

following was approved by the National Peoples Congress:

If possibilities for a peaceful reunification should be completely exhausted, the state shall employ nonpeaceful means and other necessary measure to protect China's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

This represents a change from earlier ambiguous language that would have allowed China flexibility to consider other options should conflict arise. As it is, China has taken away its own alternatives.

China has also backed itself into a troubling situation with its skyrocketing demand for oil; since my floor speeches in 1999 its oil imports have doubled, and last year alone surged upwards of 57 percent. Some analysts project China's oil needs will double again by 2010 and it will use up its reserves within 14 years. China's alarming need for oil has caused it to look around the world for new sources, sources that are often problematic states with security concerns for the United States.

In Venezuela, anti-American President Hugo Chavez announced a \$3 billion trade strategy with China, including provisions for oil and gas. This came on the heels of his statement, "We have invaded the United States, [not with guns] but with our oil."

Beijing recently signed a \$70 billion oil/gas deal with Iran, from whom it receives 11 percent of its oil imports. Naturally, China has come out firmly against the U.N. Security Council holding Iran economically accountable for its nuclear program.

Likewise, in Sudan, China seeks to defuse or delay any U.N. sanctions against Khartoum. It hardly seems coincidence that 4 percent of its oil imports come from that conflict stricken country, a supply that China seems ready to protect at all costs.

Keep in mind we are talking about the same area in northern Uganda and southern Sudan where they have the terrorist attacks that have consistently gone out, where they abduct these young children, train them to be soldiers, instruct them to kill their parents, and if they do not do it, they cut their arms off, their lips off, and their ears off. That makes no difference to China. If it means 4 percent of its oil imports potential in the future, they are willing to do it.

The United States and the European Union have sanctioned Zimbabwe, hoping to pressure its corrupt regime into reforms. China, on the other hand, has boosted aid and investment, working to blunt the sanctions.

The sources China has used to meet its oil needs and increase its world standing are clearly questionable. The Commission makes an unpopular but straightforward observation:

... [China's] pursuit of oil diplomacy may support objectives beyond just energy supply. Beijing's bilateral arrangements with oil-rich Middle Eastern states also helped create diplomatic and strategic alliances with countries that were hostile to the United States. For example, with U.S. inter-

ests precluded from entering Iran, China may hope to achieve a long-term competitive advantage relative to the United States. Over time, Beijing's relationship-building may counter U.S. power and enhance Beijing's ability to influence political and military outcomes. One of Beijing's stated goals is to reduce what it considers U.S. superpower dominance in favor of a multipolar global power structure in which China attains superpower status on par with the United States.

And while the search for energy is not yet a zero-sum game, the way the U.S. and China acquire oil is strikingly different. James Caverly, of the U.S. Department of Energy states, "The U.S. strategic framework makes certain that plenty of oil is available in the world market so that the price will remain low and the economy will benefit." China, in contrast, seeks to "gain control of the oil at the source. Geopolitically, this could soon bring the United States and Chinese energy interests into conflict." I have a chart that shows the countries that China has been buying oil from. This is the most up-to date information available. What I would like to point out is how China is using whatever leverage it can to find new energy sources, particularly in Africa. If you add up these amounts, China is acquiring about one third of its oil from African countries like Angola, Sudan, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Nigeria and Libya. Other countries China has begun seeking oil from are Algeria, Cameroon, Chad, Gabon, and Guinea.

I have had occasion to go there. And any of these countries that you go to, you see that China is giving them everything they want.

I have been traveling to Africa for many years. I just got back from a trip through Tanzania, Ethiopia and Uganda. Chinese influence is everywhere. I see conference centers and sports stadiums being constructed, donated by the Chinese. China has been expanding its influence throughout Africa with projects like this. The one thing I keep hearing is, "The U.S. tells you what you need, but China gives you what you want." Has China suddenly become compassionate and generous? No. One thing consistent with all of these countries where they are building these stadiums, sports complexes, and arenas, if you go to them, is they are places that the Chinese are depending on for their oil in the future. I think the fact these countries have large oil and mineral deposits is the reason for their generosity.

Last year, China spent nearly \$10 billion on African oil. As I said, this is nearly one third of its total crude oil imports. To gain access to these resources, China shows no qualms about catering to some of the worst governments. The fact is that China is ignoring western sanctions and redrawing the usual geopolitical map to help it level whatever advantages the U.S. may have.

The U.S.-China Commission—again, talking about the Commission that

spent 4 years looking at this—has been doing an outstanding job in translating how recent these events affect our national security. Their observations in the 2004 U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission report demand our attention.

The Commission outlines how China's energy search has both economic and security concerns for the United States:

China's rising energy demand has put added pressure on global petroleum supplies and prices. Indeed, the recent escalation in gasoline prices in the United States has been attributed, in part, to the impact of China's growing pressure on world oil supplies and the absence of any mechanism in place to counter this pressure and maintain stable prices for consumers. . . . China's growing energy needs, linked to its rapidly expanding economy, are creating economic and security concerns for the United States. China's energy security policies are driving it into bilateral arrangements that undermine multilateral efforts to stabilize oil supplies and prices, and in some cases may involve dangerous weapons transfers.

I plan on giving another speech highlighting the significance of these illegal weapons transfers, followed by a resolution to effect the Commission's recommendations. This is a critical issue and will become a greater threat as we continue to ignore it; I hope America is listening.

I would like to say it goes far beyond that. When you have people like Chavez making statements that they would defeat America not with guns but with the economy, or with oil, we have a very serious problem.

I was disturbed over the last few years with not just the nuclear capabilities that China has and is trading with other countries, such as North Korea and Iran, but also with their conventional weapons. It took a lot of courage back in 1998 for General John Jumper to stand up and say publicly that now the Russians have a better strike vehicle than we have in the United States—better than our F-15s and F-16s, speaking of the SU-30 and SU-31 series. Yet China purchased about 240 of these vehicles. It is not just their nuclear and economic capability in trading with countries that are potentially dangerous to the United States but also their nuclear and conventional base.

I will look forward to delivering a floor speech on China.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Energy Plan

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I rise to talk about the overdue need for a long-term domestic energy plan, one

that reflects the needs of a 21st century economy that will depend on a reliable, modernized electric grid.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced bipartisan, comprehensive energy legislation in each of the three previous Congresses and, as a member of that body's Energy and Commerce Committee, examined and investigated the energy crisis in California and the massive blackouts in the Northeast two summers ago.

Out of these two fiascos emerged a common theme: Without an aggressive rehabilitation and modernization of this Nation's transmission grid, we are bound for more brownouts, blackouts, and forced outages, and an inability to deal with the capacity needs of an economy that grows in the future.

Earlier this year, I introduced, along with Senators LANDRIEU and LOTT, S. 498, the Interstate Transmission Act, which addresses the fundamental elements necessary for a successful electricity policy. The bill sets out to achieve three goals:

No. 1, to ensure reliability;

No. 2, to modernize the transmission grid;

No. 3, to reaffirm the role of State and Federal regulators.

In this year's State of the Union Address, President Bush challenged the Congress to pass an energy bill that modernizes the electricity grid. S. 498 achieves exactly that goal. How do we do it?

No. 1, mandatory reliability standards. The Interstate Transmission Act makes a mandatory set of reliability standards for the electric grid. Currently, the North American Electric Reliability Council, or, as we call it, NERC, has standards and guidelines and criteria for assuring the transmission of electricity through the system is secure and reliable. However, compliance with the standards of NERC is voluntary. It is not subject to any Government oversight.

The standards in our bill are the product of consensus and cooperation, and the language is identical to the reliability language from the energy conference report that received 58 votes in the Senate.

In its 2004 report on the U.S.-Canadian blackout of 2003, the bilateral committee tasked with investigating the blackout made as its No. 1 recommendation that Congress enact mandatory reliability standards.

Without mandatory rules on the books for reliability standards, we will continue to leave our grid and our country vulnerable to another massive blackout like the one the Northeast experienced.

No. 2, we need to attract new investment in transmission. While investment in the generation sector of electricity has resulted in the construction of new powerplants, these gains in supply are negated by a substandard electric transmission grid. It is estimated that the transmission investment over the past 25 years has declined at a rate of \$115 million per year.

Additional research further indicates that there needs to be an investment of at least \$56 billion in the transmission sector to upgrade existing lines and add additional capacity in order to meet existing peak electricity demands over the course of the next decade. It is currently projected, however, that the industry will only spend an average of \$3 billion each year during the decade on upgrades and new transmission lines.

Wall Street is not promoting the transmission sector as a worthy investment. Why? Because it is not particularly profitable to invest in transmission today because it takes over 30 years to realize gains on transmission investments. Even with the good news we continue to hear about the economy, people can invest in other places and realize greater profits and quicker returns on their investment. Thus regulators must implement policies that ensure quicker, more attractive returns on investment in transmission.

The legislation I have introduced allows FERC to adopt transmission rules to promote capital investment in the system, improve operation of the system, and allow for returns to investors reflecting financial, operational, and other risks inherent in transmission investments.

Let me give you a great example of how innovative capital investments can spur the upgrade of the grid. It is estimated that electricity consumption in the West has grown 60 percent in the last 20 years. Yet transmission capacity has only grown 20 percent.

Last week, the Governors of California, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming unveiled the "Frontier Line Project," a series of new transmission lines spanning 1,300 miles from Wyoming to California. Knowing of how fast southern California and Nevada are growing, it would seem that as an investor, one would naturally be drawn to providing capital to build out this project. Yet these Governors are relying on State money and matching funds from DOE to make up the \$2 billion it will cost to have the lines up and running by 2011. Granted the utility customers receiving the power will pay back the States for the project, but is the rate of return on what looks like such a needed project so low that we have to ask cash-strapped States to put money upfront to pay for these lines?

Mr. President, I sense the need to conclude. I believe my colleagues understand just how severe the challenge and the threat is to this country. We have to address these three things. We have to have a vibrant transmission grid. The Interstate Transmission Act will accomplish all these goals.

In the State of the Union Address, the President made it clear that 4 years of debate is enough; Congress needs to pass legislation that makes America more secure and less dependent upon foreign energy. I agree with the President that 4 years is enough. A fundamental, sound economy is only as

stable as a fundamental, sound energy policy. I urge my colleagues to support S. 498. Let's get back on track and be prepared for the future.

NATIONAL PARKS WEEK

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, one of the things that all of us enjoy a great deal and are very proud of are our national parks. I call attention to this week, which is National Parks week, April 18 to 24. It is the time when we can recognize all of those wonderful places that have been set aside. We will have a number of events take place this week to commemorate our national parks.

Famed western author Wallace Stegner once said:

National parks are the best idea we ever had. Absolutely American, absolutely democratic—they reflect us at our best rather than our worst.

Our uniquely American idea began with the creation of Yellowstone Park, the world's first national park, in 1872. I am very proud to say that this park is in Wyoming, my home State. As a matter of fact, I grew up 25 miles out of the gates of Yellowstone Park, and I certainly believe it is one of the great parks we have.

Since that time, of course, we have adopted more. We have exported and adopted worldwide this idea of parks, something of which we can be very proud. America's gift to the world is the theme of our National Parks Week this year, a very fitting theme.

Each year, more than 260 million people from all over the world visit our 388 national park units in our national park system. Collectively, of course, these sites reflect our heritage. We have an amazing array of resources, whether it is Teton Park, the Everglades of Florida, or Alaska, and the Service includes natural resources, cultural resources, historic sites commemorating events, significant people and places in our history, and memorials to fallen defenders of our Nation. Visitors to the parks enjoy these through the services provided by employees and, increasingly, the park volunteers and partners. I am amazed at the number of people who volunteer to not only show people around the parks but to do much of the work there.

I recognize and thank these employees, these volunteers, the partners who work in organizations that support the foundations of our parks. I certainly suggest to all of you that you give some thought this week to our national parks.

As the chairman of the subcommittee, I will work to continue to assure the national parks meet the standard of our world today.

SENATOR JIM JEFFORDS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is with sadness and appreciation I come to the floor today to speak about the announcement my colleague from