

Oberstar	Ross	Stupak
Obey	Rothman	Sununu
Oliver	Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Ortiz	Rush	Tauscher
Osborne	Ryan (WI)	Tauzin
Ose	Ryun (KS)	Terry
Otter	Sabo	Thomas
Oxley	Sandlin	Thompson (CA)
Pallone	Sawyer	Thompson (MS)
Pastor	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Paul	Schiff	Thurman
Payne	Schrock	Tiahrt
Pelosi	Scott	Tierney
Pence	Sensenbrenner	Trafficant
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Turner
Petri	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Pickering	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Pitts	Shays	Upton
Platts	Sherman	Velazquez
Pombo	Sherwood	Vitter
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Walden
Portman	Shows	Walsh
Price (NC)	Shuster	Watkins
Pryce (OH)	Simmons	Watt (NC)
Quinn	Skeen	Weldon (PA)
Radanovich	Skelton	Weller
Ramstad	Slaughter	Wexler
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Wilson
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Reynolds	Snyder	Woolsey
Rivers	Solis	Wu
Rodriguez	Souder	Wynn
Roemer	Spratt	Young (AK)
Rogers (MI)	Stark	Young (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stenholm	

NAYS—43

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Rohrabacher
Bachus	Graves	Roukema
Baker	Gutknecht	Royce
Ballenger	Hayes	Saxton
Bartlett	Hefley	Schaffer
Bereuter	Herger	Sessions
Burton	Hunter	Spence
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Stearns
Coble	Jones (NC)	Stump
Combest	Kerns	Tancredo
Culberson	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
Deal	Mica	Viscosky
Duncan	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Everett	Norwood	
Goode	Putnam	

NOT VOTING—53

Abercrombie	Hostettler	Rogers (KY)
Barr	Hulshof	Sanchez
Berkley	Kelly	Sanders
Blumenauer	Kingston	Scarborough
Clay	Lantos	Simpson
Cox	Largent	Strickland
Coyne	Levin	Sweeney
Cubin	Lewis (GA)	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	Moakley	Thune
Fossella	Mollohan	Tiberi
Ganske	Neal	Toomey
Gordon	Ney	Towns
Hansen	Owens	Wamp
Hart	Pascarell	Waters
Hill	Peterson (PA)	Watts (OK)
Hilleary	Phelps	Waxman
Hinchee	Rahall	Weiner
Hobson	Riley	

□ 1842

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 126 and 127, I was detained due to flight

problems. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes numbered 126 and 127, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1696. An act to expedite the construction of the World War II memorial in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, appoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China—

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH);

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK);

The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON);

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH); and

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), Chairman.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-246, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, appoints Leo Hindery, Jr., of California, to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, vice Adele Hall, of Kansas.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the First Session of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, to be held in Canada, May 17-21, 2001:

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS).

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY).

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA).

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the First Session of the One Hundred Seventh

Congress, to be held in Canada, May 17-21, 2001:

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The message also announced that in accordance with sections 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly during the First Session of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, to be held in Vilnius, Lithuania, May 27-31, 2001—

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH);

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES);

The Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI); and

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN).

□ 1845

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 73

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 73.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

U.S. TRADE AND INVESTMENT POLICY TOWARD SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-73)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 106 of title I of the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-200), I transmit herewith the 2001 Comprehensive Report of the President on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy toward Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 18, 2001.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order

of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF PART OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening for a brief discussion of a part of the President's proposed national energy policy, the document of May, 2001.

This goes to the issue of electricity and electricity supply. If we look in Appendix I, way in the back of the report here under "Summary of Recommendations," there are a couple of things which I think Members of the House and members of the public should pay attention to.

At the top of this unnumbered page, in Appendix I it says, "The NEPD Group recommends the President direct the Secretary of Energy to propose comprehensive electricity legislation that promotes competition, protects consumers, enhances reliability, promotes renewable energy, improves efficiency, and repeals," there is the key part, "the Public Utility Holding Company Act and reforms the Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act."

What does that mean? That means national deregulation. Now, of course there is a little problem in proposing national deregulation. We have the California model, where this year the same amount of electricity will be sold as 2 years ago. Two years ago, that electricity sold for \$7 billion. This year that same amount of electricity, despite the myths about huge increases in the demand and all that, the same electricity as 2 years ago will sell for \$70 billion, a 1,000 percent increase in the price in 2 years.

That money has to be going somewhere, and it is. A good deal of it is flowing to a number of large energy companies based in Houston, Texas. They are saying this is such a successful model. The lights were on in parts of California for part of the day yesterday, and most people still can afford to pay their energy bills, although they are about to get a retroactive 47 percent-plus rate increase and tiered rates, which will penalize anybody with an all-electric home.

The President, under the guise of the summary buried in the back of this report, wants to take that across the Nation. People will say, that is not fair. The California plan was poorly written. Look at some of the other great models of deregulation. Let us look at some of the other great models of deregulation.

We have Montana, right near my State. Montana, until 2 years ago, had the sixth cheapest electricity in the United States of America. They were

producing 150 percent, 1½ times their peak demand, on their own hydro power; affordable, cheap, reliable. But what happened? They deregulated. Montana Power sold all of its generation resources to PP&L, Pennsylvania Power & Light, who now controls the generation in Montana.

Pennsylvania Power & Light finds they can sell Montana's electricity more lucratively elsewhere, and they have lifted the cap on industrial customers, so industry after industry in Montana is closing. They are laying people off. They are saying they cannot afford the huge increase in electric rates.

Luckily for residential consumers, their prices are capped for another year. But a year from today, it will hit them, too. They will say, Montana did not work out too well, California did not work out too well, but look at the deregulation in Pennsylvania. Look how well it is working.

First off, dereg is supposed to give us choice. I have yet to have a consumer come up to me and say, Congressman, I want to choose my energy company. I am tired of this company that just delivers the electricity day in, day out, reliably at a low price. I would like to choose, to gamble. I would like to see what would happen. Nobody, nobody wants that except a few big energy companies that are getting filthy rich off this scheme.

So they gave choice to Pennsylvanians, and very few of them chose it. Now, even though they had rate caps, and that is why people say it is a success, rates did not go up; yes, if we have capped rates. What happens when the caps go away? The same thing that has happened in California, the same thing that is happening in Montana: huge increases in price.

This is nothing but a scheme to extract more money from tens of millions of Americans and small businesses and big businesses across this country, and move that money to a few big energy companies.

So I would hope that this Congress, as it has in the last two Congresses when President Clinton proposed national energy, as they want to call it now, restructuring, because deregulation has become a dirty word, we cannot use that. It is like around here we do not talk about the estate tax, but we call it the death tax. Now they call deregulation restructuring, as does this report.

It is a scam on the American public. Let us not have it perpetrated under the guise of this report.

REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT CONCERNING THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I was disappointed by the comments of the Vice President in talking about the California energy crisis.

Vice President CHENEY put forward the theory that California made a mistake with its deregulation, and therefore, California should suffer without any Federal action; that the blackouts and outrageous prices being faced by people in my State are somehow part of a divinely ordained morality play.

Well, California did make a mistake. We put ourselves at the mercy of gougers, chiefly independent energy companies based in Houston, Texas. Our theoretical economist told us that if we deregulated, all these companies would produce independently as long as they could make a profit; that they would maintain their output.

What we discovered instead was that if we came anywhere close to a shortage, a few of them would close down, create the prospect of blackouts, all in an effort to drive up the price. That is why the California Public Utilities Commission determined that not only are we paying outrageous prices, but deregulation, which according to the theorists should maximize the production of electricity, is actually causing the blackouts by causing them to underproduce. By producing a little less, they can charge us the outrageous prices that my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, just pointed out to this House.

But returning to the Vice President's idea of fault, that this is somehow California's fault, and therefore, Californians should suffer, this might make some sense if Californians were rushing to this floor asking for tens of billions of dollars of aid. But that is not what we are asking for. We are only asking for the right to reregulate, whether that is done at the Federal level or whether it is done at the State level. We are asking for the reinstatement of the same system of regulation that served this country so well for 100 years.

The Vice President's statements are analogous to the following situation. Assume our neighbor's house is burning down. If that happens, one approach is to steal our neighbor's hose and lecture our neighbor about fire safety, that the fire should never have started.

That is in fact what this administration is doing. On the one hand, we are lectured that California made a mistake, and given the current outcome, that is no doubt true. But then, instead of being given help, instead of even being left alone, the hose is stolen, impounded, and a smile comes across the administration's face as the house burns down.

At a very minimum, California needs to see cost-based regulation of the electric plants located in California. Federal law prevents us from doing so. We