

been talking about the lack of a GOP energy policy, but I could just mention briefly here for maybe a few minutes or so that the administration, the Clinton-Gore administration, for the last 7 years has been trying to get the Congress to enact a really positive energy policy. Of course, for 6 of those 7 years they have had to deal with the Republican leadership that has simply not been willing to adopt it.

Just to give an example, because I keep hearing the Republicans saying they want to open up ANWR, they want to do drilling offshore, but earlier this year when we passed an appropriations bill in the House, the President had come forward with his budget proposing major initiatives for energy efficiency, energy conservation, alternative sources of energy.

The House bill that passed, the House appropriations bill that passed I guess in July or so, had \$201 million less than the President's request with regard to energy conservation and \$71 million below the existing appropriations level for energy conservation. This was at a time when we were already starting to experience higher prices and less ability to get foreign oil from OPEC.

Just to give an idea of these cuts and how they cut what the President had proposed, it was a \$143 million cut, a complete elimination of applied research and development at the Department of Energy for certain conservation programs. They canceled 400 R&D projects in 33 States by 15 Federal labs, 22 universities, and others. There was a \$14 million cut in the Low-income Home Weatherization Assistance Program, which would mean about 7,000 fewer low-income families would have their energy bills reduced. There was a \$2 million cut from industrial co-generation, which funds R&D.

Then, in that appropriations bill, there was \$67 million less than the President's request for solar and renewable energy. There were cuts in biomass fuels and biopower R&D, reductions in solar electricity R&D, cuts in R&D for wind power, which if adequately funded would be competitive just within a few years.

I could go on and on here, and I will not because I am running out of time.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield before he runs out of his time, when I hear people start to politicize this and say that it is a national security issue to swap oil out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, one thing we have to remind people is that it is a swap, and the oil will come back with additional oil.

Secondly, the very people who are making that acquisition now are the people who in 1995 filed a bill that was known as H.R. 1649, the Department of Energy Abolishment Act.

As part of that act, it would ask to eliminate the reserve totally and sell off 571 million barrels of oil. Now, there are 35 people on the other side of the aisle that signed onto that, including three of the very highest members of

their leadership, who are the same people now who have the audacity to go on the floor or elsewhere and start to say that a swap is somehow affecting national security.

So not only is it totally wrong and it is not affecting national security in any adverse way, and it is what our allies and what other foreign countries think is a good thing to do, as well as business and others, but it is absolutely contradictory to their past behavior and their past comments.

I think the public can pretty much get in line as to whether people are acting as statesmen or politicians when they make assertions like that. I am going to let it go at that message and defer back to you, but I think it is important for people to know that this was a good move. People in the Northeast and New England, and Massachusetts in particular, are very pleased that the LIHEAP money has gotten relieved. Our people and low-income seniors will have that relief.

We are pleased there is a Northeast reserve being set up so the gap can be addressed, and hopefully keep the supply up and the prices somewhere within the stratosphere. We are very pleased that the President indicated he was going to release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and already we have seen the prices drop on that, except for a slight rebound when Members on the other side of the aisle indicated they would try to block it.

The psychological effect, already a month before it hits the market, has shown it is bringing prices down. That is going to help our seniors, people in our districts generally, and our small businesses, who cannot stand the kind of high prices that are going on and still be productive and get their business done in a way to support their families.

Again, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to address this on the floor. I think it is important to get this information out.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming down and joining us during this time.

I think we have a couple of minutes left, so I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that all the Democrats are really asking is that instead of trying to reverse the positive steps that the administration is taking and making these false accusations, that the GOP adopt a sound energy policy and pass the measures that the Democrats have been advocating and that have been proposed by the Clinton and Gore administration in its budget request.

Above all, we should be implementing measures that sustain our natural resources, practical measures that would conserve energy, promote our long-term energy security, and promote international competitiveness and alternative energy resources, all without sacrificing our economic growth.

For example, before we adjourn, the GOP leadership should pass the admin-

istration's request for funding and tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable energy measures, efficient energy research and development, weatherization, and alternative fuel vehicles and mass transit.

I also urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to pass legislation banning the export of Alaskan oil. Earlier last week, one of my colleagues on the Democratic side introduced a bill promoting wind energy. This is the kind of creative thinking we need to reduce our dependence on domestic and foreign fossil fuels.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority has done the opposite. It has vastly underfunded programs for the past 6 years that my Democratic colleagues and I and President Clinton and Vice President GORE have promoted, programs that would have conserved energy and prevented the situation we now face.

The Republican majority has an opportunity in the waning days of the Congress, we have a couple of weeks left, to reverse their course and help us pass sound legislation to avert an even greater energy crisis this winter. I would certainly urge them to do so.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4578) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes."

ISSUES REGARDING OIL PRODUCTION AND CONDITIONS IN RURAL AMERICA

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I came down here to talk about rural issues, but I feel a little compelled to talk a little bit about what was just discussed.

I come from Pennsylvania, and in fact 5 miles from my home the first oil well in America was drilled, Drake's well. So I come from an area where my district had four refineries, we only have three now, but an area that has been in the oil business since it started. It is where all the major oil companies in America started, in western Pennsylvania, because that is the first oil field that was developed.

It is interesting to talk to people about these simple ways to fix this problem when it is obvious they have never been in a refinery and they certainly do not understand the oil business.

I am going to just back up a little bit and talk about the problem we have

with oil going from \$10 to \$35 a barrel. It is because we have been 1 million or more barrels short per day in our volume that is necessary, so we are gradually creating a shortage. When we have a shortage in the marketplace, we drive the price up.

We still have a shortage in the marketplace. We are still not importing and domestically producing enough oil to build up a supply.

Normally, in the spring, refineries have all of these tank farms full of gasoline because they cannot produce enough gasoline in the summertime for us to drive our cars as much as we do, so they build those supplies.

In the summertime and in the fall, they build up the supplies of home heating oil, and they have this reserve. This country is way behind. All the refineries are way behind in building up just the normal stocks that they need for this winter for home heating.

Now, we are talking about instantly starting a reserve for New England. In Pennsylvania, a number of years ago when we had the first energy crisis, we had reserves. We had oil and gasoline and fuel oil set aside. Then it was allocated. That is what they are talking about to help themselves in New England when the pipeline is only half full, and it needs to be full to have enough to do the winter. If we put some in a set-aside reserve, we cause a shortage.

I remember when I argued with our Department of Energy in Pennsylvania because we were having this problem every year, and I spent half of my time helping people get fuel oil or gasoline for the gas stations.

I said, I think we are close enough in volume now where if you would not have anything in reserve this year, the system would work. And we argued for weeks. Finally they did that, and we did not have any problem that year.

But the problem we have now, no matter what we do, the refineries in America cannot fill those tanks to supply us, and especially if we have a cold winter, we really are in a dilemma. They run at 96 to 97 percent capacity, so there is not much room to refine more than they are refining.

What people do not realize, my son works in a refinery. He is an electrician in a refinery. They are getting ready for a 4- or 8-week shutdown where they stop refining. They have to do this to different parts of the refinery annually, and sometimes twice a year, because the refinery runs at such high temperatures, such high pressures, certain pipes and valves and things all have to be replaced every so many months.

1730

So they shut the refinery down and rebuilt all those lines and rebuilt all those things so that it is safe. Otherwise, these lines would wear out from heat and pressure, and the refinery would blow up. They are a very dangerous facility.

So refineries have to shut down for weeks and months and sometimes 2 months at a time. It depends on if it is a minor overhaul or major overhaul,

and they just have to do it. Some of the shortages that we have had is when we have had refineries down longer than they anticipated.

I can remember when my son said they were going to have a 4-week shutdown, and they ended up with a 6-week shutdown because they had problems they did not realize they had.

So this is not a simple process. Suddenly saying we are going to set some oil aside for New England could actually cause us a national shortage that would double the price. So I think those from New England ought to think carefully that we need to fill the pipeline of oil that we refine, we need to get some more normal reserves that we historically have had before we start setting some aside for any one part of the country. It is not a simple issue.

I also was a little amused. I am not going to say that wind does not have some potential in a few parts of the country. We spent billions on wind. We have not had much progress. The researchers have told me they have just about researched wind to death.

I heard a speaker last year that said if we built windmills, the latest type of windmills, a mile wide from coast to coast, that would be 3,000 miles of windmills a mile wide. Now think of the imprint that makes on the landscape. Think of the environmental impact statement one would have to get to do that. We would produce 11 percent of our electricity.

Is it the answer to our future energy needs? No, I do not think wind will ever be. It is not dependable. So many parts of the country, one just cannot count on it. One cannot store it when one has it. It is not a resource that we can count on. So I think to pour a lot of money in wind is throwing the money to the wind from my point of view.

I do have to say that those who are suddenly trying to say the Republicans are the cause of high oil prices in this country, I was one a couple years ago that said \$10 oil will destroy our country's ability to produce its own oil. In Pennsylvania, most of the producers have gone broke. In Texas and Oklahoma, many of the producers went broke.

Mr. Speaker, \$10 oil destroyed our oil infrastructure; and because of that, one just cannot turn the spigot on. We have to find ways to get them the resources they need so they can rebuild, because a lot of them went broke with \$10 oil; and the infrastructure is no longer in place. It is not a simple issue.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

2138

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 9 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4475, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 4475) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-940)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4475) "making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:*

Section 101. (a) The provisions of the following bill are hereby enacted into law, H.R. 5394 of the 106th Congress, as introduced on October 5, 2000.

(b) In publishing the Act in slip form and in the United States Statutes at Large pursuant to section 112, of title 1, United States Code, the Archivist of the United States shall include after the date of approval at the end an appendix setting forth the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANK R. WOLF,
TOM DELAY,
RALPH REGULA,
HAROLD ROGERS,
RON PACKARD,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
TODD TIAHRT,
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT,
KAY GRANGER,
C.W. BILL YOUNG,
MARTIN OLAV SABO
(except for provisions to withhold highway funds from states that do not adopt 0.08 blood alcohol concentration laws),

JOHN W. OLVER,
ED PASTOR,
CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK
(except for provisions to withhold highway funds from states that do not adopt 0.08 blood alcohol concentration laws),

JOSE E. SERRANO,
MICHAEL P. FORBES,
DAVID R. OBEY (with exception to denial of funds to states without 0.08 BAC),

Managers on the Part of the House.