elements of a crisis building in this country's imbalance between supply and demand.

This comprehensive package, with its permanent solutions and short-term solutions, is going to be a major step forward in our time for making sure America's energy future is safe and stabilized for the good of our citizens. Affordable, reliable, dependable energy for the future is what it is all about.

One of the contentious issues in this bill has to do with the nuclear energy issue. There are outstanding issues we have not yet dealt with, such as electric restructuring, which will come in a separate package.

But in the nuclear area, there is something on the nuclear waste trust fund. In the bill, we attempted to take that trust fund off-budget. It will not be off-budget. We will not accomplish that in this rule and in this bill because of a self-executed amendment that has been adopted to the rule by my friend, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for yielding to me.

Section 301 of the bill attempts to take that nuclear waste fund off-budget. I want to express my strong support for the rule and the provision which strikes section 301 of H.R. 4.

As the chairman has stated, the Nation has been demanding a national energy policy, and has been for some time. This bill now provides the leadership for that energy policy. We know the previous administration did not have the political will to take on this issue, leaving the current administration with no choice but to act.

President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, as well as this Congress, deserve great praise for doing what is necessary to meet today's and tomorrow's energy needs. This administration has engaged the American public in this important issue, and I am proud today that the House will finally debate America's energy needs.

Section 301 presents a misguided effort to take the nuclear waste fund off-budget, and I must warn the Members that such action would be irrational and fiscally irresponsible. Taking the nuclear waste fund off-budget will undoubtedly diminish Congress's strong

oversight responsibilities over Federal spending.

Further, by taking the nuclear waste fund off-budget, we place the overall budget of this Nation at risk.

If section 301 were allowed to stay, it would allow the Department of Energy to construct and facilitate a permanent high-level nuclear waste dump at Yucca Mountain without the strict oversight that Congress has demanded and that good oversight deserves.

This debate concerning the safe, permanent storage of high-level nuclear waste is as controversial an issue as any other facing this Nation. Removing the nuclear waste fund from the strictest, most ardent congressional oversight would only escalate the controversy surrounding this issue.

Therefore, I strongly support this rule that will take this poison pill out of H.R. 4. By striking 301 from this otherwise good piece of legislation, we will maintain congressional oversight and fiscal responsibility for the taxpayers and the ratepayers of this Nation.

I want to thank again the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN) for his leadership on this issue, and I want to thank the Committee on Rules for allowing this self-executing portion to take place.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. BARTON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding to me.

I am going to support the rule, but I am very opposed to the self-executing portion of the rule that takes the nuclear waste fund and puts it back on-budget.

We passed the nuclear waste fund to take it off-budget, both in the last Congress and again in this Congress in the subcommittee and in the full committee. That fund has \$10 billion in it at the current time, and it is adding about \$800 million per year. Because of a budget amendment enacted several years ago, only \$400 million is available for the fund to be dispersed.

We need access to every penny of the \$10 billion if we are going to build and operate a nuclear waste repository in the near future. I am disappointed the rule eliminates the provision that would take the waste fund off-budget. I hope later in this Congress we can put it back on budget.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank my friend. I want to assure the gentleman that I agree that we need to address this issue very quickly in the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the fall, and I will be assisting him in every way possible to get this off-budget, because we need an energy future dependent upon nuclear energy in the future. I will work with him to accomplish that goal.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We are going to address this issue again in the very near future.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. In my opinion, it represents a gag order on this body's ability to consider H.R. 4 by severely limiting the ability of Members to offer amendments.

For instance, I submitted an amendment, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), to strike the OCS leasing royalty relief provisions from this bill: up to \$7 billion in giveaways at the American taxpayers' expense to oil companies, who do not need any relief whatsoever.

I guess one reason the majority leadership waited until August 1 to bring this bill up was so they could not be accused of giving Christmas to the oil companies in July.

But anyway, this rule does not make that amendment in order. It says that the interests of the American taxpayer in this legislation are not germane and are out of order.

I submitted an amendment to strike the Federal coal leasing giveaway provisions of this bill, provisions not considered by any committee, provisions that would give rise to rank speculation in Federal coal leasing, provisions that would harm consumers and cost coal miners their jobs. This rule does not make that amendment in order. It says that the interests of consumers and coal miners in this bill are non-germane and out of order.

I submitted an amendment to substitute the Committee on Resources provision in H.R. 4 with a more balanced approach. This amendment incorporated concepts of energy development, empowerment and endowment. Yes, we do have an alternative on our side of the aisle. It would have produced real BTUs for the countries while protecting our environment, reclaiming abandoned mines, and providing Native Americans with the tools they need to achieve energy self-sufficiency.

This rule does not make that amendment in order. It says that the interests of Native Americans are non-germane and out of order, and the interests of coal field communities are non-germane and out of order, according to this rule.

The concept of a balanced energy policy is non-germane and out of order, also, according to this rule. I joined our colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) in submitting an amendment to strike from this bill a provision that has absolutely nothing to do with energy security. It would simply give the railroads a tax break. Rail labor is strongly opposed to this provision. This rule

does not make that amendment in order.

I ask for unanimous opposition to the rule. Fortunately, we do have another body that will consider this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is really a good rule. This allows for the debate over several issues that are crucial to a successful, long-term and comprehensive energy policy. It gives everyone a fair shot at their amendment and an up-or-down vote on most of these issues.

The Committee on Rules has done a great job to ensure that these important issues are explored in a comprehensive and fair manner. I am very pleased that the committee has taken to heart the suggestion made by the House Democratic leader that was made to the Speaker and the head of the Democratic Caucus. The Democratic leadership asked in a letter for a structured rule that gives the minority an opportunity to have separate votes on several items important to them.

One of these issues is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources, that being oil and gas leasing on the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. An amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) on this high-profile and very emotional issue has been ruled in order by the committee. I am comfortable with that. It will be a close vote, but I hope the Members will vote responsibly and defeat that amendment.

The rule allows us the opportunity to honestly debate the issue of developing a long-term domestic energy source in an environmentally fair and safe way. The Committee on Rules has crafted a rule that allows us to consider this critical legislation initiative while avoiding nitpicking and amendments designed merely to delay the President's and the Republican leadership's response to the national energy problem.

For the most part, the SAFE Act has been vetted through the committee process. The Committee on Resources spent countless hours and numerous hearings addressing the various provisions in our section of the bill.

The issue of wisely tapping the vast resources of our Federal lands has been discussed for many years. These are not new issues. We have debated long enough. It is time for action. Let us have a civil and a spirited debate. I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule this morning because the Committee on Rules did not see fit to allow the Democratic minority to pay for this bill.

What do we mean by that? We mean that the cost of this bill is \$33 billion over the next 10-year period. Under normal circumstances, if we did not have the dramatic tax cut that the people did not call for but the Republicans did, this would not have been a problem.

But I can tell the Members that when we had a similar situation in trying to get the money to pay for the charitable contribution bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), was kind enough to provide the committee with a letter of comfort saying that in the budget there was \$500 billion that was there as a contingency fund, some politicians call it, a slush fund, but the proper name is a contingency fund.

That meant that, in cases of emergency, one could go to the contingency fund to get the money, and the first to get there is the first that gets the money. It is almost like having a bank account, where you make a \$500 billion deposit, but then you start writing checks on that account. I am telling the Members what we are talking about is a budgetary train wreck that the Republicans are driving us to, and each and every week we will be getting closer to that disaster.

□ 1100

I wish we could see some of the good old days, when Republicans got in the well and said how much they hated Social Security, said how much they hated Medicare, said how much they hated the Federal Government getting involved in education. But they do not do it that way anymore. They are more sophisticated. They say there is no real money at all in the Social Security Trust Fund and that we may have to move into the Medicare Trust Fund. In other words, the way they kill legislation is no longer by voting against it, it is by saying we do not have the money for it, unless of course they have the political courage to increase taxes to pay for it, and we know that is not going to happen in the next 4 years.

So what I am suggesting is this: if my colleagues will not let us actually pay for it, let us see how many checks they intend to write on this \$500 billion deposit that they have made in the Federal account, the \$300 billion for Medicare prescription drugs and the \$134 billion promised to the Secretary of Defense. In other words, to get after Social Security and Medicare they do not even mind holding it hostage on national defense. The \$200 billion to \$300 billion defense modernization is no longer a priority. The list goes on and on and I have not even started.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY).

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, we Republicans certainly welcome the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and his colleagues to the cause of fiscal discipline. We did not see such rhetoric when we were spending the Social Security surplus when they were in control of the Congress. But now that we want to cut taxes for the American people, now that we want to have a sound energy policy, they are concerned.

We welcome their concern and, in fact, we share their goal. But the fact is that at this point the Congress has not spent or cut taxes to the extent that we encroach upon the surpluses provided by the Social Security Trust Fund or the Medicare Trust Fund. We do not know what the picture will look like at the end of the year.

The responsible thing for this House to do today is to pass this energy bill, which provides this country a sound energy policy for the future, and then as we get toward the end of the year, we see what the fiscal picture looks like, we can put it all together. But do not hold up this bill in the cause of fiscal discipline. Today, let us pass this bill and this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The Republican majority calls this bill the SAFE Act, the Securing America's Future Energy, SAFE, Act. What it does, though, it allows drilling in the Arctic wilderness; it does not really do anything on fuel economy standards in automobiles, which is where we put two-thirds of all oil, into gasoline tanks, and the tax credits are for the biggest oil companies.

Right now this bill should be called UNSAFE, Unkind to nature, Sacrificing the Arctic, Freebies for Energy. UNSAFE.

Now, how was this bill put together? Well, it was put together in four committees, largely along party-line votes. The bill contains many provisions that were added to the bill after the committees finished with it, with no notice or consultation with the minority, with the Democrats, and it strips or guts other provisions of the bill that Members on this side of the aisle had succeeded in adding during the committee markups that would have been fairer to the environment and to consumers and to taxpayers. All that Members on this side of the aisle are looking for is a fair opportunity to put through to the American people a set of alternatives that all Members of Congress would have the opportunity to have voted upon. This rule does not make that possible.

I will provide a highlight of this bill. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

SANDLIN), the leaders of the Blue Dogs, put together an amendment, with me and other Members on our side, that took the \$34 billion that the Republicans are going to hand over to the largest energy companies in America, taking that money for that out of the Medicare Trust Fund from our senior citizens and create an alternative, and we would spend the same \$34 billion but we would put more of it into renewables, more of it into conservation, more of it into energy efficiency, and fund significant tax breaks for the smaller oil and gas companies across this country. And we would pay for it by increasing by a very small amount, or not increasing, actually, just not allowing to finally go through this huge tax break for the upper 1 percentile in America. And we would not even take back the whole thing, just enough to pay for this tax break for the oil and gas industry that is built into this bill.

They will not even allow us to make that amendment. This is a centrist amendment, a balanced amendment; but it is a gag rule that does not allow us even to debate it. Now, that is wrong.

And the reason they will not allow that amendment to be put in place is they know it would win, because the American people do not want to raid the Medicare Trust Fund and the Social Security Trust Fund to give tax breaks for the wealthiest energy companies in our country. Vote "no" on this rule. It is unbalanced, it is unfair, it is bad for the environment, it is bad for consumers, it is bad for taxpayers, and it is bad for our country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I really had not planned on speaking on the rule, but when we have finally reached the point of every Democratic Member coming in the well and simply misrepresenting what this bill is in such a gross way, I do think we need to put a little balance into it.

The single biggest portion of the tax area is in reliability. The second largest is conservation. There are a number of renewable requirements for solar and for biomass. There are a number of provisions for individuals to get tax credits on their major appliances, on their homes, major tax credits for fuel cell cars, up to \$40,000.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is probably not wanting to listen to this because he said \$34 billion went to major oil companies. The fact of the matter is that is not true. Half of it does not go, a quarter of it does not go, 10 percent of it does not go. But it does not make nearly as good a pitch as saying this tax credit goes to big oil and it comes out of Medicare. That is not true, but the truth is not a good story.

The truth is that on a bipartisan basis we are going to conserve, we are going to make our energy source more reliable, and we are going to produce a little bit more. That is a really good mix.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule.

Today the House takes up legislation that will affect our country's energy policy for years to come. A critical component of the plan is the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, a program which has provided essential heating and cooling assistance to our most vulnerable populations for a quarter of a century; yet this bill attempts to dismantle the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program. It requires the program to do a study to determine whether or not its recipients are conserving energy and engaging in energy-efficiency investments.

They make a false claim here. It also ignores the fact that nearly 80 percent of the LIHEAP recipients who receive heating assistance earn less than the poverty level. I might tell my colleagues that this is from an administration that does not give a hoot about conservation.

I offered an amendment to strike this language. It was not allowed. As a matter of fact, the Democratic alternative was not allowed.

This bill provides billions of dollars in tax credits and royalties to the oil and gas industry, and yet what it would do would be to begin to dismantle the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program. It is wrong. Oppose this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, which will allow a fair and open debate on many of the key elements of the bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and his staff for working so closely with all of us who contributed to this bill to ensure that the rule would allow for a manageable, yet thorough, debate. I might add that is a tribute to the leadership of the Speaker.

I want to draw attention at this point to two key amendments that have been made in order, the Boehlert-Markey amendment on CAFE standards and the Markey-Johnson amendment on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR. I think everyone agrees that these will be the two most critical votes today; and this rule, sensibly, allows 40 minutes of debate on each of them, on top of over 2 hours of general debate and an additional 40

minutes of debate on related Arctic amendments. So these issues will be adequately heard.

That is essential, because these two amendments, raising CAFE standards and continuing the ban on drilling in ANWR, these two amendments must pass if H.R. 4 is to be a truly balanced bill. As of now, H.R. 4 is skewed far too heavily toward production, much more so than was in the President's original plan.

The bill includes new subsidies and regulatory relief for the oil, gas, and coal industries without requiring any commensurate improvement on environmental performance. No one doubts that we need to increase our energy supply, but these subsidies go beyond what is necessary to do.

Still, I could support these provisions of H.R. 4 if they were part of an overall plan that was balanced, that ensured that we were doing all that we could to conserve energy and protect the environment. That is the approach we took in the Committee on Science when we unanimously passed the provisions that now make up division B of the bill, a section of the bill that gives great emphasis to conservation and renewable energy while continuing support for research on oil and gas and coal and nuclear energy. For the rest of the bill to reflect that kind of balance, we must raise CAFE standards and prevent drilling in ANWR.

We will get into the details of these later in the day, but let me just point out that transportation accounts for two-thirds of our Nation's oil consumption; yet despite our technological expertise, despite the fact that American industry is far more energy efficient than it was 20 years ago, despite studies showing that we can significantly improve fuel economy, the fuel economy of our Nation's passenger vehicles has dropped over the past generation.

We simply should not, as human beings, be trampling on some of the last pristine places on earth, making irreversible changes to our planet's landscape, when we refuse to take the simplest, most feasible, most responsible steps to reduce our use of fossil fuels, steps that could reduce our dependence on foreign oil and improve the environment without cramping our life-style one little bit.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of disappointment that I come to the floor today opposing the rule and opposing a fiscally irresponsible bill. I did not want to be here.

I have been very supportive of the work my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), has done in the areas of energy. But I have been here for 22 years, and I remember when this body used to act like a legislative

body. I remember the last time we debated a national energy policy it took weeks, not one day. I remember when we used to allow those who had a difference of opinion an opportunity to come to the floor on their issues and to vote on those issues and let the will of the House, not the will of the leadership, make the determination.

We continue day after day after day to have rules coming out of the Committee on Rules that do not allow those who have a different opinion to bring their ideas to the floor of the House. We had a Democratic alternative. It was put together by the Blue Dogs, and it was then run through our caucus, in which we got not unanimous opinion but we got enough agreement that we wanted to bring it to the floor and perfect the work of the majority; but more significantly, we wanted to pay for it.

To my colleagues in this House on both sides of the aisle who vote for this rule and for this bill, they will be voting to take additional money out of Social Security, which we have said time and time again we are not going to do. Now, my colleague is shaking his head back there now saying that is not true; wait until September when the new estimates are in; wait until we get the letter from the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) saying we are going to have to cut spending, we are going to have to defense more than we are already cutting defense.

□ 1115

There is not enough money left in the budget to take care of the needed defense.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MCCRERY. The gentleman does not mean to imply that we are spending Social Security money?

Mr. STENHOLM. I certainly do.

Mr. MCCRERY. The gentleman knows that we are not. The gentleman, I think, means that we are spending some of the surplus attributable to the Social Security payroll tax, and we are not even doing that.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time because the gentleman has misspoken what I intend to say.

Look me straight in the eye: I believe we are doing that.

Mr. Speaker, what we should have done in this body, we should have started with the reform of the Social Security system first before we had a \$1.350 trillion tax cut which is expanded to \$2 trillion. The gentleman sits on the Committee on Ways and Means. He knows that we are going to have to face some tough choices.

We are not doing that when we continue to tell the people we are going to eat dessert before we eat spinach. There is much in the bill that I support, but the leadership of this House is

misleading the American people when they say we can pass this energy bill today and have additional tax cuts that do not come out of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds; and it will take until next month and next year until I am proven right.

The gentleman will soon find that I am right.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my friend from Texas. Does the gentleman realize that repeatedly yesterday and up to midnight last night, we said if there were modifications in what the Blue Dogs had put together and made it a substitute, we would have made it in order; and that was never given? Does the gentleman realize that request was made?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, all we were asking was that it be pay-for. Did the gentleman allow pay-fors in this bill?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. We made the offer that had the other side put it in a different form, we would have made it in order. The gentleman would have had the content. Is the gentleman aware of that?

Mr. STENHOLM. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I was not personally aware of that. Nobody ever called me.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. That request was made up to midnight last night.

Mr. FROST. Will the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has his own time. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) a question.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington is asking the gentleman from Texas about actions by the Democrats on the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has the time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. It does not have everything I want in it. We took the nuclear trust fund off budget in the Energy and Commerce bill, and this bill has a portion that disallows that. I did not get everything that I want.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that over 100 amendments were offered to the Committee on Rules, and either in the manager's amendment or amendments that are going to be debated on the floor,

that 28 of those amendments have been incorporated in some fashion.

The Republican leadership is not ducking any of the tough issues. We are going to have an amendment to strike ANWR, the drilling provision up in Alaska. We are going to have an amendment to increase the CAFE standards, which is very controversial. We are going to have several California-specific amendments on price caps and oxygenated fuel.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very fair rule. We are going to let the House work its will. I hope when it comes to final passage that a majority will vote for this bill.

Three of the four committees reported their portions of the bill on a bipartisan basis. In the Committee on Science and Technology, it was a voice vote by unanimous consent. In the Committee on Energy and Commerce, it was a 50-5 vote. In the Committee on Resources, it was about a 3-to-2 vote in favor of supporting the bill. Only in the Committee on Ways and Means was it a partisan vote. That came out on a partisan vote, unfortunately.

This is not the only energy package that is going to be on the floor, it is just the first energy package. I plan to put together an electricity restructuring bill, a nuclear waste bill, a pipeline safety bill, a Price-Anderson nuclear insurance indemnification bill, and bring those to the floor this fall or early next spring. I am sure that the other committees with jurisdiction are going to do similar things.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair bill. Energy is the lifeblood of our country. We need to do something on the demand-and-supply side. There will be a number of amendments that may move it one way or the other. I hope that we have a fair debate, and I hope that we vote for the rule and final passage.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington made a misstatement. I do not think that it was intentional on his part.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats on the Committee on Rules made it very clear to the Republicans on the Committee on Rules that we had a large package of amendments. It was not a substitute because everybody agreed from the beginning that there would be separate votes on ANWR and separate votes on CAFE. So we never were going to offer a substitute. We were going to offer a major package of amendments put forward by the Blue Dogs with pay-fors in it.

The Republicans never intended to give the Blue Dogs their package of amendments. They knew there would not be a total substitute because there had to be a separate vote on CAFE and ANWR.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am releasing today an important report. It is titled Hitting the Jackpot: How the House Energy Bill (H.R. 4) Rewards Millions in Contributions with Billions in Returns.

Mr. Speaker, what this report indicates is that the cumulative value of campaign contributions from coal, oil, gas, nuclear and electric utility industries in the 2000 election cycle was \$69.5 million. The cumulative value of the tax breaks and subsidies for these industries in this energy bill comes to \$36.4 billion. If campaign contributions are viewed as a form of investment in the legislative process, the rate of return on this investment is an astounding 52,200 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the majority sets the agenda, and they set an agenda that gave away \$2 trillion in tax cuts earlier this year. They are now going to give away \$36 billion in tax breaks and subsidies to the energy special interests.

We have a rule before us that will not provide for an opportunity to move to strike these provisions. The American people ought to understand that this is not a balanced bill. This is a special interest bill. It appears to include rewards for the campaign contributions from the energy industry. Boy, are they getting a good return on their money.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following report.

Hitting the Jackpot: How the House Energy Bill (H.R. 4) Rewards Millions in Contributions with Billions in Returns

(Prepared for Rep. Henry A. Waxman, Minority Staff, Special Investigations Division, Committee on Government Reform)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report which was prepared at the request of Rep. Henry A. Waxman, compares contributions from the energy industry to provisions in H.R. 4, the energy bill sponsored by the Republican leadership of the U.S. House of Representatives. The report finds that energy interests that gave millions of dollars in campaign contributions during the last election cycle will receive billions of dollars in tax breaks and subsidies under the legislation.

The cumulative value of the campaign contributions of the coal, oil and gas, nuclear, and electric utility industries in the 2000 election cycle was \$69.5 million; the cumulative value of the tax breaks and subsidies for these industries in H.R. 4 is \$36.4 billion. If the campaign contributions are viewed as a form of "investment" in the legislative process, the "rate of return" on this investment is an astounding 52,200%. Table 1 shows how much key energy industry sectors contributed to federal campaigns and how much they stand to benefit from H.R. 4.

To put this in perspective, the total \$36.4 billion cost of the tax breaks and subsidies in H.R. 4 is equivalent to the federal taxes paid by 9,764,169 typical households in 1998.

TABLE 1.—ENERGY INTERESTS' RETURNS ON INVESTMENT IN H.R. 4

Industry	Total contributions, 1999-2000	Total industry benefits in H.R. 4	Return on investment (percent)
Coal	\$3,800,000	\$5,844,000,000	153,700
Oil and gas	33,300,000	21,980,000,000	65,900
Electric utilities	18,600,000	5,862,000,000	31,400
Nuclear	13,800,000	2,666,000,000	19,200
Totals	69,500,000	36,352,000,000	52,200

I. The coal industry's contributions and returns

The coal mining industry gave \$3.8 million in the 2000 election cycle, of which 88% went to Republicans.

Authorizations in H.R. 4 would give the coal industry \$1.1 billion in direct subsidies over the next three years, plus an additional \$1.4 billion over the following seven years. These subsidies include grants for research and development and commercial applications of technologies for coal-fired electricity generation. In addition, the bill provides tax credits for coal-fired power generation worth an estimated \$3.3 billion over ten years. These tax credits subsidize both investment in coal-fired generation technologies and production of electricity from coal-fired generation. In total, this amounts to \$5.8 billion in federal funding for coal-fired power generation over the next ten years.

The bill also has many special breaks for the coal industry. For example, it would require the government, not industry, to pay the costs for industry applications to mine coal on federal lands. It would also loosen planning requirements to address environmental damage from coal mining operations.

II. The oil and gas industry's contributions and returns

The oil and gas industry gave \$33.3 million in the 2000 election cycle, of which 78% went to Republicans.

The largest tax breaks in H.R. 4 apply to oil and gas production. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, these tax breaks are worth \$12.8 billion over the next ten years. There are at least eleven separate provisions allowing oil and gas producers to reduce their tax payments. For example, the bill would allow oil and gas producers to accelerate depreciation, carry losses back for five years, avoid otherwise applicable alternative minimum tax requirements, and expense various costs.

H.R. 4 further subsidize the industry by suspending royalties for oil and gas lease sales, which is estimated to cost taxpayers around \$7.4 billion. H.R. 4 also requires the Interior Department to reduce royalty rates for "marginal" oil and gas wells, which are defined so generously as to cover most on-shore wells. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), this provision would cost \$491 million in lost royalties, based on conservative assumptions. The bill provides an additional \$900 million for research and development and demonstration grants for technologies for ultra-deepwater mining. And the bill would require the federal government to reimburse the industry for spending on required environmental analysis. The CBO estimates that this could cost \$350 million in forgone royalties over a ten-year period.

In total, these tax breaks and other subsidies for the oil and gas industry amount to \$22.0 billion over the next ten years.

In addition to these direct monetary subsidies, the bill would weaken or eliminate environmental protections for federal lands to facilitate oil and gas development. H.R. 4

would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) for drilling, a key oil company objective. The bill also waives environmental protections that would otherwise apply to drilling in ANWR. H.R. 4 seriously weakens environmental protections for leasing and drilling on other federal lands as well. For example, the Forest Service will no longer be allowed to stipulate environmental protections in leases for drilling on National Forest lands if the state has not made such stipulations. And federal land management agencies would be largely unable to reject lease offers for drilling on public lands.

H.R. 4 gives the oil and gas industry numerous other benefits as well. The bill would allow the Interior Department to accept royalties in kind (in barrels of oil or units of gas) from leasing federal lands. In the past, the federal government has lost money in converting in-kind oil and gas royalties to revenues. The bill also requires the Department to reimburse the industry for any transportation and processing costs associated with the in-kind royalty payments. The bill authorizes up to 7.5% of total federal income from oil and gas leases from fiscal years 2002-2009 to be used to fund ultra-deep-water research and demonstration projects, potentially diverting substantial funds from other spending priorities. In addition, the bill requires EPA to conduct several rulemakings to consider relaxing regulations that affect the refining industry. It also sets up an interagency task force to expedite permitting of natural gas pipelines.

Highly specific provisions appear to benefit particular companies. For example, one provision would allow the Secretary of Interior to suspend the term of existing subsalt leases, which would benefit Houston-based Anadarko Petroleum Corporation. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, Anadarko contributed \$448,529 during the 2000 election cycle, of which 98% was to Republicans. Anadarko also reportedly has connections to Vice President Dick Cheney and his wife.

The tax breaks and subsidies to the oil and gas industry are not justified by economic hardships in the industry. The oil and gas industry has been particularly profitable in recent years. Three major oil and gas companies alone made \$309.1 billion in revenues in 2000, which translated to \$25.3 billion in profits. A recent front page story in the Wall Street Journal describes a "big problem" faced by the oil and gas industry—the companies are "sitting on nearly \$40 billion in cash" that they are struggling to invest.

III. Electric utilities' contributions and returns

Electric utilities gave \$18.6 million in the 2000 election cycle, of which 67% went to Republicans.

Electric utilities would receive several specific tax breaks under H.R. 4, as well as benefiting from many of the subsidies and tax breaks identified in this report for the coal, oil and gas, and nuclear industries. For example, changes to tax laws governing bond issuance would help utilities finance electricity production and cost the Treasury \$2.5 billion over ten years. Other provisions relating to sales of electricity transmission lines would cost \$2.9 billion over the next five years. These provisions would change the tax treatment of utilities' sales of transmission properties under electricity restructuring policies. Special rules for electric cooperatives would cost \$179 million over ten years. And a particular tax exemption for governmental utilities purchasing natural gas would cost \$827 million over ten years. In total, this amounts to \$5.9 billion for electric utilities over ten years.

IV. The nuclear industry's contributions and returns

The nuclear industry gave more than \$13.8 million to federal candidates and committees in the 2000 election cycle, of which more than two-thirds went to Republicans.

H.R. 4 gives tax breaks for nuclear power worth \$1.9 billion over the next ten years. It also provides numerous subsidies for nuclear energy, totaling over \$633 million over the next three years, and over \$100 million more in later years. These provisions would subsidize research and demonstration projects in areas such as uranium mining (through in situ leaching), uranium conversion operations, fuel recycling, plant optimization, and nuclear technologies. In total, H.R. 4 provides almost \$1 billion for nuclear power in the next three years alone, and \$2.7 billion over the next ten years.

The bill also moves the nuclear waste fund off-budget, which the nuclear industry strongly supports.

V. Auto manufacturers' contributions and returns

The automotive manufacturing industry gave \$2.2 million in the 2000 election cycle, of which 69% went to Republicans

The most significant aspects of H.R. 4 regarding motor vehicles is what the bill does not do. In the face of national concern over gas prices and our dependence on oil imports, H.R. 4 does not require any meaningful improvement in motor vehicle fuel efficiency, which is regulated under the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards. The bill contains a requirement to reduce the amount of gasoline that SUVs and trucks would otherwise use over a six-year period by five billion gallons. Although this figure sounds impressive, it represents only 0.2% of projected petroleum consumption. Moreover, the provision appears to weaken existing requirements for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to mandate more stringent reductions. When coupled with the bill's extension of a loophole for vehicles that could be run on ethanol (but almost never are), H.R. 4 will reduce overall motor vehicle fuel economy.

The bill provides numerous other breaks for the auto manufacturers. For example, several provisions to increase use of alternative fuels over dual-fuel vehicles, rather than just dedicated alternative fuel vehicles. This helps auto manufacturers exploit the CAFE loopholes for vehicles that can use alternative fuels, but do not do so. These provisions include an exemption allowing dual fuel vehicles to use HOV lands and federal fleet acquisition requirements.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to look at the bill from a different perspective. British-owned BP Amoco has 14,000 outlets in America; Motiva Enterprises, owned by a Dutch company has 14,000 outlets in America; Citgo, owned by a Venezuelan company has 14,000 outlets in America. FINA, a French company, has 2,500 outlets in America. Beam me up. All that is left in America is Budweiser flatulence at a Dodger's game.

Mr. Speaker, this sellout of America is ridiculous, and I believe America will continue to depend on foreign petroleum until we maximize our own resources. Having said that, I want to

commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the Republican Party because in the 1970s, there were long lines. The Democrats were in control, and we are now debating it in 2001. Evidently they did nothing, nothing but reward monarchs and dictators.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for putting my Buy American amendment in the manager's bill, and I urge Congress to pass my oil shale, oil trapped in shale rock amendment.

There is enough oil trapped in shale rock in America to fuel America for 300 years without another drop of fuel from anybody. Yes, it will cost a little more per barrel now, at first; but it will create jobs, tax revenues, reduce our dependency on foreign oil, make America free, get us out from under dictators and monarchs that have been rewarded by a do-nothing Congress in the 1970s.

I support this bill. No bill is perfect. This is the way to start, and I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the committee, for bringing us this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see a New Yorker in the Speaker's chair.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. Day in and day out we have been debating appropriations bills, and we debate them for days on end. Here we have a bill dealing with energy policy, and amendments are denied, and we are doing this in less than one day.

Mr. Speaker, I submitted three amendments to the Committee on Rules, all of which were denied. Our governor in New York, Governor Pataki, has put into effect a "green energy" mandate for New York State which would say that 10 percent of the agency's energy consumption comes from renewable energy by 2010 and 20 percent by 2020.

That would be State agencies' energy consumption. I propose to do that for the Federal Government. We should be taking the lead in Federal policy, and the Committee on Rules denied my amendment which would mirror Governor Pataki's New York "green energy" mandate.

I also had an amendment to have cool roofing, because in urban areas, heat is trapped on the top floor when roofs are dark; and that was denied. I am a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and that amendment passed the committee and was part and parcel of the bill. And I want to say that I voted for the committee bill, and if that had been here, I would probably vote for the rule; but the rule denied it.

Finally, a demonstration project providing for a Federal match for replacing transmission lines with super-

conductive transmission lines saving energy losses.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this rule is fair. I think it denies too many amendments, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources of the Committee on Resources, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. This is a missed opportunity today.

The American people wanted us to work in a bipartisan fashion and develop a long-term, comprehensive and balanced energy policy. This underlying bill does not get us there. The underlying rule that we are debating now does not get us there.

While the rule does make important amendments in order, a discussion whether we should drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, whether we should increase fuel efficiency standards for our cars and trucks, it also denies an amendment that I offered with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that would strike the oil royalty give-back program contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many of my colleagues had a chance to see the Wall Street Journal article last Tuesday that talked about the hoards of cash that the oil industry is sitting on, over \$40 billion of excess cash reserves. They are swimming in it, and we are about to pass legislation that will give a multi-billion dollar royalty kickback for them to drill on the OCS. This is money that would be used to fund the Land and Water Conservation program for conservation programs and national park enhancement in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a balanced bill. It is not a balanced rule, and I urge "no" on both.

□ 1130

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN).

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, the word of the day today is disappointment. Let me ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, what are you afraid of? Once again in the middle of the night, the Republican leadership has produced a rule that blocks numerous Democratic amendments, it blocks discussion, it blocks debate, it blocks a balanced energy plan; and contrary to the representations made on the floor this morning, no Blue Dog perfecting amendment was offered to be in order. No Blue Dog amendment was to be

voted on. No Blue Dog amendment is part of our decision this morning. It blocks an alternative for our perfecting amendment, and that is just not fair.

In 1992, the last time Congress considered comprehensive energy legislation, we talked about it for days and for weeks. Congress was given the parameters of this debate only this morning. Now within a few hours we are expected to vote on a national energy policy affecting this country for decades to come. That shows a lack of leadership. It is very disappointing.

The Democratic perfecting amendment includes a balanced, forward-looking energy policy for the country. It includes tax incentives for increased production of domestic, natural gas and oil production by our small, independent producers. It provides access to capital for refining capacity and natural gas distribution. It facilitates construction of the Alaska natural gas pipeline.

But our plan is balanced. It does more:

It requires the Federal Government to buy more energy-efficient central air conditioners;

It strengthens the household appliance standby power efficiency standards;

It directs the DOE to reinstate central air conditioning and heat pump efficiency standards issued by the last administration;

It fully funds research and development of clean coal technology, not a game of bait and switch;

It funds renewable energy at twice the rates of the Republican plan.

Are these good provisions? We think they are. But we will never know because we are not going to debate them because we did not get the opportunity to present amendments. We were shut out from the process, shut out from the debate as the American people have been. I guess the public will never know. Vice President Cheney recently correctly said we cannot conserve our way out of this current problem. But neither can we produce our way out. We have to do both.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for a bill that risks raiding our Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds and fails to provide critical relief to electricity ratepayers in Washington, Oregon, and my State of California.

The amendment my Commerce Committee colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPP), and I had planned to offer would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to stop delaying the refunds owed electricity consumers in the western States. These consumers

have been grossly overcharged. Not even FERC disputes this fact. It has found on several occasions that ratepayers were charged unjust and unreasonable rates. Yet FERC has adopted an investigate-and-delay approach that has blocked even the first penny in refunds. Our amendment would have forced FERC to act finally in 30 days based on two alternative options for calculating refunds.

Mr. Speaker, electricity consumers deserve refunds promptly. This House deserves the opportunity to debate this issue and FERC's unwillingness and inability to act expeditiously. This rule blocks that debate.

I urge rejection of the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. First, this energy bill in my view is about yesterday, not about tomorrow. With its focus on fossil fuels, oil, gasoline and coal, the bill is mired in the Stone Age. When it comes to tax credits for conservation or anything to do with conservation, they are not paid for, so it simply will not happen.

Secondly, the Committee on Rules disallowed a very important amendment that we offered which the gentlewoman from California just described. The FERC has been on a sit-down strike with regard to California's energy crisis. Yet they are responsible for the energy consumer in the country. They acknowledge that the rates that Westerners have paid are unjust and unreasonable; and yet they still side with the gougers, not the consumers. They have left Californians waiting, waiting on interim orders to become final, waiting for FERC to make us whole again, waiting for the FERC to act.

Every day the cash register rings in California out of our general fund up to \$50 million a day to pay for electricity. As the fifth largest economy in the world, this administration and this House I think is going to regret this bill, because it does not speak to California and it does not speak to the future of our Nation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the debate, I will urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment that makes in order the Markey-Sandlin-Stenholm amendment.

This amendment is balanced. It pays for the tax cuts in the underlying bill by paring back the recently enacted tax cut in the top bracket for the richest Americans. Half of the tax credits in the Markey-Sandlin-Stenholm amendment would go to renewables and energy efficiency, but only 17 percent of the Republicans' bill goes to such programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask Members to vote against this unfair rule which stifles debate and in our view undermines our energy future and undermines our economic future and the future of Medicare and Social Security.

All we asked for was an amendment to deal with the glaring flaws in this bill, for an effort to make the bill better and stronger, more fiscally responsible. All we wanted was an hour. One hour, 60 minutes, is all we asked the Committee on Rules for to put out an alternative vision on energy policy to the American people. That hour request was refused.

This in my view suppresses a free and fair dialogue in this House of what one of our most important policies should be. We have been shut out and shut down, I guess because somebody was worried we might win the amendment.

What was the amendment? We think it is an amendment for a balanced energy policy. We believe in more production. We believe in more oil and natural gas for the American people. We believe, however, that there should be balance. We need renewables, we need solar, we need wind energy, we need incentives for people to buy more energy-efficient cars.

I come from a part of the country where we make a lot of cars. If we are going to talk about increasing efficiency standards, we have got to help the auto companies be able to have demand for the automobiles that increase efficiency. Those kinds of provisions are not in this bill. We wanted to add them to the bill. We get no right to do that. The minority asked for one thing to be put in the bill, this series of amendments that we think brings balance to the bill, and we are shut out.

There is another thing we wanted to do in the bill, and that is pay for it. We have been saying for 6 months that the fiscal road we are on is going to cause us to go into the Medicare and ultimately the Social Security Trust Funds. We come out here every 6 months and pass another lockbox. It is an illusion. It is a deception. It is all designed for consumption of the public when in fact and in truth if this bill passes today, we will be in the Medicare Trust Fund big time. And we are doing it without even a debate about an alternative.

This is an outrage that we should have a rule like this that cuts off debate on the most important energy debate and the most important fiscal debate that this country will ever have. It is a bad rule. It is unfair. It is wrong that this country cannot have the proper debate that we ought to be having on this floor today. It is a shame that this rule is on the floor.

I urge Members to vote against the rule. Let us get a fair rule that is good for the future of this country.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, for 25 years this country has prohibited the commercial reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. We have prohibited reprocessing because it creates plutonium, and plutonium is the raw material of nuclear bombs. We do not want to proliferate that raw material. This underlying bill reverses that 25-year prohibition and permits what they are calling an advanced fuel recycling technology. That is reprocessing. The Committee on Rules did not make in order an amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that would have permitted a straight vote up or down on whether or not to reverse a 25-year prohibition.

This is a bad rule because of that and because of all the other reasons we have heard this morning, and we should vote "no" on the rule. We do not want to add to the proliferation of nuclear weapons in this country and around the world. This is an issue that goes beyond our own national energy policy and affects our international policy. We are reversing with hardly any notice this 25-year policy. It is wrong. The rule is wrong and should be defeated.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and my remarks are on Indiana Daylight Savings Time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the rule and to deplore the failure to consider an amendment that would make great energy sense for Indiana and for the cities and towns and states that breathe the air emitted by Indiana's smokestacks.

Indiana is mixed up when it comes to time. I offered an amendment to bring the energy-saving benefits of Daylight Saving Time to all of Indiana, repealing the "Indiana amendment" to the Uniform Time Act to help my constituents and other Hoosiers be in better touch with the world, build our economy, save money and improve the nation's air.

Energy savings and uniformity of timekeeping through Daylight Saving Time were the aims of the 1966 law. But, since a change in the early 1970s, much of Indiana has been out of synch with the rest of the world in terms of time and as been denied those benefits.

The USDOT put 10 counties on Central Standard Time and the other 82 on Eastern Standard Time. The 10 counties in the Central Time Zone observe DST—and they wouldn't have it any other way—but the other 82 are not permitted to, though some set their own time.

Confusion and waste are the results. Our businesses with relations elsewhere are out of

touch and out of synch with the larger world, constrained in communication and growth.

A 1975 DOT study, still cited today, concluded that reduced electricity demand in areas affected by Daylight Saving Time could save consumers \$7.5 million, yield reductions in carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide emissions, and help to clear the air in Indiana and to the east and northeast.

And this was a plan that is sensitive to state government: it gives the Indiana General Assembly the last word to: (1) vote to preserve the status quo; (2) vote to repeal the exemption from DST; or, (3) do nothing and exempt the entire state—including the counties in the Central Time Zone—from Daylight Saving Time.

An energy bill that does not avail itself of conservation opportunities like Daylight Saving Time for Indiana, a plan with other benefits, as well, is flawed.

Mr. Speaker, I am not done. Indiana's business, our industry, our employers and our workers deserve this leap forward, want to save energy, and need to be in better touch with the nation and the world.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. This energy bill can be summed up in three words: drill, drill, drill. We have heard a lot of other reasons to be opposed to this rule.

I offered an amendment to help do something about this in the Committee on Rules. It deals specifically with North Carolina and the American people to help protect the fragile natural resources, specifically oil and gas drilling off the North Carolina coast. I would urge my colleagues from North Carolina to vote against this rule because it specifically deals with North Carolina but the rest of the country.

For several weeks we have heard a lot of talk about this. Today we have one of the most important issues we will deal with in this country for a long time. As we have already heard, we are not having time to deal with the specific issues that affect us as a whole and bring it to this body.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would put an end to the question of whether or not the drilling would take place on one of the most fragile, pristine beaches in this country. But the Republican leadership has refused to give us a chance just to debate the issue in the House, have us decide it and have us vote on it.

□ 1145

My State is opposed to it. Tourism, fishing and transportation are important. I urge Members to vote against this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if rhetoric turned turbines, we would have enough electricity for the next 100 years just listening to the Democrats today. But the truth is, we have got to move on. We do not have an energy policy. Let me give you a quote from Clinton's Energy Secretary Bill Richardson: "It is obvious that the Federal Government was not prepared. We were caught napping. We got complacent." February 16 of last year.

I applaud the Bush Administration for taking the brave steps to say we have got to look ahead. We have a neglected energy infrastructure. Think about this: the last refinery for gasoline was built in Garyville, Louisiana, in 1976. We are dependent on foreign oil. Today 57 percent of our oil comes from other countries. Now, compare that to 1973 during the infamous OPEC oil embargo, when only 35 percent of our oil came from foreign countries. Today, it is 57 percent.

Our national security is vulnerable to the whims of foreign nations. Let us look at the demand. Since 1980, the supply has only increased by 18 percent, but the demand has increased by 24 percent. Think about the number of cars that are on the road today. In 1940 we had 5 million cars on the road. Today we have 130 million cars driving. There is a huge increase in demand.

Think about the environmental question. Everybody wants clean air, everybody. I do not know anybody who does not. We are united on that. But the reality is radical environmental politics have become the rule of the land. Today there are 8,000 environmental organizations. It is a \$3.5 billion industry. Greenpeace in Washington, D.C. alone pays \$46,000 a month just in rent. It is a big business. They want to have everybody in America convinced the sky is falling if a bill passes.

But, fortunately, mainstream America sees that there are a lot of solutions out there. We can and we will improve our energy infrastructure. We will continue to promote conservation. This bill alone funds \$940 million in conservation. Think about the new hybrid car that Honda is developing, 68 miles a gallon, and think about the fuel cell technology which the Republicans are pushing so strongly. This is a battery that, in essence, does not give out. Think of all the alternative sources of energy we support in this Congress, and on the Committee on Appropriations, \$440 million will be spent on research and development for hydroelectric power, solar power, wind power, geothermal, and biomass. These are great, positive developments.

And let us be serious about nuclear power, the nuclear energy question. In France, 76 percent of the homes are powered by nuclear energy, in Belgium, 56 percent. In America, already 20 per-

cent is. Yet you listen to some of the rhetoric from my friends, the Democrats, and you would think, oh no, we are getting into some kind of brave new world of nuclear energy. It is not that scary out there. We have the technology to keep up with it.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I think it is a good one. It is responsible. I am glad the Committee on Rules is moving forward.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and urge my colleagues to vote against this unfair rule.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on the rule on H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001. I appreciate the opportunity to share my concerns with one section of H.R. 4 as it stands in its current form.

Section 306 authorizes the appropriation of \$10 million payment, or subsidies, for three years to domestic uranium producers "to identify, test, and develop improved in situ leaching mining technologies, including low-cost environmental restoration technologies."

This legislation is not needed for research and development purposes. In fact, this in-situ leaching process causes radioactive uranium and other toxic chemicals to leach into groundwater, threatening the public health of communities surrounding the mines.

The impact of this legislation could be severe on the Southwest's environment and on the public health of the Native American communities I represent.

Specifically, section 306 of the SAFE Act of 2001 could directly prop up with millions of taxpayer dollars a uranium mining company that proposes in-situ leach uranium mining in the Crownpoint and Church Rock areas of New Mexico.

In the case of the proposed uranium mines in Crownpoint and Church Rock, the mining process would pollute the high-quality aquifer that is the sole source of scarce drinking water for over 10,000 Navajos.

This proposed subsidy for the uranium industry also would lead to unsound fiscal policy. In fact, in addition to a host of environmental and Native American groups—both nationally and in New Mexico—this amendment is supported by the group Taxpayers for Common Sense, which views this as an unfair corporate give-away.

Most importantly to me, however, are the residents in my District in New Mexico. The local Navajo communities have suffered tremendously over this government's past practices and policies regarding uranium mining. My constituents, as well as those in Arizona, Colorado and Utah continue to be negatively affected by the long-term impacts of past uranium development.

We as a nation cannot find the financial resources necessary to fully fund the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, or RECA, to compensate the victims of past uranium development, but we may put our stamp of approval on this \$30 million subsidy for the uranium industry.

I oppose this effort.

It is sadly ironic that just last week we as a Congress paid a long overdue tribute to the contribution that the Navajo Nation made to our country, in the ceremony to grant Congressional Gold Medals to the Navajo Code Talkers of World War II. I was honored to be a part of that effort and shared the stage with President Bush.

However, this week, we are about to ignore them and their pleas for environmental justice again. Section 306 is a slap in the face to the Native Americans in my district that continue to seek justice for the past errors of our energy production policy.

For the record, I'd like to read the organizations that support this effort to amend H.R. 4 and eliminate this uranium industry subsidy.

Eastern Navajo Dine Against Uranium Mining, Southwest Research and Information Center, Physicians Resisting In-Situ Mining, New Mexico Environmental Law Center, U.S. and New Mexico Public Interest Research Groups, Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, Mineral Policy Center, Nuclear Information Resource Service, Public Citizen, and Taxpayers for Common Sense.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, this rule does nothing to bring down the obscenely high prices that we have been paying for electricity in California and the rest of the West Coast for the last year. It does nothing. We are being gouged, and the Republicans refuse to do anything.

If we were paying the price for bread that we are paying for electricity, we would be paying \$19.99 for this loaf of bread. In fact, the price went up to \$190 at some points during the last year. And what does this bill do for us in California and the rest of the coast? Nothing but crumbs. We get crumbs out of this bill.

I will tell Members, many of my constituents have gone out of business during the last year in San Diego and the rest of the West Coast. Sixty-five percent of my constituents face bankruptcy in the next year if the prices do not go down. With this bill, my small business people are toast.

Defeat this rule, defeat this bill. Let us have a real energy policy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who has chaired, I think, a very eminently fair rule on this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate my friend from Washington, who has worked long and hard to deal with our Nation's energy

needs, and specifically raised very important issues that affect the area of the country he represents.

Let me say that there is no group of people who know better how important this is than the people I am privileged to represent in California.

We, for the first time in a quarter century, Mr. Speaker, are moving towards a comprehensive energy package, and the leadership, the President and the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, have been very, very important with regard this issue.

We have worked very closely with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to fashion a rule that is fair. Contrary to the rhetoric we have heard from virtually everyone on the other side of the aisle, this is a very fair and balanced rule.

We need to move ahead and try to attain energy self-sufficiency. We need to do what we can to encourage conservation. We need to take the kinds of steps that are necessary to increase the energy supply.

I believe that we are going to, in the next 12 hours, have the opportunity to do that. Yes, we are going to have 12 hours of debate. Some people who are trying to claim we shut things down are way off base. We are going to have a full debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, at this point, enter in the RECORD a letter the Speaker received from the minority leader and the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Rules, the Democratic Caucus Chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: During the past two weeks, the Rules Committee has dealt with major legislation inconsistently and in a manner which seriously undermines open and fair debate, and in doing so, has done serious harm to the practice of affording the minority opportunity to put forward amendments it has sought, both substitute and perfecting. For example, the Rules Committee made in order 14 separate amendments instead of allowing them to be offered as a substitute to the committee-reported campaign finance reform bill while making in order only a substitute instead of allowing individual amendments on the faith-based/charitable choice bill. We want to take this early opportunity to set out exactly what the minority is seeking on any rule relating to energy legislation, which may be sent to the floor before we adjourn for the August District Work Period.

It is our understanding that the Rules Committee may package the various energy bills that have now been reported to the House by four separate committees into one omnibus package to be considered by House. If that is indeed your intention, the Minority hereby requests that the House be given the opportunity to have legitimate up or down individual votes on the various parts of the package as well as the opportunity to offer any substitute that may be drafted. Allowing

these votes, rather than just giving the Minority one substitute and a motion to recommit, is particularly important in light of the fact that some of the key provisions in these bills have bipartisan support or bipartisan opposition and thus, should be allowed to be considered and voted on separately. Given the importance of these issues and the magnitude of their impact on the entire Nation, we believe this is the only right way to approach the construction of any rule dealing with the energy issue.

The most important matters that clearly deserve a separate up or down vote include the following:

(1) CAFE standards: The provisions relating to automobile and light truck efficiency standards are controversial and there are Members who wish to have the opportunity to offer a strengthening amendment.

(2) West Coast electricity: As you know, West Coast Members have sought many opportunities to have a vote on this issue and just such an amendment was offered in the Energy and Commerce Committee markup. While that amendment was defeated, this issue is of such great importance to a great many Members and the Inslee bill (H.R. 1468) is certainly deserving of an opportunity to be debated and vote on during the consideration of a major energy package.

(3) Tax-related matters relating to conservation and production: While the Ways and Means Committee has reported a bill which provides for many of the tax incentives Democrats have endorsed to promote conservation, increase efficiency, and promote increased domestic oil and gas production, this bill provides no off-sets for the reduction in revenues that would occur if the package were to become law. Democrats believe strongly that Members must be given the opportunity to offer tax code offsets for these and other provisions and because of the way the bill may be structured. The offsets may require waivers in order to be eligible for consideration.

(4) ANWR: As you know, this is a very controversial issue and Members on both sides of the aisle want to have an opportunity to have a straight up or down vote on the question of ANWR. In addition, there are other issues in the Resources Committee reported bill that Members would like to have the opportunity to amend or delete.

(5) Fuel oxygenates: This is a very controversial issue that has supporters and opponents on both sides of the aisle. Henry Waxman offered an amendment in the Energy and Commerce Committee markup to waive the requirements for California, and while the amendment was defeated, it does deserve to be debated and voted on during the consideration of any omnibus energy package.

(6) Alternative and renewal energy sources: The Science Committee has reported a very solid proposal; however, some Members would like to have the opportunity to offer increases and expansion of these important elements in an overall national energy strategy and to pay for that increased spending with offsets from the tax code. This, of course, would require waivers in the rule.

(7) Appliance standards: Two very important amendments were considered in the Energy and Commerce Committee markup relating to efficiency standards for air conditioners. These amendments, one of which would have required the federal government to purchase only the most energy efficient air conditioning systems and the other which would implement the air conditioning efficiency standards promulgated by the

Clinton Administration, were defeated on straight party line votes. We believe these amendments, as well as any other appliance efficiency amendments should certainly be included in any list of amendments allowed under the rule.

We are of the opinion that since this is the first piece of energy legislation the Republican leadership has brought to the floor in the past six and one-half years, these amendments, as well as other important proposals which may be offered by Members, should have the opportunity to be heard. If ultimately the rule reported by the Rules Committee does not give Members the opportunity to take a clean up or down vote on these matters, the rule will fail and the House will never have the opportunity to reach the merits on this legislation that is so vital to the future of this country. We would like to work with you to avoid the fiasco of the campaign finance rule so that we can actually debate, in a fair and democratic fashion, legislation that will affect each and every American citizen now and well into the future.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,
House Democratic
Leader.

MARTIN FROST,
Chairman, House
Democratic Caucus.

The letter basically says that we should make in order almost everything that we have done. Almost every provision that was requested as priorities from the Democratic leadership we have made in order.

We are going to be having a full and fair debate on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We are going to be having a full and fair debate on CAFE standards. And I wanted to congratulate the minority leader, he encouraged in his letter for us to make in order the fuel oxygenate amendment, which is going to be very important to the people I represent in California. Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for urging us to make this amendment in order. So, if one looks at the issues that we are going to be addressing, we have got very, very important ones.

I do want to state one concern that I have, however, and that has to do with the exemption for partners in the Energy Star Program. I am concerned about the potential unintended consequences it might have on our technology industry. I am happy to say I have been talking with my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and, as we head into conference, I have every assurance we will be able to effectively address the concerns that have been raised by our friends in the tech sector of the economy.

This is a very fair rule. It represents the priorities that have been set forth by both Democrats and Republicans. So I think the rule, as well as the legislation itself, at the end of the day should enjoy broad bipartisan support.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate having expired, the question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting if ordered on the question of adoption of the resolution and then on the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 208, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Ferguson	Largent
Akin	Flake	Latham
Armey	Fletcher	LaTourette
Bachus	Foley	Leach
Baker	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Ballenger	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Bartlett	Gallegly	LoBiondo
Barton	Ganske	Lucas (OK)
Bass	Gekas	Manzullo
Bereuter	Gibbons	McCrery
Biggart	Gilchrest	McHugh
Billirakis	Gillmor	McInnis
Blunt	Gilman	McKeon
Boehrlert	Goode	Mica
Boehner	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Bonilla	Goss	Miller, Gary
Bono	Graham	Moran (KS)
Brady (TX)	Granger	Morella
Brown (SC)	Graves	Myrick
Bryant	Green (WI)	Nethercutt
Burr	Greenwood	Ney
Burton	Grucci	Northup
Buyer	Gutknecht	Norwood
Callahan	Hansen	Nussle
Calvert	Hart	Osborne
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Ose
Cannon	Hayes	Otter
Cantor	Hayworth	Oxley
Capito	Hefley	Paul
Castle	Hergert	Pence
Chabot	Hilleary	Peterson (PA)
Chambliss	Hobson	Petri
Coble	Hoekstra	Pickering
Collins	Horn	Pitts
Combest	Hostettler	Platts
Cooksey	Houghton	Pombo
Cox	Hulshof	Portman
Crane	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Crenshaw	Hyde	Putnam
Cubin	Isakson	Quinn
Culberson	Issa	Radanovich
Cunningham	Istook	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Regula
Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Rehberg
Deal	Johnson (IL)	Reynolds
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Riley
DeMint	Jones (NC)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart	Keller	Rogers (MI)
Doolittle	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Dreier	Kennedy (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Kerns	Roukema
Dunn	King (NY)	Royce
Ehlers	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Ehrlich	Kirk	Ryun (KS)
Emerson	Knollenberg	Saxton
English	Kolbe	Scarborough
Everett	LaHood	Schaffer

Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder

Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton

NAYS—208

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Murtha
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Allen	Hall (TX)	Napolitano
Andrews	Harman	Neal
Baca	Hill	Oberstar
Baird	Hilliard	Obey
Baldacci	Hinchee	Olver
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Barcia	Hoeffel	Owens
Barrett	Holden	Pallone
Becerra	Holt	Pascrell
Bentsen	Honda	Pastor
Berkley	Hooley	Payne
Berman	Hoyer	Pelosi
Berry	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Israel	Phelps
Blagojevich	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Bonior	(TX)	Rahall
Borski	Jefferson	Rangel
Boswell	John	Reyes
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Boyd	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Ross
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Capps	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Rush
Cardin	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Carson (IN)	Klecza	Sanchez
Carson (OK)	Kucinich	Sanders
Clay	LaFalce	Sandlin
Clayton	Lampson	Sawyer
Clement	Langevin	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lantos	Schiff
Condit	Larsen (WA)	Scott
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costello	Lee	Sherman
Coyne	Levin	Shows
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Crowley	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cummings	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Snyder
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Solis
Davis (IL)	Luther	Spratt
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Stenholm
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
Delahunt	Markey	Stupak
DeLauro	Mascara	Tanner
Deutsch	Matheson	Tauscher
Dicks	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dooley	McCollum	Thurman
Doyle	McDermott	Tierney
Edwards	McGovern	Towns
Engel	McIntyre	Turner
Eshoo	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Etheridge	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Evans	Meehan	Velazquez
Farr	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Filner	Menendez	Watson (CA)
Ford	Millender-	Watt (NC)
Frank	McDonald	Waxman
Frost	Miller, George	Weiner
Gephardt	Mink	Wexler
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Woolsey
Gordon	Moore	Wu
Green (TX)	Moran (VA)	Wynn

NOT VOTING—4

Hastings (FL)
Hutchinson

Spence
Stark

□ 1216

Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Texas and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 206, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—220

Aderholt	Foley	Linder
Akin	Forbes	LoBiondo
Armey	Fossella	Lucas (OK)
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Baker	Galleghy	McCreery
Balenger	Ganske	McHugh
Barr	Gekas	McInnis
Bartlett	Gibbons	McKeon
Barton	Gilchrest	Mica
Bass	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Bereuter	Gilman	Miller, Gary
Biggert	Goode	Moran (KS)
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Morella
Blunt	Goss	Myrick
Boehlert	Graham	Nethercutt
Boehner	Granger	Ney
Bonilla	Graves	Northup
Bono	Green (WI)	Norwood
Brady (TX)	Greenwood	Nussle
Brown (SC)	Grucci	Osborne
Bryant	Gutknecht	Ose
Burr	Hansen	Otter
Burton	Hart	Oxley
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Callahan	Hayes	Pence
Calvert	Hayworth	Peterson (PA)
Camp	Hefley	Petri
Cannon	Herger	Pickering
Cantor	Hilleary	Pitts
Capito	Hobson	Platts
Castle	Hoekstra	Pombo
Chabot	Horn	Portman
Chambliss	Hostettler	Pryce (OH)
Coble	Houghton	Putnam
Collins	Hulshof	Quinn
Combust	Hunter	Radanovich
Cooksey	Hyde	Ramstad
Cox	Isakson	Regula
Crane	Issa	Rehberg
Crenshaw	Istook	Reynolds
Cubin	Jenkins	Riley
Culberson	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
Cunningham	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal	Keller	Roukema
DeLay	Kelly	Royce
DeMint	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart	Kerns	Ryun (KS)
Doolittle	King (NY)	Saxton
Dreier	Kingston	Scarborough
Duncan	Kirk	Schaffer
Dunn	Knollenberg	Schrock
Ehlers	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Ehrlich	LaHood	Sessions
Emerson	Largent	Shadegg
English	Latham	Shaw
Everett	LaTourette	Shays
Ferguson	Leach	Sherwood
Flake	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Fletcher	Lewis (KY)	Shuster

Simmons	Terry
Simpson	Thomas
Skeen	Thornberry
Smith (NJ)	Thune
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt
Souder	Tiberi
Stearns	Toomey
Stump	Traficant
Sununu	Upton
Sweeney	Vitter
Tancredo	Walden
Tauzin	Walsh
Taylor (NC)	Wamp

NOES—206

Abercrombie	Hall (TX)
Ackerman	Harman
Allen	Hill
Andrews	Hilliard
Baca	Hinchee
Baird	Hinojosa
Baldacci	Hoefel
Baldwin	Holden
Barcia	Holt
Barrett	Honda
Becerra	Hooley
Bentsen	Hoyer
Berkley	Inslee
Berman	Israel
Berry	Jackson (IL)
Bishop	Jackson-Lee
Blagojevich	(TX)
Blumenauer	Jefferson
Bonior	John
Borski	Johnson, E. B.
Boswell	Jones (OH)
Boucher	Kanjorski
Boyd	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Kennedy (RI)
Brown (FL)	Kildee
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick
Capps	Kind (WI)
Capuano	Kleczka
Cardin	Kucinich
Carson (IN)	LaFalce
Carson (OK)	Lampson
Clay	Langevin
Clayton	Lantos
Clement	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Condit	Lee
Conyers	Levin
Costello	Lewis (GA)
Coyne	Lipinski
Cramer	Lofgren
Crowley	Lowey
Cummings	Lucas (KY)
Davis (CA)	Luther
Davis (FL)	Maloney (CT)
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)
DeFazio	Markey
DeGette	Mascara
Delahunt	Matheson
DeLauro	Matsui
Deutsch	McCarthy (MO)
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)
Doggett	McCollum
Dooley	McDermott
Doyle	McGovern
Edwards	McIntyre
Engel	McKinney
Eshoo	McNulty
Etheridge	Meehan
Evans	Meek (FL)
Farr	Meeks (NY)
Fattah	Menendez
Filer	Millender-
Frank	McDonald
Frost	Miller, George
Gephardt	Mink
Gonzalez	Mollohan
Gordon	Moore
Green (TX)	Moran (VA)
Gutierrez	Murtha
Hall (OH)	Nadler

NOT VOTING—7

Dingell	Hutchinson	Stark
Ford	Smith (MI)	
Hastings (FL)	Spence	

□ 1225

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 307, I unfortunately missed the vote somehow or another. I wanted to declare that if indeed I would have voted, I would have voted “no” on rollcall 307.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker’s approval of the Journal of the last day’s proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 343, noes 65, answered “present” 2, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—343

Abercrombie	Castle	Foley
Ackerman	Chabot	Ford
Akin	Chambliss	Frank
Allen	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Clement	Galleghy
Baca	Clyburn	Ganske
Bachus	Coble	Gekas
Baker	Collins	Gibbons
Baldwin	Combust	Gilchrest
Balenger	Condit	Gonzalez
Barcia	Cooksey	Goode
Barr	Cox	Goodlatte
Barrett	Coyne	Gordon
Bartlett	Crenshaw	Goss
Barton	Cubin	Graham
Bass	Culberson	Granger
Becerra	Cummings	Graves
Bentsen	Cunningham	Green (TX)
Bereuter	Davis (IL)	Green (WI)
Berkley	Davis (FL)	Greenwood
Berman	Davis, Jo Ann	Grucci
Berry	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Biggert	Davis, Tom	Hall (TX)
Bilirakis	Deal	Hall (OH)
Bishop	DeGette	Hansen
Blagojevich	Delahunt	Harman
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hart
Blunt	DeLay	Hastert
Boehlert	DeMint	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Deutsch	Hayes
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Bonior	Doggett	Herger
Bono	Dooley	Hill
Boswell	Doolittle	Hilleary
Boucher	Doyle	Hinojosa
Boyd	Dreier	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hoefel
Brown (OH)	Dunn	Hoekstra
Brown (SC)	Edwards	Holt
Bryant	Ehlers	Horn
Burr	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Burton	Emerson	Houghton
Buyer	Engel	Hoyer
Callahan	Eshoo	Hunter
Calvert	Etheridge	Hyde
Camp	Evans	Inslee
Cannon	Everett	Isakson
Cantor	Farr	Israel
Capito	Fattah	Issa
Capps	Ferguson	Istook
Cardin	Flake	Jackson (IL)
Carson (OK)	Fletcher	Jefferson