

search for those who remain unaccounted for. Regrettably, however, Iraq has hindered all efforts to locate and secure the release of those individuals, and Iraq has denied the ICRC access to its prisons in violation of article 126 of the third Geneva Convention to which Iraq is a signatory.

Accordingly, H. Con. Res. 275 condemns the Iraqi governments refusal to comply with the will of the international community regarding these prisoners of war and urges Iraq to fulfill both the letter and the spirit of resolution 686 and 687.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that our own government should continue to actively seek the release of these Kuwaiti prisoners of war as well as other prisoners of war who are still missing some 9 years after the fact.

Accordingly, I urge the adoption of H. Con. Res. 275.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Page 4, line 5, strike "and".

Page 4, after line 10, insert the following:

(E) urges Iraq to immediately release all information regarding the fate of United States Navy Lieutenant Commander Michael Speicher and to release Lieutenant Commander Speicher, or deliver his remains, to the International Committee of the Red Cross for return to the United States; and

Page 4, line 19, strike "and" at the end.

Page 5, line 2, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 5, after line 2, add the following:

(C) actively and urgently work with the international community and the Government of Kuwait to actively seek information on the status of United States Navy Lieutenant Commander Michael Speicher and make every effort to expedite the release of Lieutenant Commander Speicher, or deliver his remains, from Iraq.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the Preamble Offered by Mr. GILMAN:

In the 12th clause of the preamble, strike "and" at the end.

In the 13th clause of the preamble, strike "Now, therefore, be it" and insert "; and".

At the end of the preamble, add the following:

Whereas significant questions remain regarding the status of United States Navy Lieutenant Commander Michael Speicher, who was shot down over Iraq on January 16, 1991, during Operation Desert Storm and was declared dead by the United States Navy without the conduct of an adequate search and rescue operation, however subsequent information obtained after the Persian Gulf Conflict by United States officials has raised the possibility that Lieutenant Commander Speicher survived and was captured by Iraqi forces: Now, therefore, be it

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 275.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SIERRA LEONE

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to the tragic situation in Sierra Leone, where the democratically elected government of this West African country has long been under attack by rebels who have relied on the most heinous tactics, including systematically chopping off the limbs of little children. In Sierra Leone, the world is seeing pure evil.

The administration's response was to encourage a deal with the rebels, which predictably feel apart and now we have a U.N. peacekeeping operation there. Well, the fact is that this peacekeeping operation is not up to the task. Its record of incompetence includes its troops having willingly turned over weapons and equipment to the rebels. This operation remains in shambles, and more troops and resources will not address its shortcomings.

The rebels could, though, be marginalized by the Nigerian military and the defense forces of the Sierra Leone government, working with strong logistical training and other backing from the British. The U.S. should be focused on backing this effort, providing support to the Nigerian troops in Sierra Leone.

Whether African states move towards great stability is very much in question. An alternative and disastrous vision of state disintegration is looming for large parts of Africa. That is why a response to Sierra Leone is so important.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

REGARDING THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

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

tleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House on the urgent need for leadership in developing a Comprehensive National Energy Policy. Those of my colleagues who have followed my floor speeches over the past 25 years know that this issue is not a new one for me. As a Member of this House during the 1970s when gasoline shortages resulted in long lines at the pump and even when the crisis subsided, I have continued to speak on the need for a balanced energy policy which provides for a diversity of energy options for Americans.

Today, Mr. Speaker, recent spikes in the world crude oil prices, the tight gasoline supply, and the resulting extremely high prices at the pump, especially across the Midwest, again focus our attention on the urgent need for a comprehensive, and I emphasize comprehensive, policy.

Today we have crossed the 50 percent threshold on oil imports. We now import 52 percent of our petroleum, and by 2020, that number is projected to reach 64 percent.

□ 1415

This number is important because, unlike in other sectors of the energy market, we are dependent on petroleum-based fuels for more than 90 percent of our transportation market, automobiles, trucks and airplanes.

In 1999, U.S. consumers used four times as much gasoline as they did 50 years ago. In the past, our tendency has been to try to solve the problem with a short-term solution, then continue with our same habits. However, I urge my colleagues to consider the long-term benefits of developing a comprehensive, balanced policy for our Nation's energy. Our Nation depends upon affordable, reliable energy in every sector to retain our strong economy. Energy is too important for us to merely hope for the best.

Mr. Speaker, today I recommend that we bring not just the Department of Energy into this debate, but the numerous other Federal agencies which have a direct impact on our Nation's energy supply through various regulations on how we produce, transport, and consume energy. These include the Department of Interior, the Department of Transportation, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to name a few. All of these agencies impact the energy we use every day. Further, the Department of Defense and the U.S. Postal Service as major users of energy must also be at the table.

Today about 85 percent of our energy use comes from traditional fuel sources, coal, oil and natural gas. The Energy Information Administration estimates that by 2020 that market share will reach nearly 90 percent. Our future use of these traditional fuels depends upon our continued research into ways to use these more efficiently, more cleanly, while, at the same time, we expand research on alternative fuels. We must do both.

We cannot ignore the fact that we have more coal in this country in Btus than the rest of the world has recoverable oil. Coal is an excellent energy source, and we should be supporting research that will ultimately provide us with zero emission coal-fired power plants.

International markets are an important component of our energy policy. As we look at the world energy situation, 2 billion people lack access to electricity. Current electric power capacity will have to triple over the next 50 years to meet this demand. The worldwide market for new power equipment is expected to be \$2 trillion per decade for at least the next 5 decades. China alone plans to construct eight to 10 power plants a year for the next 20 years, 75 percent of which will burn coal. This fact alone is the reason we must focus on continued research to develop the most energy-efficient, cleanest-burning coal technology possible.

Natural gas holds great promise in many energy sectors. First, its great abundance in the United States, as well as all of North America, together with its clean-burning attributes, make it a fuel of choice for future power generation in this country. In the fiscal year 2001 interior appropriations bills we have funded a major natural gas infrastructure program. Pipelines and refueling stations are necessary to improve access to clean, efficient domestically produced natural gas.

Our dependence on petroleum-based fuels, gasoline and diesel fuel, for our transportation sector is a more difficult situation to address. We must continue to support alternatives, including natural gas and electric vehicles.

We need to look at how we can make transportation fuels less polluting and how we can combine the use of these fuels with other cutting edge technologies and hybrid vehicles. Again, there is a focus on these efforts in the Interior appropriations bill for next year. The Interior appropriations bill has a strong focus on conservation of our energy and its end use.

While we are doing what we can to provide necessary funding for research to improve emissions and efficiency in our Nation's energy use through funding provided to the Department of Energy, we must examine other important components of our energy picture. Policies which cut off supplies and access are not for tomorrow.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join together to develop a truly comprehensive energy policy. Failure to do so will make today's crisis a permanent crisis.

WHY WE NEED TO ABOLISH THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ensure that H.R. 1649, the act to abolish the Department of Energy, does not get pushed behind a copy machine like two highly classified secret hard disk drives were recently.

In 1995, I was the leader of the House task force that first introduced the Department of Energy Abolishment Act. Back then we highlighted four principal reasons why Congress needs to eliminate the Department of Energy. Listen to the same principles which still hold true:

Number one, the DOE no longer serves as a core energy-related mission. In fact, less than 20 percent of the current Department of Energy budget is dedicated to energy-related activities.

Number two, the Department of Energy is a failed cabinet level agency, unable to meet its most basic obligations.

Number three, the Department of Energy has developed into a feeding trough for corporate welfare recipients.

Number four, DOE wastes billions of taxpayer dollars annually.

These four principles still stand true today; and unfortunately, now we can add a fifth principle, a reason why Congress must abolish this agency. That reason is that the Department of Energy has become and continues to be a serious threat to the security of this Nation.

First it was Chinagate, and now we learn that highly classified and secret materials were missing for 2 months until recently discovered behind a copying machine.

The Department of Energy has become a threat to our national security. In 1998 the House of Representatives created a Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military and Commercial Concerns with China, also known as the Cox Committee. I have with me a copy of one of three volumes of the Cox report I am holding in my hand outlining problems within the Department of Energy.

The Cox Committee issued 38 recommendations in response to their conclusion that the security at the Department of Energy nuclear laboratories in Sandia, Los Alamos, and Lawrence Livermore do not meet even the minimal standards, and that China has stolen design information on our Nation's most advanced thermonuclear weapons.

Into the House Cox Committee, President Clinton appointed former Senator Warren Rudman, chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, to also evaluate security at the DOE labs. In my hand I have that report that was submitted by Senator Rudman. It has at the top "science at its best, security at its worst."

Some of the examples of the Department of Energy mismanagement as reported by the Rudman report is, one, a Department of Energy employee was dead for 11 months before the security officials realized that four classified documents were still assigned to him.

It also took 45 months to fix a broken doorknob that was stuck in an open position, allowing access to classified nuclear information. Department of Energy officials also took 35 months to write a work report to replace a lock at a weapons lab facility which contained classified information. Several months passed before the security audit team discovered that a main telephone frame door at a weapons lab had been forced open and the lock had been destroyed.

During this Congress, in separate reports, Congressman Cox and Senator Rudman have reached the same conclusion regarding the Department of Energy: the agency is incapable of reforming itself and has a culture of waste, fraud and abuse.

What does Secretary Richardson have to say about these problems? On March 9, 1999, Secretary Richardson said, "Security at the labs right now is good."

On March 14, 1999, Secretary Richardson said, "We have top notch security right now in our national labs." He also said on that day, "Our labs are very security conscious now." On March 16 he said, "Security is being tightened dramatically at the labs. This should not happen again."

What Bill Richardson said yesterday was, "What I did not take into account was that the lab culture needs more time to be changed. I did not take into account the human element," on Meet the Press on June 18, 2000.

I think this is the final straw, Mr. Speaker. On May 7, highly classified computer disks containing nuclear secrets were discovered missing from the Department of Energy lab in Los Alamos. Although the disappearance was discovered on May 7, it was not until 24 days later that the director of the lab was notified, along with the Department of Energy Secretary, Bill Richardson and the FBI. To date, no one has been fired or taken off the payroll.

While I recognize progress in the announcement this week by chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services of his intentions to introduce legislation to examine whether the nuclear weapons program should be turned over to the Department of Defense, what we do not need is another commission telling us what we already know.

The Department of Energy is a threat to our national security, and all defense-related functions currently housed within the Department of Energy should be transferred to the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I believe it is time to turn out the lights at the Department of Energy by passing H.R. 1649.

DEMOCRATIC VS. REPUBLICAN PRESCRIPTION MEDICINE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr.