

been a lot built of late and a lot more coming online. And we are happy to have them, but we do not have enough natural gas distribution coming into the State of California, which is adding to the increased price of natural gas within our State. So we have an infrastructure problem, not just with gas pipelines coming into California, but with the infrastructure around refineries. Refineries have been talked about. We have far less refining capability in California than we used to have.

California is well known because we have a lot of people, 35 million people. We certainly have a significant number of them living in the L.A. Basin and we have air quality issues. We have done a great job of cleaning up the air in Los Angeles. Doing that we have come up with our own fuel standards in California. We have lower sulfur than any other State in the Union, 15 parts per million or less in gasoline. California was the first State to do that. The U.S. EPA has now required the rest of the States to meet that standard, but California did it first.

Now, one of the unintended consequences of that is many of the refineries did not have enough capital so they went out of business rather than spending the money to upgrade that refinery to meet the new environmental standard. That was an unintended consequence. We do not have enough refineries, so even if we have additional oil, or the price of oil goes down, we cannot get enough petroleum products through a limited number of refineries. So we need to get incentives to build additional refineries to build the clean type of gasoline we need in California and throughout the country.

By the way, one of the problems my people in California, the people that drive every day have in California, is we have a stranded market in essence on gasoline because we have a different kind of gas standard than any other State in the Union. So we cannot import gasoline from anywhere. We have to produce all the gasoline that we make in our State for our drivers.

With respect to the Speaker, I will not get into the issue of oxidates today, but nevertheless to say that we in California will always produce clean gasoline; but we want to make sure we produce it economically and at the best cost available to the people of the State of California.

We do have a crisis in California. We have a crisis throughout this country on energy, and I am so pleased that we now have a President who will address it and a Vice President who took upon himself the time, and certainly in this last 100 days there have been a lot of pressures on this new administration, to recognize this problem that has been neglected for too long.

□ 1645

Now as we proceed with a long-term solution, and we did not get here over-

night, certainly in California's case it took many years to get to the point that we are at today, but we finally will see a solution to the problem. I say to my friends and constituents, be patient. I know it is difficult. I filled up my car last week and it cost \$35. No one should tolerate blackouts and these kinds of cost increases, but we have done it to ourselves. But we can get out of it because we have a policy that in the next number of years will bring us down the road to better energy independence, both with electricity and fuel.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time for my colleagues.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) is recognized for the remainder of the leadership hour, 14 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the energy policy released today by the administration.

Madam Speaker, for the last several years we have had a strong economy, primarily because we have had affordable and reliable sources of energy; but now we are in an energy crisis which threatens our economic future and our national security.

The President and Vice President have come together and put together a plan, and today they released their national energy policy, which I would encourage every Member and every individual in America to get a copy of and read it through. It is a comprehensive plan. The President recognizes the problem. He is concerned about the effects that high energy prices, both in gasoline and in electricity, will have on the American people and on our economy. We have a bold, new approach to addressing the energy policy in this country.

We need reliable, affordable, and clean energy increases. We need improved infrastructure. We cannot meet tomorrow's challenges with yesterday's technologies. We need new technologies to meet the demands. Some people will say those technologies are not here yet. I will say, Madam Speaker, that Americans are second to none in their ability to solve problems when they set their minds to it. We are the most technologically advanced Nation on Earth. If we set our minds to solving a problem, we can do it.

The President's leadership comes at a very critical time, but we must act now if we are going to have a comprehensive plan to address the energy crisis which will be with us for several years if we do not act. If anyone questions whether there is a serious energy shortage in this country, let me just give a few statistics.

Over the next 20 years, U.S. oil consumption will rise by 33 percent. Over the next 20 years, U.S. natural gas consumption will rise by over 50 percent. Over the next 20 years, U.S. electricity consumption will rise by 45 percent. Since 1992, oil production is down 17 percent in this country, while consumption is up 14 percent. In 1993, we were reliant on foreign oil for 35 percent of our demands. That was during the oil crisis that we had in 1973.

We said at that time we needed to become less dependent on foreign oil because our economy was subject to the whims of those countries in OPEC. Instead of becoming less reliant on foreign oil, we are now nearly 60 percent reliant on foreign oil for our oil needs. The U.S. spends roughly \$300 million a day, or about \$100 billion a year on foreign oil.

It is obvious that the demands for energy in the future are going to increase in this country. So what have we done in the way of supply? In 1990, U.S. jobs in exploration and production of oil and gas were 405,000 in the United States. In 1999, 10 years later, U.S. jobs in exploration and production of oil and gas were 293,000, down 27 percent. In 1990, in the United States, U.S. oil rigs, we had 657 of them in the United States. In the year 2000, working U.S. oil rigs, 153; a 77 percent decline. Thirty-six oil refineries have closed since 1992, and we have not built a new oil refinery since 1976.

The previous administration had no, I repeat, had no long-term energy policy. It seems the energy policy of the past administration was to shut down exploration as we became more reliant on foreign oil, to shut down refineries, to shut down research on clean coal and finding new sources of coal, to shut down nuclear research. It seems that you could sum up the past administration's energy policy as the "Do not worry, be happy," energy policy.

As I said, we have in this country a supply and demand problem, and that is essentially what the energy crisis is, a supply and demand problem.

Let me summarize what President Bush's energy plan does. It is 105 specific recommendations. Forty-two of those recommendations are targeted at conservation. Much has been said by our opponents that the President does not rely heavily enough on conservation. Forty-two of the recommendations are targeted at conservation; 35 recommendations are targeted at energy supply; 25 of the recommendations are targeted at increased energy security; 12 of the recommendations can be done through executive order; 73 of the recommendations are directives to Federal agencies; 20 of the recommendations will require action by this Congress.

Briefly, let me go through the major portions of his recommendations.

First, conservation. He wants to expand government support for programs for conservation, improved energy efficiency for appliances, improved conservation efforts in Federal buildings, and support new fuel-efficient technology for vehicles, buses, transit and other transportations.

In the area of renewable and alternative energies, he wants renewed focus on renewable and alternative energy, reduced delays in geothermal leasing processes, help for communities that want to use renewable energy, so that they can do so; extend and expand wind and biomass tax credits; a new 15 percent tax credit for residential solar energy. He wants to put \$1.2 billion in ANWR proceeds to renewable research, a new tax credit for the purchase of new hybrid or fuel cell vehicles, expand research on hydrogen and fusion energy. It sounds to me like he has concentrated much of his effort on conservation and renewable and alternative energy sources.

In clean-coal technology, President Bush wants to invest \$2 billion over the next 10 years in new clean-coal technologies.

In the area of oil and natural gas, he wants to review the impediments to oil and gas leasing on Federal lands; review regulations on outer Continental Shelf energy development; consider additional leases in the national petroleum reserve in Alaska, and work with Congress to look at the possibility of leasing portions of ANWR which were set aside specifically to look for new energy sources, oil and gas, to work with Congress to look at making some leases in those areas of ANWR for oil and gas exploration.

In the area of nuclear energy, he wants to streamline the relicensing of existing nuclear power plants. There are many nuclear power plants that will be up for relicensing in the near future, which may not ask for relicensing because of the cost and time delays necessary to relicense these plants.

Madam Speaker, nuclear energy is truly one of the cleanest and environmentally friendly forms of energy that we can have. With the technologies that are being developed today at the INEEL in Idaho and in Madam Speaker's district in Chicago, they are developing technologies which are reducing the amount of waste that comes from nuclear power plants. If we continue down this road, energy in the United States will be produced, I believe, largely by environmentally friendly nuclear energy.

In the area of hydropower, the administration recognizes the clean air benefits of hydropower. It also has some problems. It dams up rivers, and that causes problems with fish, as we are seeing in the Pacific Northwest. But hydropower in the Pacific Northwest is very important. Eighty-one percent of the Nation's renewable electricity comes from hydropower. Hydropower supplies approximately 70 per-

cent of the electricity in the Pacific Northwest. The administration supports reform of the relicensing process for hydroplants.

Today in Idaho we have a series of dams in the Hell's Canyon complex which have been there for some 30 years. I can understand the length of time it would take to license a new dam. If you have a free-flowing river and you suggest putting a dam in there, you would do substantial environmental studies to see the impacts that dam would have on the environment and the species and so forth. Those dams have been there for 30 years. We are trying to get them relicensed. Idaho Power is. It has taken over 10 years to relicense those dams, and millions and millions of dollars. And the people that are going to pay those dollars are the ratepayers. We need to streamline this relicensing process not only for dams but for transmission lines, for transmission pipelines, for oil and natural gas and other things.

Some people will say that this policy concentrates too much in one area and not enough in another area. I will tell you there are no silver bullets. We cannot conserve our way out of this problem. We cannot find enough oil or natural gas to get ourselves out of this problem. Nuclear power will not do it. It takes a combination of all of the efforts that we can bring to bear on this problem.

Conservation, renewable new sources of energy, new technologies, clean coal, new exploration, and nuclear energy, those are the things that are going to be necessary if we are going to address this energy crisis in the long term. And if we do not address this energy crisis in the long term, it will be back to visit us again.

Madam Speaker, I am glad that we have a President that recognizes the importance of reliable, affordable energy and the impact that it has on our economy, and I look forward to working with him to enact this policy.

CORRECTION OF PROCEEDINGS OF MAY 16, 2001, PAGE H2247

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) reserves the right to object.

Mr. FOLEY. I do, but I would like to hear the pending request from the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the Chairman very much.

First, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), they know that I tried to get an amendment in dealing with the human rights violations of Ethiopia. All I ex-

pect to do today is to indicate that thousands of students have been detained and they have been released, but—

Mr. FOLEY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) objects.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. GANSKE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of traveling with the President.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BENTSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 21, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.