

of the largest clean coal sources in the lower 48 States, in Utah's Grand Escalante National Monument. This administration has been opposed to any new nuclear power plants and has been opposed to waste disposal.

This administration is importing more oil than ever with regulations and taxes designed to close our domestic oil industry. It is closing vast areas to gas development in the outer continental shelf. Due to extreme environmental policies, domestic reserves of oil and gas in the Rocky Mountains are too expensive to produce. And possibly more importantly, in the Rocky Mountains, pipelines are tougher than ever to permit. We must be able to increase domestic crude oil production not only to help alleviate the risks to our national security but also to make energy in the United States more affordable.

This administration is importing more oil than ever, with regulations and taxes designed to close our domestic oil industry.

We have a wealth of untapped energy resources in this country and yet we can't get at them because this administration keeps throwing up barriers through needless rules and regulations.

Why should we have to depend on any foreign energy resource when we have it setting right here in our backyard.

I implore this administration to wake up and start working on a solution to this crisis so that our national security will not be jeopardized, and our constituents can know and appreciate stable energy prices.

This bill, the Oil Price Reduction Act, is a step in the right direction.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. We have heard a lot today about OPEC and sending the message to OPEC and how there was an expression of surprise that OPEC would be fixing prices. Well, they have been doing it since 1960. It should not come as a surprise. Is OPEC a problem? Of course OPEC is a problem. At the same time, there was reference to Secretary Richardson being dispatched by the President.

Let us go back a bit in history. In 1990, it was President Bush that dispatched a half a million men and women in combat to the Gulf. Let us be candid. They were not dispatched there to safeguard democracy. They went there to protect economic interests of the United States. They went there because of the oil. Not only did we fail to remove Saddam Hussein, but when we had the leverage in terms of our relationship with OPEC, when they needed us, what happened, when we could have absolutely once and for all crushed the cartel? Nothing happened. That is what happened. That is why we are in the problem today. Not because of the failure of this administration but what went on back in 1990.

Mr. Chairman, with gas prices hitting record highs, approaching the \$2-a-gallon mark, con-

sumers are understandably searching for villains. OPEC is an easy target.

Last year, OPEC removed about 6 percent of world production from the market. These cutbacks have significantly reduced worldwide stockpiles of crude oil and refined petroleum products, and nearly tripled crude oil prices to around \$30 a barrel.

According to the Energy Department, this winter distillate fuel stocks nationwide were nearly 32 percent below last year. The supply shortfall was even more severe in the Northeast, where distillate fuel stocks were 13 million barrels below average levels.

The Clinton administration's sluggish response has made it another easy target, especially when the original rationale for inaction was "Sorry, can't intervene. Leave it to market forces."

I, for one, believe government intervention is entirely appropriate. When the price of home heating oil triples in a few weeks, the public interest demands that we help. I believe we must act aggressively to lower prices by increasing supplies; provide additional relief to the most vulnerable; and combat any anti-competitive actions—both domestically and abroad.

While we're sorting causes from effects, let's look a little deeper.

It should come as no surprise that OPEC is a cartel. We've known that since 1973. And we haven't done much about it for almost 20 years.

When American troops marched toward Iraq in 1991, their mission was broader than saving democracy in Kuwait. They were also there to keep our hands on the oil spigot. When former President Bush had the leverage to keep that spigot open, he blew it.

By failing to take care on the cartel then, former President Bush allowed American families today to be held hostage to OPEC nations.

Now, almost a decade later, there's a chorus of outrage against OPEC. And for good reason—the cartel's continued efforts to restrain supply has affected prices throughout the world.

But when there is a drastic price hike in home heating oil—as much as 300 percent in a year, and 100 percent in just a few weeks—when the majority of supplies come from domestic producers, then factors other than OPEC reductions may be at work. When I hear accounts of a \$9 per barrel fee assessed on crude oil during the refining process in domestic ports, then we have an obligation to oppose any unscrupulous actions by domestic producers, too. And an obligation to intervene.

Beyond stepping up pressure on OPEC to boost production, I support an immediate release of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to exert a downward pressure on prices. This is a step that is completely within our discretion.

Back in 1991, within hours of the first air strike against Iraq, former President Bush authorized a draw-down of the reserve. When the Energy Department activated it, crude prices plummeted by nearly \$10 per barrel overnight, falling below \$20 per barrel for the first time since the original invasion.

Some of our colleagues oppose a draw-down out of blind faith in the "invisible hand" of market forces. To them, I ask, what about price supports for domestic cartels—for example, for dairy farmers.

Why a helping hand for farmers, but no hand for the elderly trying to heat their homes, or the small independent trucker trying to bring goods to the market?

So let's be clear. OPEC production cuts are a big factor. But there's a lot more to this current crisis, and a lot more at our disposal than relying on OPEC production to increase supplies and reduce prices.

For instance, what about suspicions of domestic price gouging? Yes, it's possible there are culprits within our own borders.

The fact that fees are added at different points along the process of moving crude oil to consumers—from processors to refiners to shippers to dealers—makes it hard to pin down all the factors which have contributed to the price spikes. No matter who you blame or how you calculate it, however, consumers are now paying two-and-a-half times the cost of crude straight out of the ground.

Although milder weather is on its way, we can not wait idly for the sun to shine and for OPEC to convene next week while soaring gas prices continue to afflict and affect families and businesses.

So, I rise in support of immediate action. With or without this bill, the Administration has the authority to withhold foreign assistance. It has the authority to draw down from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. It has the authority to create heating oil reserves to provide supplies to cushion against future shortages and price hikes. The Congress has the authority to broaden LIHEAP to struggling families who can't pay exorbitant heating bills, and to invest more in energy conservation and renewables to wean us off dependency on foreign oil and help our environment.

At a time when U.S. taxpayers are suffering, our government has every right—and an obligation—to press OPEC countries, who receive substantial U.S. aid, to consider the impact of their policies on the streets of the United States. I urge the administration to act now—and to learn from and help compensate for the mistakes of almost a decade ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAXTON) assumed the chair.

□

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□

OIL PRICE REDUCTION ACT OF 2000

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the enthusiasm of the Committee on International Relations to bring forward something to at least focus the Nation's attention on the energy price increase we have had in the

last 3 or 4 months. I cannot applaud, though, their work product. I am going to oppose the bill. I am going to insist on a point of order on the amendments that should have been before the subcommittee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Energy and Power of the Committee on Commerce.

I want to point out one fact. In the fiscal year that just ended, the United States of America gave directly in foreign aid, military aid, economic aid and food aid to the OPEC nations \$197.9 million. Based on \$30 per barrel for oil, that is less than one day's supply of imports of oil to this country. So if the amendment as reported out of the Committee on International Relations had kept the teeth in it and if the President of the United States had dictated that all of our aid be suspended to the OPEC nations that have engaged in their cartel, it would have impacted the cartel by one day of oil imports to this Nation. I hope we will oppose the bill and work for responsible solutions.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this bill does absolutely nothing to help working families cope with higher energy prices but frankly we can expect an energy bill without content from a Republican Party without an energy policy. Just take a look at their record. They want to lay the blame elsewhere. But they slashed \$1.3 billion from energy efficient programs that would reduce our dependence on gas and oil. They wanted to sell off the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. They wanted to abolish the Department of Energy. They will not reauthorize the President's authority to draw down from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We had an opportunity here last night with amendments that were offered to set up a Northeast Petroleum Reserve in order to deal with home heating oil, to look at tax incentives for our domestic production of gas and oil, renewable sources of energy, all kinds of ways in which we could address the problem that people are facing today in this country.

And what did they say? No. They said no because this is about politics. This is not about an energy policy. What we need to do is to look people straight in the eye and say, this is what we want to do to help you cope with the high cost of energy.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of this measure, the Oil Price Reduction Act, although it will not do that but I think it is important that we do send a signal that we are concerned about this issue and that we recognize this issue hits at the very heart of America's prosperity and it hits at every American family.

I want to make a couple of observations, though. This is a bipartisan

issue, and it really deserves some bipartisan solutions. Unfortunately my Republican colleagues in many instances chose to play politics. They denied concrete amendments which would have really done something, amendments to use the strategic reserve to calm the marketplace, amendments to provide incentives for greater production, a reserve that could help the Northeast with home heating costs. Those are real action items that we could have done on a bipartisan basis but they said no and blocked the amendments.

Second, I want to observe that since they have been running this place for the last 6 years, they could have instituted an energy policy that would have made us self-reliant. They have not done so.

Third, I want to observe that this bill is not a bad idea but it does not do anything more than the President already can do. So let us not oversell this. The President has the right to engage in these negotiations. He should and in point of fact he is doing so in the form of a quiet diplomacy that we believe will yield positive results when OPEC meets. But it is important that we do send a signal and Congress in fact does have a role.

What am I saying? Simply this. We need to say to our foreign oil-producing allies that there is a link between your cooperation and our generosity in foreign aid. When I look at the foreign aid request of Indonesia for \$135 million, of Nigeria for \$80 million, of Russia for \$252 million, I believe these countries can play a constructive role in helping us lower oil prices. I do not think we should have to beg. I think we should send an important signal to them which this bill does. That is, that we are serious about oil prices in this country and we expect and hope that our allies will be supportive. I think that is an important first step. But we need to do more. It needs to be more concrete and we need to do it on a bipartisan basis.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA).

Mr. MASCARA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to call attention to the threat that rising oil prices pose to our economy. We are witnessing the most drastic price increases since the oil crisis of the 1970s. Many of my colleagues recall the devastating impact of high oil prices during that period. Long lines at the pumps and rationing were only modest inconveniences compared to the economic impact of double-digit inflation, soaring interest rates and high unemployment.

We are at a crossroads. We need to act now. Our country's economic well-being depends on how we respond to this crisis. The United States has been fair and generous towards oil-producing nations. We have invested in their economies; we have rescued their

currencies from collapse; we have risked the lives of our men and women to defend their sovereignty.

Now we must go begging for fairness. OPEC is playing Russian roulette with the world's economy. While there are serious questions as to whether this bill in its final form will be effective, our oil-producing friends need to know and understand that we mean business.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, this resolution is an imposter. Its very name, the Oil Price Reduction Act, is a trick and a deception. If we wanted to do something about it and we must, that is, the price of oil, we know what we have to do. But the majority party here has refused to do it. You have refused to allow a bill on the floor which will allow us to tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to deal with price fluctuations. You have refused to allow a bill on the floor which will establish a home heating oil reserve in the Northeast to deal with the cost of home heating in that part of the country. You have refused to deal with a bill, and bring a bill out on the floor which will reduce the consumption of oil through transportation, particularly through automobiles. You have refused to bring legislation out on the floor which will allow this one to be amended which would allow for conservation and for the development of alternative energy.

All of these things are needed. Yet you have refused to do any one of them. Instead, what you have done is dragged this imposter out here to pretend you are doing something when it is clear you are doing nothing.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, let me tell Members what this bill does, and I read: "It shall be the policy of the United States to consider the extent to which major net oil exporting countries engage in oil price-fixing to be an important determinant in the overall political, economic and security relationship between the United States and these countries."

This bill requires a report. It requires a study. And in fact if it does what I think it will do, it will label these OPEC nations as price-fixing. They have raised this price of oil at over \$30 a barrel, and that has increased the price at the gas pump from 98 cents a year ago to, in my district, \$1.55 this weekend.

That is not acceptable. As I have told my constituents and as they have told me, we need to respond to this. What we ought to be doing if we can label these folks, any sixth, seventh grade economic individual can tell you, they have cut off our oil, which has raised the price. They have turned off the spigot not only to the United States but to the rest of the world as well and we ought to turn off the spigot on

them. Economic aid, foreign military aid, it ought to go until they open up the spigot back on us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

□ 1715

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, Congress has awesome power when it wants to act but today that power is being squandered. American consumers are being price gouged by an unholy alliance of OPEC and big oil.

The gentleman who preceded me wants to do a study to see if they are price gouging. Oh, come on. Did the gentleman see the movie *Casa Blanca*? This is ridiculous. We know price gouging, price fixing is going on. It is time, it is past time, to act. Concrete actions could be taken today on the floor but they will not be allowed by the majority because they fly in the face of big oil, their campaign sponsors.

We could ban the export of oil from Alaska. We could file a complaint in the World Trade Organization for these violations of their charter. We could reinstitute programs which they decimated for conservation for renewable resources. We could give the President the authority to tap the strategic petroleum reserve. There are things we could do.

They want a study. They want to undertake a concerted diplomatic campaign and take the necessary steps to begin negotiations. The White House has already done that and I think they are pathetic steps. You are even more pathetic by telling them to do what they are already doing.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, the problem is, we have to do something because the administration, by their own admission, has been caught napping and they are still napping. And the people of this country and the people of South Dakota cannot afford to wait until the alarm clock goes off. We have farmers and ranchers who are going to be going into the field to plant. We have tourism season coming on in our State, and we have people who travel a long distance between points to get to their destinations.

There is no place that is more dependent upon a reliable energy supply than is my State of South Dakota. The administration has failed in the past. They are currently failing and that is why Congress needs to act. This legislation sends OPEC a very loud and clear message that time and time again we have come to their defense and it is high time for those nations to do what is right, to recognize the past support of the United States and to stop manipulating the supply of the world's oil.

This legislation is an important first step. It calls upon the administration

to take strong measures to see that if there is price-fixing going on, that arms sales and other sales, economic and political measures, are taken to stop the abuse of the oil prices and oil supply crisis.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a hearing on matters pertaining to the soaring costs of gasoline and diesel fuel. Ostensibly the purpose of the hearing was to determine whether consumers would benefit from repealing a 4.3 cents Federal fuel tax, which they would not. Such a proposal is SSI, a simply stupid idea.

Experts in the transportation field, including consumer groups such as the AAA, all said this proposal would have severe adverse effects on our country in terms of highway safety, congestion relief and employment while, at the most, saving the American consumer about fifty cents a week; the price of a pack of chewing gum, if that, because the oil companies would probably take that amount themselves.

What every witness did support, however, is releasing oil from the SPR, and I join them in calling on the President to do so immediately. This is very important within the context of the measure we now consider. I am sure that the President and our former colleague, Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, are doing their best on the diplomatic front, but one cannot fight a cartel without weapons and our best weapon is to turn on the spigots, bring our fuel prices down and show OPEC that we will not be at its mercy, that we will not be held hostage.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues on both sides, the Department of Energy that is caught napping and retired on active duty should be eliminated; that an energy policy where they said we were in the majority, I would like to remind my colleagues that the President vetoed our energy policy. The President vetoed our bill when we wanted to open up ANWR, and we are asking him to change that policy and to review those kinds of policies.

I would ask the President, when he took over the Utah coal, who was his direct competitor? It was a guy named Mr. Trie. And guess what? He doubled the price of coal that he sells to China, and yet the DNC gets millions of dollars from Trie and Huang and Riady, and yet when we look at the Spratly Islands and China and the oil reserves there, fighting both Japan and the Philippine Islands, there has been zero taken care of and we are asking the President, any foreign policy to take a look and to change that. I think that is legitimate.

I would say that I am just as upset at OPEC as my colleagues on the other

side of the aisle. We had men and women die to support the freedom for Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Qatar, and I think it is outrageous what they are doing.

I agree with the gentleman, we in San Diego have seen price-fixing even during normal times. I agree with the gentleman. We ought to do something about that as well. In the meantime, I think it is legitimate to ask the President to come forward and review those policies, both the ones that he has supported and those that he has not; that we have supported. We will join with the President because like my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) talked about, it is the farmers, it is the truckers, it is the consumers that are paying the bill. It is the people in the Northeast that demand heating oil.

So I ask my colleagues to support this resolution and bill.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the reasoned statement of my colleague, the gentleman from California Mr. CUNNINGHAM) that he just made because that is exactly the tone in which we ought to be speaking today; not the continuous blame game that I have heard. That is why I rise to express my great disappointment in this legislation which pathetically fails to address any of the fundamental energy policy questions that Congress and the administration should be working on together to reduce our Nation's dependence on foreign energy sources.

Unfortunately, this legislation is a knee-jerk reaction which is targeted towards publicity far more than solving our long-term needs. Right now consumers are paying high gasoline and diesel prices at the pump and folks in the Northeast faced very high home heating costs this winter. These are very serious problems, just as critically low oil prices were serious problems only 14 months ago.

Over a 2-year period, our Nation lost over 500,000 barrels per day of domestic oil and gas production when prices were so low that it cost more to find and produce crude than could be made by selling it.

When prices are so low that our domestic producers are forced out of business, our Nation's dependence on foreign oil inevitably increases. Now that we depend on foreign sources for almost 60 percent of our fuel demands, we begin to see the folly of our earlier inaction.

We cannot afford to continue ignoring the desperate need for a comprehensive energy policy which encourages and promotes domestic production of oil and gas, provides for incentives for renewable energy sources, and reduces our Nation's dependence on foreign oil.

Congress should act, and to my friends on this side of the aisle they would be surprised how many Democrats are willing to reach out and work with them.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of our committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for stepping up to the plate at a time when the American people are being hurt and being hurt badly.

The fact is, this administration, the Clinton administration, should have acted a year ago and finally it takes us in Congress and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and his leadership to step up to try to do something about this actual theft of money from the American people.

What is happening? We are talking about hundreds of dollars being taken out of the pockets of each and every American family by an international, a criminal conspiracy, to control the prices on oil and gas.

This was not a covert conspiracy. A year ago, OPEC openly worked, blatantly and openly decided that they were going to cut production in order to bring up prices. Where was the Clinton administration? It is supposed to be watching out for the well-being of our people. This is the worst regressive tax we can have. It is hurting the very poorest and middle-class people in America that can be hurt. This is taking the money out of people's salary; it is taking money out of their pockets that they would spend on food, et cetera.

Let us make it clear here, what is happening is OPEC has gotten together in a conspiracy to raise prices. This administration did nothing over a full year and now the prices are going through the roof and the American people are seeing that their standard of living is going down. That is what is happening.

Now the bottom line is that makes it even worse, this administration could have done something. Some of these people involved in this conspiracy to raise prices, we are defending them, whether it is Saudi Arabia or Kuwait, friends of ours. We have troops over there right now defending them. And this administration does not use that as leverage to try to get them to treat the American people fairly?

This is an insult to the American people that after defending these people they end up taking us to the cleaners; they end up hurting our people; they end up decreasing the standard of living or the well-being of the American people down after we have defended them. That is an insult.

It is incompetence on the part of this administration or cowardice that they have not confronted those people in OPEC, used the leverage that we have

and said if they are going to abuse the American people we are not going to defend them anymore.

Believe me, had we done that we would have gotten their attention. Instead, by the time this gets fixed, there will be billions of dollars being taken out of the pockets of the American people and it is going to hurt some people's lives here.

I salute the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for stepping up to the plate. I am just sorry that this administration did not do the same.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, legislation should not be necessary. The President and Congress should mutually sign a letter and send the letter to the kings and monarchs of these OPEC countries and tell them the next time they are attacked call Mobile Oil in the rotary because we are not going to defend them.

Mr. Chairman, OPEC is not the only villain. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) should not have objected to the Traficant amendment. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) should not object to the Traficant amendment, and I may test the ruling of the Chair.

In the 1970s, OPEC was blamed when American companies kept tankers out in the ocean denying the product, artificially driving up the prices.

OPEC is not the only villain. American companies are taking license with this increase and gouging our citizens. My amendment would force an investigation and if it proves that this, in fact, occurred, a fine of up to \$100 million would be imposed on American companies who rip us off.

First of all, I think we should send the letter and say the next time they are attacked, call the rotary.

I may appeal the ruling of the Chair, and I am asking the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) to listen carefully to the Traficant amendment. It deals with the other side of the issue.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Oil Price Reduction Act encourages President Clinton to take stronger action against those involved in price-fixing, but he is already doing that. This energy crisis should really be a wake-up call for Congress to seriously reconsider our current energy policy, and there is no better time than now to take up real long-term solutions.

Secretary Richardson's diplomatic efforts are the right thing to do, and I am hopeful like all of us are, that OPEC will reconsider its production policy when it meets.

According to press accounts, Saudi Arabia, Norway, Mexico, and Venezuela say they are in favor of raising production levels. Now this is good news. The President's initiative to strengthen

America's energy security, particularly his \$1.4 billion investment in energy efficiency and alternative energy technology, is a right step. However, now is the time for Congress to push for long-term solutions. Now is the time to encourage stronger energy efficiency standards.

The State of California, for example, is leading the Nation in requiring the development of electrical and hybrid vehicles, which is an excellent example of how we both reduce emissions and also reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and also emissions.

□ 1730

Now is really certainly the time to invest in alternative fuels and renewable energy. Currently, in my district, Alameda Contra Costa Transit Company is taking great strides to invest in fuel cell engines, which offers a very promising alternative and is a zero emissions energy source.

Now is the time to encourage a wider spread use of mass transits. As in many cities across the Nation understand, increasing our investment in buses and light rail will help reduce traffic congestion, pollution and our dependence on gas.

Now is the time to end our dependence on OPEC oil. For example, there are numerous countries in Africa, such as Angola and some off the west coast of Africa, that are examples of oil-producing countries with promising opportunities for the United States.

In my district in Northern California, prices rose by 15 cents to \$1.66 in early March. Now my constituents are looking at gas prices of almost \$2.00 and above. This has got to stop. Low-income wage earners can barely make it in many areas across our country with the high cost of housing. They can ill afford these high prices for gas and oil. Our response to their concerns must start by promising to never allow this to happen again by committing ourselves to long-term solutions.

The time is now for us to really be for real, by getting down to work for a consumer-friendly national energy policy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Oil Price Reduction Act. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for his timely response to address this energy crisis.

I believe that this bill is a step in the right direction. Last winter we in the Northeast were feeling the economic sting of this oil crisis due to high heating oil and diesel prices. Now, with increased gasoline prices, the rest of the country is feeling the pain we in the Northeast have experienced for the last 3 months.

I was going to offer an amendment today that would require a report from

the administration distilling what our national energy policy really is and how we can reduce our dependency on foreign oil. Although this amendment was printed in the RECORD, I have been informed that it is not germane.

The thrust of my amendment was to address the question everyone is asking: Why did we not see this coming? Why were we not prepared to meet it?

I am here today to work with you and the Members of this Chamber to find the answers to these questions and also to make sure that we will never again be held hostage by the princes and potentates of the Middle East. These are the same friends for whom a decade ago we risked our sons' and daughters' lives to protect against Iraqi aggression.

The bottom line is that we lack a coherent national energy policy to insulate us from volatility in the markets. To my knowledge, the only visible policy this administration has demonstrated is to have Secretary of Energy Richardson globe-trot to palaces in the Middle East to plead and petition those princes to ease our burden.

As this drama unfolds and more bankruptcies pile up, more independent trucks will be idled, parked or sold, another farmer will go out of business, another family will have their budget busted.

On the 27th, OPEC will meet to determine our near-term economic future. We should not have to wait on OPEC to determine our economic future. OPEC may extend the existing production cuts; and according to the international energy agency, global supplies could be as much as 3 million barrels per day below demand. Now we have to have a coherent energy policy so that we are working towards a long-term solution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone recognizes that we are in the midst of a serious crisis. The leadership of the House decides for this serious crisis that each side will have one-half hour for the discussion; that any amendments that would directly affect the supply, availability of product, alternative energy, any attempt to provide additional support for the strategic petroleum reserve, will be out of order.

Think about this: it may be understandable that the leadership of this House, for the 6 years they have been in control, they have stopped every effort at increasing the fuel efficiency of automobiles, that they have resisted filling the strategic petroleum reserve, and now sit on that legislation which expires this month and refuses to reauthorize it.

All that may have been understandable for the last 6 years, that ideologically they felt government had no role in energy policy, that we did not need to invest in more efficient automobiles and weatherizing homes and having a

substantial strategic reserve, in working on alternative energy policy, on conservation programs. But now we have been awakened again. We now find ourselves in a created crisis. OPEC has used its coordinating production policy to drive up the price of heating oil, first; and as the heating oil season demands are reduced, we are now seeing the impact on gasoline prices.

What is the response from the Republican leadership? We are going to have a half-hour on each side to discuss sending the President a request for a report.

It seems to me that we owe our constituents more; that the gentleman from New York may be restricted by jurisdiction, but clearly the Committee on Rules and the leadership of this House could have brought to the floor legislation that starts today that would authorize this strategic petroleum reserve.

The Speaker of the House and the Committee on Rules could have brought to the floor legislation to help us create new energy through conservation. Every study indicates you can produce more energy dollar for dollar through conservation, insulation and weatherization than even drilling for new oil in proven fields.

In the 1970s, as we began to press the automobile industry to increase the fuel efficiency of cars, time and time again we were told you could not do so. Time and time again we were told by the automobile industry, you cannot get cars that Americans will drive to get 20 or 22 miles to the gallon.

Again, I tell you, I was thinking about when my children graduated from college. I was in a Chevrolet dealer, and I looked at a brand new Corvette. Twenty-seven miles to the gallon, fun to drive, fast, a substantial car. Family cars getting 22, 25, 26 and 30 miles to the gallon.

We do not have to tell people who need large vehicles or large trucks they cannot have them. We merely must demand that the fleet averages are increased. But, no, the Republican leadership in the House has, year after year, prevented the Clinton administration from moving forward to increase automobile standards.

If we had as illogical a system for electric energy as we have for heating oil in the Northeast, there would be criminal charges against the administrators. It is as if we would allow the electric companies to shut down half the generating capacity, and then be shocked when we were short of power in August.

We have had the lowest reserves, we have had the whole system changed to just-on-time delivery; and yet today, when the Congress has been doing virtually nothing, we do not take the time to pass a Northeast reserve for heating oil.

Again, we are given 30 generous minutes to discuss the very limited jurisdiction the gentleman from New York has for his bill, which was even further

shrunk by the Committee on Rules; and, no, we cannot deal with the strategic reserve, we cannot deal with the heating oil reserve for the Northeast, we cannot deal with conservation measures.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Northeast heating oil reserve is on the books. It is on the books. The Clinton administration has asked that it be repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, in closing, what is clear here is we have had an extended period of time of the most powerful economy in the history of this country. We have had a situation where it may be reasonable to assume that both the administration and Congress went to sleep. At least the Republicans refused to move any conservation legislation forward.

Today, and for the last several months, we have had the wake-up call. We have had a wake-up call that there is a crisis; 60,000 barrels from Alaska go to Japan. We have a situation today where that oil ought to be coming home here to the United States. We ought to be working on conservation. We ought not wait even for this administration.

We ought to be doing more than having a 30-minute discussion about a bill that asks the President to send us a report about a crisis we well understand. We need to move legislation from the House to protect the people we were sent here to represent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to press the Speaker and the leadership of this House to move positive legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, section 157(a)(1) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is entitled Regional Petroleum Reserve. It gives the strategic petroleum reserve plan. It shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Regional Petroleum Reserve in, or readily accessible to, each Federal Energy Administration Region, as defined in title 10, Code of Federal Regulations in effect on November 1, 1975.

It is in effect today. The Clinton administration has sent a letter to my subcommittee asking this be repealed.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this measure has revealed that

there a strong sentiment in the House regarding the recent sharp rise in world oil prices and the impact these increases have had on our Nation's economy.

There is also a clear understanding among our Members that these increases have not been produced by any natural economic force in an open and free marketplace, but by the concerted effort of a cartel, a cartel fixing higher prices for its product by restricting supply.

I am fully aware, Mr. Chairman, that a number of our Members would have preferred that this bill address a number of broader energy policy issues, such as the establishment of the heating oil reserve, the release of the oil in the strategic petroleum reserve, and a wide range of tax credits and incentives for increased domestic production. Some too prefer an even tougher approach to those petroleum exporters that have engaged in price-fixing to the detriment of our Nation's economy.

While I am sympathetic to those views, I am convinced that upon the whole, this measure is balanced, forward looking, and prescribes a policy that the administration may pursue to address and alleviate this problem.

This is a first and perhaps the most concrete step that the Congress will take in addressing the problem caused by the recent excessive increase in the price of oil. By adopting this measure, the House will be sending a strong signal to the OPEC countries and to other petroleum exporters that also are artificially restricting their oil production that continued price-fixing efforts to prop up the price of oil will be an important consideration in our overall foreign policy considerations.

Although our Nation has one of the most unselfish approaches to its foreign policy of all the world's nations, when countries that benefit from our good will conspire to harm our interests, economic or otherwise of the America people, we will respond accordingly. While our energy requirements may make us dependent, we are not powerless.

Accordingly, to address our oil crisis, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 3822, the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000. Like most Americans, I am deeply troubled by the sharp increase in the price of petroleum products, as well as their impact. Fuel oil is especially crucial in the Northeast, and in my home state of New Jersey, where about one-third of the residents heat their homes with oil. Middle class families and seniors on fixed incomes cannot afford the nearly doubling of their heating oil expenses.

It requires the President to send Congress a report explaining our security, economic, and trade relationships with Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries' (OPEC) members and other key oil exporting countries. And it requires the President to outline the diplomatic efforts that we are taking to convince all oil exporting nations that price fixing is wrong,

and that volatile oil prices will have a negative effect on the world economy. Additionally, it requires the Administration to take the steps necessary to dismantle oil price fixing arrangements.

I believe that just the threat of action, such as exemplified by the Oil Price Reduction Act, has already encouraged OPEC and other oil exporting nations to change their production quotas. Mexico, Norway, and Venezuela are already on record supporting an increase in crude oil production, and next week OPEC nations will meet to discuss raising their quotas. We need to continue this diplomatic momentum and pass this bill today.

Unfortunately, for too long, the Clinton Administration, particularly, Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, has seemed satisfied with a wait and see attitude. I reject this approach. If we just wait around for prices to drop on their own, people will go bankrupt and the economy could catch a nasty bout of inflation. I am worried that the Clinton Administration is playing with fire here through its inaction.

The administration should have been addressing the energy crisis with oil exporting nations on a daily basis and it should have long ago been applying pressure where and when it was needed. The Oil Price Reduction Act will force the Administration to stay focused on the need for stable and reasonable oil prices and get tough with oil price fixing countries. If the United States told oil exporting nations that we would be forming an international cartel to raise the price of grains and bread by 200 or 300 percent, they would be the first to yell 'foul,' and they would be justified in doing so. But I fail to see why the Clinton Administration's diplomacy is so bereft of outrage.

The OPEC cartel's production cuts have unquestionably been the catalyst for rising oil prices, driving the price per barrel from \$11 in December of 1998 to over \$30 a barrel today. While we have recently been somewhat effective in our energy related discussions with OPEC, the Oil Price Reduction Act will ensure that we take the critical steps necessary to identify the threats to our energy security, develop options and a coherent plan, and effectively pursue policies that will stabilize world prices and head off price fixing arrangements that threaten the U.S. and world economies.

Middle class American families, senior citizens of fixed incomes, and truck drivers cannot afford inaction. The Oil Price Reduction Act will help lower prices and provide a mechanism to guard against future price fixing schemes.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000.

The increase in gas prices over the last 12 months has been the largest in history.

Last week I received a call from an independent trucker in my district asking Congress to do something about the sharp increase in the price of fuel. He is currently paying \$200 more a week for fuel than he was paying less than a year ago. This is money that comes directly from his pocket. It is money that should be going toward taking care of his family—not to a cartel of oil billionaires.

This gentleman called my office pleading for help. Help that has not been delivered by the current administration, whose own Secretary of Energy admitted that they were not prepared when the problem arose. The Energy Secretary has stated "We were caught napping. We got complacent."

The Oil Price Reduction Act calls upon the President to implement a foreign policy related to oil producing nations who are involved in price-fixing. A policy that would help stem the type of energy crisis we are seeing right now. A policy that for almost 8 years, the Clinton-Gore administration has done nothing to develop.

I ask for your support of this bill to send a message to the international community that the United States government takes the price-fixing of foreign oil very seriously. This is an important step in providing relief for constituents in my district and throughout the country.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, for the life of me, I cannot understand why we are debating a bill that does absolutely nothing to address the problem at hand. H.R. 3822 is not even a band-aid solution to the problem—it is mere lip service.

When is this House going to have a real debate on national energy policy—or better yet, our lack of one?

I have no doubt that every Member in this House is concerned about the economic ramifications of the recent oil price spike. When the price of gas at the pump goes up drastically in just a week, everyone feels it in his pocket. This unexpected economic hardship on the consuming public and the economy is of great concern to us all.

But where was the concern in late 1997, 1998, and 1999, when the domestic oil and gas industry was being decimated by eighteen (18) months of historically low prices? During that time, the federal government stood by and watched as thousands upon thousands of independents—many of whom were Texans with family-owned businesses that had been in operation for generations—called it quits. The government did nothing to help those producers.

Now, I know it is hard for Members from non-producing states to care much about the price of gas when it is rock-bottom cheap. The economy buzzes along and the consuming public benefits at the pump. But Members from producing states feel the crunch at both ends of this country's wild energy price fluctuations. During that eighteen (18) month period, more than 150,000 oil wells—25 percent of total U.S. oil wells—were shut down, and U.S. industry lost more than 65,000 jobs. Where was the help then?

As policymakers, we need to acknowledge that the boom-and-bust cycle in oil prices—which dropped prices to below \$10 per barrel just last year, then boosted them to more than \$30 in recent days—negatively impacts the economy, the consuming public and the domestic petroleum industry. This country cannot stand by and ignore the implications of an unstable oil market. The benefits we derived from low oil prices last year are quickly stripped away by the high prices of today. No one benefits from this instability.

Furthermore, in addition to the economic disruptions caused by oil price instability, these fluctuations also endanger our national security. When oil prices began dropping to historic lows in November of 1997, independent oil and gas producers lost billions of dollars as foreign governments fought for market share in the U.S., with the express intention of eliminating our domestic production.

As domestic oil production continues to decline, U.S. dependence on foreign oil has actually grown, from 36 percent in 1973, to

about 56 percent today. That makes the U.S. more vulnerable than ever, both militarily and economically, to disruptions in foreign oil supplies.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we recognize that oil is a strategic commodity. It is absolutely vital that the government have policies in place that protect the U.S. oil and gas resource base. Oil is the nation's economic lifeblood, and we need to get ourselves off foreign life support.

This is not an easy task. Now that the price of crude is high, we might make the mistake of assuming that domestic oil and gas producers do not need our assistance. One only has to look to history to know that this assumption is a dangerous one. Prices will continue to wildly fluctuate unless we act now to stabilize the market. The best way we can do that is to take back some of the control we have lost to other oil producing nations.

After the sustained drop in the price of crude in recent years, it will take time and stability for the domestic industry to fully recover. Tax reforms could be a major step toward directing capital to finding and recovering oil and gas in the United States and bringing these resources to market for the benefit of all Americans.

With this goal in mind, I had hoped to bring a package of tax incentives for domestic oil and gas producers to the floor today as an amendment to this bill. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership did not allow my amendment to be made in order. My amendment would have reformed the tax code to provide incentives for domestic oil and gas production and exploration by removing the barriers to capital access that are causing the mass exodus of independent producers from the domestic industry. The lack of foresight and hindsight on this issue is frustrating and troubling to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that we should vote against this bill. It at least brings some level of attention to the underlying problem. But this is clearly an exercise in futility, and I am greatly disappointed that the Republican leadership has chosen to deny us a meaningful debate on the policies that would get to the heart of this country's energy problems. I urge my colleagues and the leadership to join me in a serious effort to craft a national energy policy, one that affords us price stability as well as economic and national security. Our independence and future security depend on it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000, but I regret that the rule has substantially lessened the potential impact of this legislation by preventing the consideration of meaningful proposals to relieve our country's energy crisis.

This bill makes an important statement—the United States will no longer tolerate the manipulation of our energy supplies by a price fixing cartel, and we are prepared to take concrete measures to protect the American people from inadequate supply and astronomical prices. We have the opportunity today to begin dismantling OPEC's unfair and disingenuous pricing policies by investigating the detrimental effects of these policies on the United States economy, and by undertaking decisive diplomatic steps to change the current situation. We have a responsibility to our constituents to ensure that our economy is no longer held hostage to the whims of those countries that export their oil to us.

But while this legislation is a good start to solving our energy problems, it could have been a great deal stronger. We should be debating legislation that explicitly authorizes the President to consider a country's involvement in oil price fixing when making decisions about U.S. assistance or arms sales. We should be debating an amendment to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to increase the supply of oil in the domestic market. And we should be debating an amendment to strengthen programs that develop energy efficient technologies.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a good start, but it doesn't go far enough. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and also to continue to work together to enact the meaningful remedies that we could not debate today.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation that takes a reasonable first step at illuminating the failure of our nation's energy policy.

Gene Sperling, the chief economic advisor in the Clinton Administration might have it right when he calls their dealings with OPEC "Quiet Diplomacy."

"Quiet" is what this Administration's reaction has been since experts began warning of an impending crisis last November. The silence is deafening.

In the Northeast, we've been calling for help for months. I contacted the Administration in January to urge action, and I know many of my colleagues here did as well. We received what I would call a "quiet" response. Our pleas have fallen on deaf ears.

After a winter of economic hardship for so many in the Northeast, Spring breaks with no promise of easing their burden. While the rest of the nation reels from daily-increasing gas prices, we in the Northeast have been suffering for many months.

Mr. Chairman, Northeasterners' budgets continue to get socked, the only difference being it hits at the gas pump instead of their heating oil tanks. Silence from the Clinton Administration.

I would ask the President, when are you going to start feeling our pain?

"Quiet" does not describe the anger of my constituents bearing this burden. "Quiet" does not describe my response or that of my colleagues joining me here today.

We are here to raise the volume on this debate and talk about ensuring a consistent energy policy.

An energy policy that promotes reasonable fuel prices through the growth of domestic oil production.

A policy that supports alternative energy sources, takes the needs of America into account and preserves the environment.

Mr. Chairman, by ending the silence I hope we can forge a consensus and move towards a sound energy policy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, our nation needs a real energy policy rather than allowing ourselves to be surprised with global price changes. We need to support incentives to improve energy efficiency such as tax credits for new energy and alternative fuel technologies, as well as improved efforts to weatherize homes and businesses.

As Charles Krauthammer pointed out in the Washington Post, we are becoming a nation of oil addicts. The past decade has seen an increase in gas-guzzling SUV's and a dramatic increase in the number of vehicle miles trav-

eled. Average fuel efficiency has remained unchanged for the last 10 years. Congress has repeatedly refused to increase CAFE standards for SUV's and light trucks, going so far as to prevent the U.S. Department of Transportation from even studying the impacts on oil consumption and air quality from increased CAFE standards.

In real terms, there have only been four years out of the last 70 where the price of a regular gallon of gasoline was as low as it is today. Gasoline is getting cheaper and cheaper all the time. There are some real problems for home heating oil costs and supply flows, but it is important to put gas prices in perspective.

Nevertheless, we need to make sure that the free market is really free. If that requires legislation, let's get on with it. Everyone needs to play fair and by the rules. Any suspicion that oil producers are artificially "fixing" the price of oil should be investigated fully. Oil producing nations do receive assistance from us, and we need to make sure they understand that unless the free market is allowed to work, we may reconsider future assistance. Our diplomatic efforts should be firm but not heavy-handed.

Our nation cannot afford to set our own energy policy with the assumption that petroleum supplies are unlimited and that we will always have the world's lowest oil prices. Record low oil prices last year made us lazier on conservation and the development of new energy technologies. A kink in the supply chain today could develop into a full blown oil crisis tomorrow. We need to remain vigilant on providing people with more transportation choices and higher efficiency standards to conserve the oil we have.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on this legislation by my good friend from New York (Mr. GILMAN)—not to point fingers at anyone for finding ourselves in the circumstances we find ourselves in today, but simply to make a plea—that we develop and implement a workable national energy policy.

Today's legislation does not do that. In fact it deals mostly with symptoms of the problem—not the underlying problem itself.

OPEC is only a transitory problem. Oil prices rise and oil prices fall—and it has been that way since oil took its place as the fuel of choice for such basic uses as transportation, hearing and industrial processes. The measures contained in this bill to bring the OPEC cartel to its knees are nothing more than a reiteration of authorities that already exist in law today.

One of the real problems is availability of competing fuels in the areas of the country reliant on heating oil. And there are others. Let's look at the northeast. Natural gas provides a clean alternative to heating oil, but they can't burn it in those areas if they can't get it. The federal government can do more to ensure that natural gas is more readily available to industrial New England as well as its residential consumers. I believe fuel competition would do wonders for fuel prices in the Northeast and help clear the air in the process.

Let's work on things like getting natural gas into the northeast—things that we can accomplish—not tilt at windmills like OPEC—which we are unlikely to influence in the short term. The OPEC members will have a falling-out—just like they always do—and prices will fall. Let's pay more attention to what we can do

domestically to avoid the problems of this winter.

I'm going to vote for this bill but without any enthusiasm. I believe it will accomplish little or nothing and it detracts from dealing with the hard issues that really will help bring about stable oil prices. The northeast and the oil patch have a common objective—stable prices, and we ought to have the opportunity to bring legislation to this floor which will do that.

Let's don't kid ourselves. It's easy to beat up on OPEC. The hard part is finding agreement on things that really work—like increasing domestic production, expediting pipeline projects, opening up some of our public lands to exploration and development. When we take on those issues, I will know that we are really serious about finding solutions that will help us out the next time prices run-up. Let's finish our fun today, then turn our attention to the really hard issues.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly support the rule and will support the bill, but I think we should be doing more. The bill, as amended by this rule, would direct the President to undertake diplomatic efforts to convince countries engaged in oil-price fixing that the current high oil price levels will negatively affect global economic growth rates.

I think this is something that the President has been doing all along, but I support this congressional action to emphasize the importance of this strategy.

I am hopeful that the passage of this bill will spark a much-needed global discussion on current high oil prices. But it's not enough for us to hope that this global discussion will result in reduced oil prices. Here at home, we need to remember the importance of seeking out alternative energy sources to replace our dependence on ever-dwindling supplies of fossil fuels.

That's why I hoped to offer an amendment to the bill that would have authorized the President's fiscal 2001 budget request for the Department of Energy's solar and renewable energy research programs. It was to be very similar to an amendment I offered and the House unanimously adopted on the Floor during last year's debate on HR 1655, the bill to authorize the Department of Energy's energy research programs. However, the rule does not make that amendment in order. I would have preferred a rule that would have done so.

Unfortunately, the Senate has not yet acted on the DOE authorization bill. It seems to me that we ought to seize the opportunity for the House to once again move to reauthorize these important programs that can lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

There would have been no inconsistency between my amendment and the purpose of the underlying bill. Just like the underlying bill, my amendment would have helped to lessen America's dependence on foreign oil and thus to act as leverage against the price increases of foreign producers. Given the current public concern about the high price of imported oil, I believe it would have been appropriate for the House to consider not just one approach to reducing oil prices, but to consider all approaches that promise to bring down prices by addressing the core problem: our continued dependence on imported oil.

We need to invest more in renewable energy programs. They benefit our economy by

stimulating private sector activity and adding jobs. They reduce our reliance on imported oil. They have a positive impact on air and water quality. Renewable energy and energy efficiency is all about an investment in America's future—the future of our energy security, our environment, and our international competitiveness.

We can't go on year after year without giving adequate attention to developing renewable energy. For our investment in these technologies to pay off, our efforts must be sustained over the long-term. To me, the recent rise in energy prices indicates that we haven't been paying enough attention to the long-term.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we are here today to address this urgent issue. I just wish we were being asked to vote on a bill that did more than merely encourage the President to engage in diplomatic efforts as a way to reduce oil prices. It's time for us to think about addressing serious problems with serious solutions.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3822 regarding OPEC's role in raising oil prices to the detriment of the U.S. and other industrialized nations. I want to commend the Chairman of the International Relations Committee, Mr. GILMAN for his efforts to find ways to help our constituents with this problem.

Everyone knows prices are skyrocketing at the gas pump. Others are beginning to realize that crude oil prices are also driving up the costs of paving your driveway, painting your house or installing new carpet—all of which contain oil products.

Prices for most everything else will also likely rise as well as transportation costs are passed on to consumers.

It is critical, Mr. Chairman, that we find a short-term solution to this problem. But it is equally critical that we find long-term solutions so that we are not faced with another price crisis next Fall or next year.

The International Relations Committee reported this bill which was designed to reduce or terminate foreign assistance or weapons sales to any country that engages in oil price fixing. This is a reasonable position to take because it sends a message that if our friends among the oil producing nations wish to continue to have good relations with the U.S., which is supporting their efforts to defend themselves and their resources, then we all must cooperate across the board.

Last week, I wrote to President Clinton, urging him to take immediate action to persuade the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries to increase production. OPEC is meeting next week to reconsider whether they should boost oil production in order to allow oil consuming nations, particularly the U.S., to refill its critical oil reserves and to stabilize oil prices. We all know that the oil producers were not happy when oil sold for \$10 per barrel. And maybe we, as a nation, did lower our commitment to energy conservation in the wake of cheap prices at the pump. But now the pendulum seems to have swung too far in the opposite direction and it is critical that the OPEC nations understand the position of the United States well in advance.

As I pointed out to President Clinton, we went to war and shed American blood to protect two Persian Gulf OPEC nations—Kuwait and Saudi Arabia—from Saddam Hussein and

we pitched in with unswerving support for Venezuela during its recent natural disaster. It is inexcusable, then, that these same countries are conspiring to keep oil production low which results in increased gas and other fuel costs. Similarly, in the case of Mexico, the health of their economy is highly dependent on the strength of ours. They must know that these policies will slow the economic vitality of the U.S., which in the long run will negatively affect their own economies.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, once crude oil prices are stabilized, the President and the Congress must resolve to create a new national energy strategy. As Energy Secretary Bill Richardson said on February 16th: "It is obvious that the federal government was not prepared. We were caught napping."

That is unacceptable. It is also unacceptable that the U.S. relies on foreign imports for 56 percent of its crude oil needs—up from 35 percent during the 1973 Arab oil embargo. At the same time, domestic production has fallen dramatically.

U.S. energy policy is serious business. It affects our entire economy. When the administration is admittedly caught napping, the American people suffer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation as a sign of our concern to our friends in OPEC. But beyond that, we must, as a nation, get serious about our future energy needs.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have a crisis in this country, and I rise in support of using all of the tools at our disposal to end this crisis. I rise in support of the American people, the American family, and the American worker. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000.

We need to pass the Oil Price Reduction Act to officially hold the Clinton-Gore Administration accountable for the oil crisis that they have created. Any spike in the oil prices dramatically affects every family in the country. When the price of transportation rises—all prices rise. Nothing, not a loaf of bread, not a home computer, not a gallon of milk can get from their points of production to the home without using petroleum to fuel the machines to get it there.

Families in the Midwest and the northeast have been forced to readjust their budget to ensure that they could afford heating oil during the mass cold spells this winter. Now families are looking to take a vacation, and have to take another look at their wallets to make sure they can afford it. Even if they can make the trip, many will be forced to change the duration or possibly the destination of their vacation.

How did we get this point? According to the Congressional Research Service, OPEC decided at a meeting in March 1999—more than a year ago—to drastically scale back petroleum production. Today the American people are feeling the brunt of the OPEC cartel's decision.

What does the Clinton-Gore Administration say about this? Well, let me tell you, on February 17, Energy Secretary Bill Richardson told some consumer groups and industry leaders in Boston, "We were caught napping. We got complacent." Later that same day, on the NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, he reiterated, "Everyone was caught napping."

Secretary Richardson, you knew a year ago that OPEC was cutting production. That's not napping, that's hibernating. That's a slumber

that would give Rip Van Winkle a run for his money. It is the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Energy to ensure a stable supply of affordable energy. Look at the Department's own website where it states: "The Department of Energy is working to assure clean, affordable, and dependable supplies of energy for our nation, now and in the future."

On accepting the position of Secretary of Energy, on August 24, 1998, Secretary Richardson stated: "One of my highest priorities at the Department of Energy will be to let the American people know the many ways in which we serve them and to determine how we can serve them better. I want the American people to know that the Department is their public servant and that we are working for them.—August 24, 1998."

Napping while OPEC cut production in order to push gas prices over \$2/gallon is not the sort of thing we had in mind.

It seems that only in the past month, the Clinton-Gore-Richardson team got engaged in this issue. One of the principle responsibilities of the U.S. Department of Energy is to ensure a stable supply of affordable energy. The Administration has failed miserably in this respect, and the American people are paying the price, literally. The average family will have to pay out between \$500 and \$1,000 extra this year, just to fill their tank with gasoline. This will cut into the family budget significantly.

This bill before us will force the President to determine the oil pricing practices of the OPEC countries. We have known that they have been involved in price-fixing. It's not legal here in the United States—so why would the Administration tolerate price fixing among other countries?

We give these OPEC countries millions of dollars in federal aid and defense assistance each year. We protect them and their citizens every time they have a Middle East squabble. We are the first to assist them in their times of need. And how do they thank us? By consorting among themselves to ensure the highest price for their oil exports to the United States—and the Clinton Administration sat idly by until the American people saw what was in store and got outraged.

While giving the President ample time to pursue a diplomatic remedy to this crisis, this Act ensures that, should OPEC nation's continue price-fixing to the detriment of the U.S. economy, we will scale back or even revoke our federal assistance to these nations. This is a fair and prudent process. A process which has been well within the authority of the Clinton-Gore Administration since OPEC's decision to cut back production a year ago.

This increase in gas prices over the last 12 months, is the largest increase in U.S. history, the average cost for a gallon of gas to the American family is \$1.54, and our national oil inventories are at the lowest level in four years.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a time of crisis, I look to the Members of this body to pass the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000 and force the Clinton-Gore Administration and Secretary Richardson to wake up from their hibernation, smell the coffee, and take firm action against those who have been permitted to hold the American people hostage to higher gas prices.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3822, "The Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000."

I would like to thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for his leadership in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor this afternoon.

H.R. 3822 represents an effective, forward-thinking approach to reforming our Nation's failed energy policy and providing long-term relief to our Nation's consumers.

Every day we see newspaper or television reports on the rising cost of fuel. There are stories about truckers having to park their trucks because they can't afford to keep them running. Many airlines have already imposed surcharges to reflect their higher costs. And there is plenty of speculation in the press about how high prices will really go before the summer vacation season. Prices of \$2 per gallon, which seemed far-fetched just weeks ago, now don't seem out of the question.

Prices are simply too high and have risen too fast. The United States has been caught flat footed and its economy is at the mercy of foreign oil suppliers. The situation is unacceptable and we must take action.

Since the current Administration took office, domestic oil production has dropped by 17% while consumption has increased by 14%. This, along with an oil cartel run by countries that are supposed to be our allies who the President is supposed to be able to influence, seem to me to be the real causes of high fuel prices.

This legislation is an important tool that the U.S. can use against foreign oil producers who constrict supply to drive up the price of their product. It affords us significant diplomatic leverage in difficult economic times, and I believe that this sort of supply-side solution is the most effective way to prevent the kind of price escalation we see today from occurring in the future.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves in an unhappy situation today with respect to fuel oil, gasoline, and diesel prices. We learned from our last experience with high energy prices in the 1970's the importance of energy supplies to our citizens and our economy.

This bill is a weak attempt to address our current and long-term energy needs. We need sustained funding for long-term and medium-term programs that improve the efficiency of energy use and that diversify our energy supplies. We have let low energy prices that we have enjoyed in the past few years be the justification for cuts in energy efficiency and energy research and development programs. The administration has consistently requested larger sums for these accounts than have been appropriated.

For example, the Weatherization Assistance Program, which was cut by 50 percent in 1995, helps to make housing more energy efficient. The program now weatherizes an average of 70,000 dwellings a year at a current appropriation of \$135 million. If we had level funded the Weatherization Assistance Program from 1996 through this year, DOE would have weatherized 248,000 more homes than we were able to under the existing appropriations.

Compare this to the funds we need to spend under the Low Income Heating Assistance Program which serves over 4 million households at a cost of more than \$1 billion. By making homes and buildings more efficient, we can serve more of our needy constituents with the limited LIHEAP funds that we have

and ultimately we would be able to reduce the funds that we must pay under LIHEAP.

One of our best defenses against high energy prices is to decrease our energy demand through the use of energy efficient products both by industry and by consumers. Some of our past investments in these areas have helped us to weather this current high energy price storm, but obviously we must do more. High energy prices take a toll on household budgets directly through home and transportation energy use and indirectly as consumer prices for goods rise in response to energy prices. Decreasing the proportion of these budgets that are devoted to energy purchases saves money for households and for businesses everyday and is our best insurance against future price increases.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, residents in my home State of New Jersey certainly haven't been immune to exorbitant energy prices. The cost of home heating oil for my constituents has doubled to \$2 a gallon in just a matter of weeks. As a result, a typical household could spend an additional \$350 or more in home heating costs this winter.

Consumers, truckers, and other oil dependent industries have been suffering for months as a result of these excessive prices. Some independent truckers have taken their trucks off the road because they simply can't afford to operate them.

The legislation before us, which I voted for in committee, simply does exactly what the administration has been doing. Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson has already been engaged in diplomatic efforts to leverage our relationship with oil producing nations and to demand an increase in oil production. As a matter of fact, he just recently completed his whirlwind OPEC diplomatic tour, which I'm hopeful will yield results at next Monday's OPEC meeting. Today's debate is simply a "cheering-on" of those efforts.

But regardless of what happens on Monday, we need to take steps to protect the American economy and American consumers in the short- and long-terms.

In addition to passing this bill which will send a message to OPEC that the United States will not be held hostage to its monopolistic practices, we should implement President Clinton's initiative to create a home heating oil reserve for the Northeast to cushion future spikes in oil prices. We should also reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is set to expire next week—on March 31. Regardless of your position on drawing down the reserve in this crisis, I think we can all agree that the option should remain available to address fluctuations in the market.

For the last 5 years, the Republican majority has failed to provide Americans with energy security. Rather than address the real issues, our Republican colleagues have failed to bring a Strategic Petroleum Reserve reauthorization bill to the floor; they continue to send Alaskan oil to Japan, despite our current domestic price spike; and they have failed to fund research and development into alternative fuels and energy efficiency. They have not only failed to build up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve when fuel was cheap, but they proposed eliminating the Department of Energy and selling off the reserve, even when the nation was not facing an energy crisis, simply in order to balance the federal budget. Despite their claim that the administration should repeal the gas

tax, they have failed to even bring the issue to the floor for a debate.

It's obvious that we must do more than has been proposed today to ensure that consumers in the Northeast will never again have to forfeit heating their homes, in order to feed their families.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by striking subsection 6(c), shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered read.

No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

□ 1745

Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1? If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Oil producing countries, including the nations of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), took concerted actions in March and September of 1999 to cut oil production and hold back from the market 4,000,000 barrels a day representing approximately six percent of the global supply.

(2) OPEC, in its capacity as an oil cartel, has been a critical factor in driving prices from approximately \$11 a barrel in December 1998 to a high of \$30 a barrel in mid-February 2000, levels not seen since the Persian Gulf Conflict.

(3) On February 10, 2000, a hearing before the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives on "OPEC and the Northeast Energy Crisis" clearly demonstrated that OPEC's goal of reducing its oil stocks was the major reason behind price increases in heating oil, gasoline, and diesel oil stocks.

(4) During this hearing, the Assistant Secretary in the Office of International Affairs of the Department of Energy noted that artificial supply constraints placed on the market are ultimately self-defeating in so far as they increase volatility in the market, lead to boom and bust cycles, and promote global instability, particularly in developing countries whose economies are extremely vulnerable to sharp price increases.

(5) These price increases have caused inflationary shocks to the United States economy

and could threaten the global economic recovery now underway in Europe and Asia where the demand for oil is rising.

(6) The transportation infrastructure of the United States is under stress and tens of thousands of small- to medium-sized trucking firms throughout the Northeast region are on the verge of bankruptcy because of the rise in diesel oil prices to more than \$2 per gallon—a 43 percent increase in the Central Atlantic region and a 55 percent increase in the New England region—an increase that has had the effect of requiring these trucking firms to use up to 20 percent of their operating budgets for the purchase of diesel oil.

(7) Many elderly and retired Americans on fixed incomes throughout the Northeast region of the United States cannot afford to pay the prevailing heating oil costs and all too often are faced with the choice of paying the grocery bills or staying warm.

(8) Several key oil producing nations relied on the United States military for their protection in 1990 and 1991, including during the Persian Gulf Conflict, and these nations still depend on the United States for their security.

(9) Many of these nations enjoy a close economic and security relationship with the United States which is a fundamental underpinning of global security and cooperation.

(10) A continuation of the present policies put in place at the meeting of OPEC Ministers in March and September of 1999 threatens the relationship that many of the OPEC nations enjoy with the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **POLICY WITH RESPECT TO OIL EXPORTING COUNTRIES.**—It shall be the policy of the United States to consider the extent to which major net oil exporting countries engage in oil price fixing to be an important determinant in the overall political, economic, and security relationship between the United States and these countries.

(b) **POLICY WITH RESPECT TO OIL IMPORTING COUNTRIES.**—It shall be the policy of the United States to work multilaterally with other countries that are major net oil importers to bring about the complete dismantlement of international oil price fixing arrangements.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3? If not, the Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Congress a report that contains the following:

(1) A description of the overall economic and security relationship between the United States and each country that is a major net oil exporter, including each country that is a member of OPEC.

(2) A description of the effect that coordination among the countries described in paragraph (1) with respect to oil production and pricing has had on the United States economy and global energy supplies.

(3) Detailed information on any and all assistance programs under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act, including licenses for the export of defense articles and defense services under section 38 of such Act, provided to the countries described in paragraph (1).

(4) A determination made by the President in accordance with section 5 for each country described in paragraph (1).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4? If not, the Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF MAJOR OIL EXPORTING COUNTRIES ENGAGED IN PRICE FIXING.

The report submitted pursuant to section 4 shall include the determination of the President with respect to each country described in section 4(1) as to whether or not, as of the date on which the President makes the determination, that country is engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5? If not, the Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6, as modified, is as follows:

SEC. 6. DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS TO END PRICE FIXING.

(a) **DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.**—*Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President transmits to the Congress the report pursuant to section 4, the President shall—*

(1) undertake a concerted diplomatic campaign to convince any country determined by the President pursuant to section 5 to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy that the current oil price levels are unsustainable and will negatively affect global economic growth rates in oil consuming and developing countries; and

(2) take the necessary steps to begin negotiations to achieve multilateral action to reduce, suspend, or terminate bilateral assistance and arms exports to major net oil exporters engaged in oil price fixing as part of a concerted diplomatic campaign with other major net oil importers to bring about the complete dismantlement of international oil price fixing arrangements described in such report.

(b) **REPORT ON DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.**—*Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Congress a report describing any diplomatic efforts undertaken in accordance with subsection (a) and the results achieved by those efforts.*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 6?

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: Insert the following after section 6 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly:

SEC. 7. SUSPENSION OF EXPORTS OF ALASKAN NORTH SLOPE CRUDE OIL.

(A) **SUSPENSION.**—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) subsection (s) of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(s)) shall cease to be effective; and

(2) subsection (d) of section 7 of the Export Administration Act of 1999 (50 U.S.C. App. 2406(d)) shall be effective, notwithstanding section 20 of that Act.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The President may exercise the authorities he has under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to carry out subsection (a).

(c) **LIFTING OF SUSPENSION.**—If the President determines that the United States is not experiencing a shortage of foreign crude oil and an inflationary impact due to the demand for foreign crude oil, subsections (a) and (b) shall cease to apply 30 calendar days after the President submits that determination to the Congress.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, under rule 16 clause 7 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the amendment deals with a different subject matter than the text of the bill. The fundamental purpose of the amendment is unrelated to the bill which is offered. H.R. 3822 addresses issues relative to the U.S. policy regarding foreign assistance to other countries which engage in oil price-fixing of oil produced in other countries and imported to the United States.

The subject of the amendment is very different from that bill. It would take away the authority of the President to determine whether to ban the exported oil produced on public lands within the United States to other countries. Therefore, the amendment is not germane and I ask my point of order be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon wish to speak on the point of order?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the bill purports to deal with the oil shortage. My amendment deals directly with the oil shortage, particularly as it relates to the West Coast of the United States. By keeping the Alaskan oil home, we would deal with the oil shortage. So it is certainly, in terms of the intent of the legislation in the bill, in order.

The bill purports in its title and in the assertions in the debate to be targeted at reducing the price of oil. My amendment, by restricting the export of the oil from Alaska, would reduce the price of oil.

The bill says that it will go after countries which fix the price of oil. My amendment goes after companies which fix the price of oil.

The bill finds that oil producing countries took concerted actions in March and September to cut oil production and hold back from the market 4 million barrels a day. My amendment addresses a cut-back in oil available to the West Coast of the United States in the amount of 60,000 barrels a day by bringing this oil home.

So I would argue, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment is germane to the bill. We heard earlier from the Committee on Rules that their intent was to allow amendments to the bill, and I would offer that that is a false promise if all of the amendments that people are going to attempt to be offering are found out of order.

So I would ask the Chair to rule in favor of offering a substantive amendment to a symbolic piece of legislation so that it might actually do something about the problem which is being discussed.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, may I explain the reason I brought the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is redundant,

number one. It relates to the export of Alaskan oil. The President now has the authority to do so. The cases in law, 104-58—Section 201, states that if the Secretary of Commerce finds that exporting oil has caused sustained material oil supply shortages or sustained oil prices significantly above world market levels, and further finds these supply shortages or price increases have caused or are likely to cause sustained material adverse employment effects in the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall recommend, and the President may take, appropriate action concerning exports of this oil, which may include modifying or revoking the authority to revoke and export.

Mr. Chairman, we also had a GAO report that says there is no impact on the West Coast, and I again remind the gentleman from Oregon that there is no capacity for refining the oil from Alaska. Frankly, I would like to sell it all to the lower 48 if they had refinery capabilities.

So I ask the Chair to sustain the point of order.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if I might just further respond.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Alaska, his initial point I think was very well taken in this matter, that the authority which I am attempting to extend through this amendment does exist, but this would encourage the President to use that authority.

That is exactly what the bill is doing. The bill does nothing new; it encourages the President to go out and negotiate. The bill encourages the bill to go out and gather information. Certainly, those things are within his authority. In fact, he is already doing them.

So I would argue that my amendment is probably less redundant, and certainly more meaningful, than other provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Alaska raises a point of order that the amendment printed in the record and numbered 8 offered by the gentleman from Oregon is not germane.

The bill, H.R. 3822, addresses a variety of diplomatic efforts to curb alleged price-fixing in the global oil market. Specifically, the bill states a policy regarding such price-fixing requires the President to identify oil exporting countries that engage in price-fixing and requires the President to undertake certain oil-related negotiations. H.R. 3822 is referred to and reported by the Committee on International Relations and its provisions are confined to the legislative jurisdiction of that committee.

The amendment seeks to suspend exportation of Alaskan North Slope crude oil. It would achieve this result, in part, by waiving application of section

28 of the Mineral Leasing Act. The amendment falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources.

Clause 7 of rule XVI, the germaneness rule, provides that no proposition "on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment." One of the central tenets of the germaneness rule is that an amendment should be within the jurisdiction of the committee reporting the bill. This principle is recorded on page 671 of the House Rules and Manual.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon falls outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations. The amendment is not germane, and the point of order is sustained.

Are there other amendments under section 6?

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) TITLE I.—Title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6211-6251) is amended—

(1) in section 166 (42 U.S.C. 6246)—

(A) by inserting "through 2003" after "2000"; and

(B) by striking ", to remain available only through March 31, 2000"; and

(2) in section 181 (42 U.S.C. 6251), by striking "March 31, 2000" each place it appears and inserting "September 30, 2003".

(b) TITLE II.—Title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6261-6285) is amended—

(1) in section 256(h) (42 U.S.C. 6276(h)), by inserting "through 2003" after "1997"; and

(2) in section 281 (42 U.S.C. 6285), by striking "March 31, 2000" each place it appears and inserting "September 30, 2003".

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill here does not do much with regard to energy conservation. One thing that has to be done is to reauthorize the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, specifically with regard to the President's authority to draw down the strategic petroleum reserve to deal with any prolonged energy crisis, or any sharp spikes in the energy supply to the United States. It has been used before for this purpose, and it has worked admirably in terms of diminishing some of the more extraordinary movements in the oil and petroleum industry.

The text of the amendment is exactly and precisely identical to S. 1051, which was authored by Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska, which passed the Senate by unanimous consent last year. I have always opposed precipitous use of the Reserve, which Congress directed should only be drawn down in a severe energy supply interruption, as determined by the President, and in accordance with specific statutory criteria. Certainly there is agreement now as to whether or not the hardships that Americans are currently experiencing, such as high heating oil prices and high gasoline costs, warrant the use of the Reserve. It is my view that they do not at this time.

However, there is no disagreement I think amongst people who are familiar with the situation and with the law and with the history that the Congress must ensure the President continues to have the necessary authority to deploy the Reserve if it becomes necessary to protect either our economy, our national interests or, indeed, the defense of the United States.

The Reserve contains some 570 million barrels of oil which has served useful purposes, as I have mentioned, in connection with the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

This is not, fortunately, a complex drafting matter. The amendment consists of a few small, but necessary, changes to the relevant dates in EPCA. I would submit that the President's petroleum reserve authority is far more useful than some of the other things in this provision.

The White House has warned about the possibility of a veto to this legislation, and the President has issued a statement which says as follows in the last paragraph: "The administration calls for Congress immediately to reauthorize his Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the International Energy Program at the Department of Energy. This is necessary to ensure that the President retains the ability to use all available tools to respond to the needs of the U.S. economy. Further, to reduce the likelihood of future heating oil shortages which will harm consumers, the administration calls on the Congress to authorize the creation of a home heating oil reserve in the Northeast with an appropriate trigger that could supply additional heating oil to the market in the event of a supply shortage.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. I urge them to recognize that there is no controversy with regard to this particular amendment, and indeed, it is something that makes the best of good sense from the standpoint of our national security, from the standpoint of pricing and supply of petroleum products to American consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to tell my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, I know that he knows this, but I want to repeat it; I have no greater respect for any Member of the House than I do for my distinguished friend from Michigan. However, I rise to insist on this point of order to maintain the prerogatives of the Committee on Commerce for which the former chairman served with distinction for so many years.

The pending amendment that he has just put forward violates clause 7 of rule 16 of the Rules of the House of Representatives which requires that an amendment be germane to the matter that it is amending. It is not germane to the bill because it has a different subject than the underlying bill and the amendment concerns matters entirely within the rule 10 jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

First, the purpose of H.R. 3822 is to direct the President to reduce, spend or terminate foreign assistance in arms export authority for countries determined to be engaged in oil price-fixing. The Dingell amendment, however, reauthorizes the Energy Policy and Conservation Act for the fiscal year 2003. These provisions address an entirely separate question from the one in the underlying bill which renders the amendment nongermane under the rules.

The pending amendment also is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce under rule 10 of the Rules of the House. The underlying bill, on the other hand, is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations. The jurisdiction test has long been regarded as a primary indicator of germaneness.

For these reasons, the pending amendment is not germane to the bill under consideration, and I must insist on my point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

□ 1800

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform Members that there is no opportunity to yield. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I can save a lot of time if I am permitted to have the gentleman yield.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan be allowed to speak for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will let the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) proceed and then the Chair will go back to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply observe that if the unanimous consent is granted, I would

simply concede the point of order and would save substantial time to the House and some aggravation to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) may proceed.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, based on that understanding, I would terminate any comments simply to say that sometime next week there are two pending bills at the Committee on Rules, one of which came out of the House, the Committee on Commerce on H.R. 2884, which deals with the reauthorization of EPCA. We should be able to move one of those bills next week.

I insist upon my point of order if the gentleman does not withdraw his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan desires to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been doing my best.

Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for his kindness to me. I want to express great affection and respect for the chairman of the foreign affairs committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN). I want to observe that I have been much impressed with the gentleman's statement on the point of order. Regretfully, he is correct, but we still need this language to be enacted into law, and the reason is, without it, the President's ability to address national security questions with regard to oil is very much impaired and the country is put significantly at risk.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) withdrawing his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) raises a point of order that the amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 9 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is not germane. As stated previously, the bill, H.R. 3822, is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations.

The amendment seeks to reauthorize the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. The amendment falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) falls outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations.

The amendment is not germane in violation of clause 7 of rule XVI, and the point of order is sustained.

Are there any other amendments to section 6?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am hoping to take up enough time that maybe the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN)

and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) might have to use the rest-room when I offer my amendment.

I want to offer to this Congress a suggestion, and I am not going to challenge the ruling of the Chair when I do offer my amendment, because I have too much respect for the Chairman on transportation. He would probably kill all of my projects that I desperately need in my district, so I am not going to do that.

I want to make a couple of points before I offer my amendment, and I want the gentleman from Texas to consider this. And I would like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) to pay attention, because I think the chairman should be listening. I can remember about 10 years ago, I had an amendment in a bill before the Committee on Science that would appropriate X amount of dollars to retrieve oil trapped in shale rock.

We have oil reserves trapped in shale rock that can keep America operating without use of 1 pint of foreign oil and not using 1 ounce of our reserves and not using 1 ounce of our normal oil fields.

I want the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to listen as well. You know what I was told? We can buy oil, TRAFICANT, at \$18 a barrel. Your cost is \$28 a barrel to retrieve it. Therefore, we are not going to do it.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can put Americans to work. We have coal coming out of our ears, and we are still dependent upon foreign oil. Before I offer my amendment, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), I want the gentleman to listen to it carefully; the Traficant amendment deals with what I think is another conspiracy. In the 1970s those tankers were out at sea, it was not OPEC countries that kept those tankers out at sea; it was American oil companies depriving us of the product, made the demand go up.

They artificially raised above those prices that OPEC would have generated, a tremendous cost factor, and had our people like stupids standing in line waiting to get fuel.

The Traficant amendment would impose the following: the Energy Information Administration within the Department of Energy, if they find reasonable that the American domestic industry is conspiring or has unreasonably raised prices, they can be fined up to \$100 million.

I want to know, I say to the gentleman, when your next bill comes up, if the Traficant amendment would be germane to that bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for an answer.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to commit to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) that I am planning to do a series of hearings on our energy policy in this country in the next month.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, would the Traficant amendment

be germane to the bill that the gentleman talked with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) about?

I yield to the gentleman from Texas. Mr. BARTON of Texas. It would not be germane to that bill which is a straight reauthorization of this Energy Policy Conservation Act, no. So a straight answer to that particular bill, it would not be germane.

Mr. TRAFICANT. The gentleman would not allow an amendment to be made in order to it?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. It would not be germane to that bill, but it might well be germane to some other bills that we are going to bring to the floor.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, here is what I am trying to tell the Congress. We have 300 years of oil trapped in shale rock. If we put Americans to work, we would not be dependent on monarchs and dictators. And we are still playing around now 20 years later, but they are not only the villain, OPEC. Nobody's investigating these domestic oil companies who ripped us off before. I do not feel comfortable with what they are doing now.

And I think, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), what bothers me is this may be the only real instrument we have. How can I vote against a report and how can I go against the judgment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON)?

I am going to vote for it. And with that, I yield back the time that I had when I had stricken the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 6?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman tell us which amendment he would like to offer?

Mr. TRAFICANT. The amendment that was preprinted in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three amendments printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TRAFICANT. The one that is germane, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on the germaneness after the gentleman from Ohio tells us which amendment he would like to offer.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I do not have all the numbers. I have to see the amendments, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Why do we not start with the Traficant number 21.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT
Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 8, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. CIVIL PENALTY FOR UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE FOR CRUDE OIL, RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, OR REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Secretary of Energy shall issue regulations that—

(1) apply to all crude oil, residual fuel oil, or refined petroleum products that are sold in the United States;

(2) prohibit any unreasonable price increase for such products by an energy-producing company (as defined in section 205(h)(6) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135(h)(6))); and

(3) impose a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000,000 for each unreasonable price increase.

(b) UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “unreasonable price increase” means any price increase that exceeds any concurrent increase in the production or operation costs of the energy-producing company that are directly related to the products being sold.

(c) DETERMINATION OF UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE.—The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall determine at least annually whether any energy-producing company has implemented an unreasonable price increase in violation of regulations issued under subsection (a).

Page 8, line 3, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the Traficant amendment No. 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio withdraws his amendment No. 21.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. CIVIL PENALTY FOR UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE FOR CRUDE OIL, RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, OR REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall issue regulations that—

(1) apply to all crude oil, residual fuel oil, or refined petroleum products that are sold in the United States;

(2) prohibit any unreasonable price increase for such products by an energy-producing company (as defined in section 205(h)(6) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135(h)(6))); and

(3) impose a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000,000 for each unreasonable price increase.

(b) UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “unreasonable price increase” means any price increase that exceeds any concurrent increase in the production or operation costs of the energy-producing company that are directly related to the products being sold.

(c) DETERMINATION OF UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE.—The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall determine at least annually whether any energy-producing company has implemented an unreasonable price increase in violation of regulations issued under subsection (a).

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the Traficant amendment No. 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

Is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) withdrawing his amendment?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) would have to use the restroom. Since he is not, I concede the point of order on amendment No. 22.

The Chairman. Does the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his amendment?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I withdraw the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio withdraws his amendment No. 22.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. CIVIL PENALTY FOR UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE FOR CRUDE OIL, RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, OR REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall issue regulations that—

(1) apply to all crude oil, residual fuel oil, or refined petroleum products that are sold in the United States;

(2) prohibit any unreasonable price increase for such products by an energy-producing company (as defined in section 205(h)(6) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135(h)(6))); and

(3) impose a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000,000 for each unreasonable price increase.

(b) UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “unreasonable price increase” means any price increase that exceeds any concurrent increase in the production or operation costs of the energy-producing company that are directly related to the products being sold.

(c) DETERMINATION OF UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE.—The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall determine at least annually whether any energy-producing company has implemented an unreasonable price increase in violation of regulations issued under subsection (a).

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, with reluctance, I also reserve a point of order on Traficant amendment No. 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) not only does a great job, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) said, he certainly has a strong physical

constitution and strong bladder, and it is evident that he is going to be there standing.

I have worked with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for years. I believe he is an original helper of JIM TRAFICANT when we tried to take that oil from shale rock. I am going to be introducing a bill to go after that oil in shale rock. I am going to ask the gentleman from Texas to help.

Second of all, I am going to ask the gentleman from Texas to help me in the goal that I pursue, that if there is an unreasonable gouging and conspiracy with these domestic oil companies, we can impose a fine of \$100 million. A million dollars, \$5 million is nothing to these companies. With that, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) who has been a friend.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my third amendment, No. 23.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio withdraws his amendment No. 23.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to section 6?

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GARY MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. GARY MILLER of California:

Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. OIL PRODUCTION REPORT.

The Secretary of Energy, in conjunction with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall, not later than September 30, 2000, transmit to the Congress a report on all possible means of protecting the national security of the United States by increasing domestic oil production without harming the environment.

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned over the recent rise in prices being paid for gasoline at the pump. Right now, my constituents are facing extremely high gas prices. I have received letters and e-mails from many of the people I represent informing me they have recently paid as high as \$1.90 a gallon for the lowest grade of gasoline at the pump. Predictions from the Department of Energy have indicated that unleaded gasoline could get as high as \$2.25 a gallon by June, at the same time my constituents will be taking their families on summer vacation.

As we all know, the reason for the recent price spike is the result of OPEC deciding to decrease production to raise the price of oil. OPEC made this decision last March. We have been well

aware of the possibility that a price increase would occur from that. But, because the Clinton administration lacks a definitive national energy policy; and according to the Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, the administration was caught napping, Americans were not shielded from this crisis.

I am the first to admit there is no overnight solution to the problem. But I will be the first to say this problem would not have been as costly if President Clinton would have also shown leadership. Instead, the President jeopardized the economy and national security of this country. Now Congress is forced to act on this problem.

My amendment to H.R. 3822 would require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report for Congress on how we can strengthen the United States national security by increasing domestic oil production. The United States is the number one consumer of oil. Even if we increase domestic production, the United States will still rely on foreign oil. But we must diversify our sources of supply so we do not find ourselves in a compromising position should OPEC decide to decrease production again down the road.

Moreover, by requiring the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress on how to increase domestic oil production, a blueprint can be provided for future administrations to avert this problem. In addition, future Congresses would not be in the position that we are currently in where Congress is forced to react to a crisis that arguably could have been foreseen and averted.

Because the environment is very important and should not be neglected in the decision-making process, my amendment would also require the Secretary of Energy to work with the administrator of the EPA to determine how domestic oil production can be increased without harming the environment.

Since President Clinton has taken office, America's dependency on foreign oil has almost doubled to 55 percent. Furthermore, President Clinton has reduced access to Federal lands in the western United States by nearly 60 percent. This is where nearly 67 percent of our onshore oil reserves are located. If Federal lands had been opened to exploration, we may never have been in this position we find ourselves in today.

President Clinton has also been responsible for increasing regulations on U.S. oil refineries without consideration of the economic impact these regulations may have on their ability to produce oil. In many cases, independent refineries are forced to close up shop because of the burdensome regulation imposed on them. For every refinery that goes out of business, this is a decline in the domestic oil produced.

Although I will withdraw this amendment, I will continue to push the administration to come up with a strategic national energy policy that can thwart another situation like this

again and strengthen U.S. national security. I plan to offer this amendment again at a more appropriate time. I hope that my colleagues will support this amendment when I reintroduce it at a later time.

Mr. CALVERT. I rise today in strong support for the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague on the Energy and Environment Subcommittee of the Science Committee, Mr. GARY MILLER.

The price of gasoline in my home state of California is already over \$2 per gallon. Instead of investing in this great nation's plentiful domestic energy resources, this Administration has been "asleep at the fuel pump." We are now more dependent on imported oil than at the height of the Oil Embargo Crisis of 1973.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, we have just completed two authorization hearings on this Administration's Budget Request for the Department of Energy. This Administration's requests for Petroleum, Natural Gas Technologies, Other Fossil Energy R&D and Nuclear Energy are, in general, below last year's funding levels. R&D and production of these major and fundamental domestic energy resources should not be short-changed.

The Secretary of Energy finally went on his diplomatic mission to beg for increased production from OPEC and some of the more notorious OPEC members have only thumbed their noses at his request. Last week on the House floor, I talked about the Administration's "F" for failure on oil diplomacy and domestic oil production. We still don't know whether OPEC will agree to step up production to reduce prices—we are at OPEC's mercy once again.

On the domestic production side, the Administration has discouraged—in every way—the opportunity to take advantage of this country's domestic oil resources and I would like to add coal and nuclear energy to the list. It is time for us to seriously develop our great country's domestic oil reserves—we know we have the oil—it's time to produce it—of course, in an environmentally sound way—so that the American people will no longer be dependent on OPEC's whims.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California withdraws his amendment.

There was no objection.

Are there any other amendments to section 6?

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. BACHUS:
Page 8, after line 2 insert the following:

Add at the end thereof the following new title:

TITLE II—ENERGY EFFICIENT TECHNOLOGY TAX INCENTIVES

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Energy Efficient Technology Tax Act".

SEC. 7. DENIAL OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Title XV of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 2620-2620-2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 1504. DENIAL OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR MAJOR OIL EXPORTING COUNTRIES ENGAGED IN PRICE FIXING.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2)) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the institution to urge the institution to adopt as a matter of policy and practice not to provide financial assistance of any kind to a country determined by the President pursuant to section 5 of the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000 to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy."

Redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that I am a cosponsor of the main legislation, and I fully endorse the legislation and the purpose of the legislation.

Now, one thing that this legislation does is it looks at the OPEC nations and we look at the assistance that we are giving to the OPEC nations.

□ 1815

In this regard we have heard testimony that the United States gives \$415 million worth of assistance to the OPEC nations. We have heard testimony that we have 10,000 troops in these OPEC nations. What my amendment says is not only do we consider these assistance programs and this foreign aid, but we also look at something else that we cannot overlook, and that is the fact that through the World Bank, through the IMF, through the Asian Development Bank, through the African Development Bank, through the multilateral development banks we are also, as a contributor to these banks, pumping billions of dollars into these countries.

It may come as some surprise to Members of this body, but through the multilateral development banks we have given \$4.4 billion worth of loans to Algeria alone, \$30 billion to Indonesia, and \$3.7 billion to Venezuela. What my amendment says, when we look at OPEC and the price gouging that they are doing, the fact that they are yanking our chain, we need to not only look at direct aid, but we need to look at aid that the multilateral development banks are giving to these countries.

And let me say this. We are dealing literally with billions of dollars worth of aid. And if we are going to have a

comprehensive approach to using all leverage under our control, then we must also consider this multilateral aid. If we do not, we have an incomplete remedy here.

Punishing or withholding assistance from the OPEC nations is a short-term solution. The long-term solution to our problem is increasing our domestic oil production. These are some figures that I think will astound the American people. In 1973, when we had the Arab oil embargo, we were importing only 35 percent of our oil needs. In 1991, at the time of the Gulf War, we were importing 46 percent. Only 9 years later, we are now dependent on foreign sources for 56 percent of our needs.

When we depend on these sources for 56 percent of our oil needs, we are going to be dependent. We are going to be at their mercy. So the long-term solution is to urge the President to open our domestic oil fields to exploration, make us less dependent on foreign oil, and get us out of this dependency on foreign oil. But until such time, we simply must take all action we can.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I will introduce it at a more appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I simply wanted to seek recognition so that I could thank and to commend the gentleman from Alabama for his amendment. I just wish we had jurisdiction of the financial institutions or I would have been pleased to support the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 6?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act.

(1) *OIL PRICE FIXING.*—The term "oil price fixing" means participation in any agreement, arrangement, or understanding with other countries that are oil exporters to increase the price of oil or natural gas by means of, inter alia, limiting oil or gas production or establishing minimum prices for oil or gas.

(2) *OPEC.*—The term "OPEC" means the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 7?

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MRS. THURMAN

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mrs. THURMAN:

SEC. 202. CREDIT FOR CERTAIN ENERGY-EFFICIENT PROPERTY USED IN BUSINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 48 the following new section:

“SEC. 48A. ENERGY CREDIT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the energy credit for any taxable year is the sum of—

- “(1) the amount equal to the energy percentage of the basis of each energy property placed in service during such taxable year, and
- “(2) the credit amount for each qualified hybrid vehicle placed in service during the taxable year.

“(b) ENERGY PERCENTAGE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The energy percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

“Column A—Description	Column B—Energy Percentage	Column C—Period	
		For the period:	
In the case of:	The energy percentage is:	Beginning on:	Ending on:
Solar energy property (other than elected solar hot water property and photovoltaic property) and geothermal energy property	10 percent	1/1/2000	no end date
Elected solar hot water property	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2004
Photovoltaic property	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2006
20 percent energy-efficient building property	20 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2003
10 percent energy-efficient building property	10 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2001
Combined heat and power system property	8 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2002.

“(2) PERIODS FOR WHICH PERCENTAGE NOT SPECIFIED.—In the case of any energy property, the energy percentage shall be zero for any period for which an energy percentage is not specified for such property under paragraph (1).

“(3) COORDINATION WITH REHABILITATION.—The energy percentage shall not apply to that portion of the basis of any property which is attributable to qualified rehabilitation expenditures.

“(4) TRANSITIONAL RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(c) MAXIMUM CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY.—In the case of property described in the following table, the amount of the current year business credit under subsection (a) for the taxable year for each item of such property with respect to a building shall not exceed the amount specified for such property in such table:

Description of property:	Maximum allowable credit amount is:
Elected solar hot water property	\$1,000.
Photovoltaic property with respect to which the energy percentage is greater than 10 percent	\$2,000.
20 percent energy-efficient building property:	
fuel cell described in subsection (e)(3)(A)	\$500 per each kw/hr of capacity.
natural gas heat pump described in subsection (e)(3)(D)	\$1,000.
20 percent energy-efficient building property (other than a fuel cell and a natural gas heat pump)	\$500.
10 percent energy-efficient building property	\$250.

“(d) ENERGY PROPERTY DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term ‘energy property’ means any property—

“(A) which is—

“(i) solar energy property,

“(ii) geothermal energy property,

“(iii) 20 percent energy-efficient building property,

“(iv) 10 percent energy-efficient building property, or

“(v) combined heat and power system property,

“(B)(i) the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which is completed by the taxpayer, or

“(ii) which is acquired by the taxpayer if the original use of such property commences with the taxpayer,

“(C) with respect to which depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable, and

“(D) which meets the performance and quality standards (if any), and the certification requirements (if any), which—

“(i) have been prescribed by the Secretary by regulations (after consultation with the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, as appropriate), and

“(ii) are in effect at the time of the acquisition of the property.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Such term shall not include any property which is public utility property (as defined in section 46(f)(5) as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990). The preceding sentence shall not apply to combined heat and power system property.

“(e) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO TYPES OF ENERGY PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) SOLAR ENERGY PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘solar energy property’ means equipment which uses solar energy—

“(i) to generate electricity,

“(ii) to heat or cool (or provide hot water for use in) a structure, or

“(iii) to provide solar process heat.

“(B) ELECTED SOLAR WATER HEATING PROPERTY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘elected solar water heating property’ means property which is solar energy property by reason of subparagraph (A)(ii) and for which an election under this subparagraph is in effect.

“(ii) ELECTION.—For purposes of clause (i) and the energy percentage specified in the table in subsection (b)(1), a taxpayer may elect to treat property described in clause (i) as elected solar water heating property.

“(C) PHOTOVOLTAIC PROPERTY.—The term ‘photovoltaic property’ means solar energy property which uses a solar photovoltaic process to generate electricity.

“(D) SWIMMING POOLS, ETC., USED AS STORAGE MEDIUM.—The term ‘solar energy property’ shall not include a swimming pool, hot tub, or any other energy storage medium which has a function other than the function of such storage.

“(E) SOLAR PANELS.—No solar panel or other property installed as a roof (or portion thereof) shall fail to be treated as solar energy property solely because it constitutes a structural component of the structure on which it is installed.

“(2) GEOTHERMAL ENERGY PROPERTY.—The term ‘geothermal energy property’ means equipment used to produce, distribute, or use energy derived from a geothermal deposit (within the meaning of section 613(e)(2)), but only, in the case of electricity generated by geothermal power, up to (but not including) the electrical transmission stage.

“(3) 20 PERCENT ENERGY-EFFICIENT BUILDING PROPERTY.—The term ‘20 percent energy-efficient building property’ means—

“(A) a fuel cell that—

“(i) generates electricity and heat using an electrochemical process,

“(ii) has an electricity-only generation efficiency greater than 35 percent, and

“(iii) has a minimum generating capacity of 5 kilowatts,

“(B) an electric heat pump hot water heater that yields an energy factor of 1.7 or greater,

“(C) an electric heat pump that has a heating system performance factor (HSPF) of 9 or greater and a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 15 or greater,

“(D) a natural gas heat pump that has a coefficient of performance of not less than 1.25 for heating and not less than 0.70 for cooling,

“(E) a central air conditioner that has a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 15 or greater, and

“(F) an advanced natural gas water heater that has an energy factor of at least 0.80.

“(4) 10 PERCENT ENERGY-EFFICIENT BUILDING PROPERTY.—The term ‘10 percent energy-efficient building property’ means—

“(A) an electric heat pump that has a heating system performance factor (HSPF) of 7.5 or greater and a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 13.5 or greater,

“(B) a central air conditioner that has a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 13.5 or greater, and

“(C) an advanced natural gas water heater that has an energy factor of at least 0.65.

“(5) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER SYSTEM PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘combined heat and power system property’ means property comprising a system—

“(i) which uses the same energy source for the simultaneous or sequential generation of electrical power, mechanical shaft power, or both, in combination with the generation of steam or other forms of useful thermal energy (including heating and cooling applications),

“(ii) which has an electrical capacity of more than 50 kilowatts or a mechanical energy capacity of more than 67 horsepower or an equivalent combination of electrical and mechanical energy capacities,

“(iii) which produces—
“(I) at least 20 percent of its total useful energy in the form of thermal energy, and

“(II) at least 20 percent of its total useful energy in the form of electrical or mechanical power (or a combination thereof), and

“(iv) the energy efficiency percentage of which exceeds 60 percent (70 percent in the case of a system with an electrical capacity in excess of 50 megawatts or a mechanical

energy capacity in excess of 67,000 horsepower, or an equivalent combination of electrical and mechanical energy capacities).

“(B) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(i) ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iv), the energy efficiency percentage of a system is the fraction—

“(I) the numerator of which is the total useful electrical, thermal, and mechanical power produced by the system at normal operating rates, and

“(II) the denominator of which is the lower heating value of the primary fuel source for the system.

“(ii) DETERMINATIONS MADE ON BTU BASIS.—The energy efficiency percentage and the percentages under subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be determined on a Btu basis.

“(iii) INPUT AND OUTPUT PROPERTY NOT INCLUDED.—The term ‘combined heat and power system property’ does not include

property used to transport the energy source to the facility or to distribute energy produced by the facility.

“(iv) ACCOUNTING RULE FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PROPERTY.—In the case that combined heat and power system property is public utility property (as defined in section 46(f)(5) as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990), the taxpayer may only claim the credit under subsection (a)(1) if, with respect to such property, the taxpayer uses a normalization method of accounting.

“(v) DEPRECIATION.—No credit shall be allowed for any combined heat and power system property unless the taxpayer elects to treat such property for purposes of section 168 as having a class life of not less than 22 years.

“(f) QUALIFIED HYBRID VEHICLES.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2)—

“(1) CREDIT AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The credit amount for each qualified hybrid vehicle with a rechargeable energy storage system that provides the applicable percentage of the maximum available power shall be the amount specified in the following table:

“Applicable percentage		Credit amount is:	
Greater than or equal to—		Less than—	
5 percent		10 percent	\$ 500
10 percent		20 percent	\$1,000
20 percent		30 percent	\$1,500
30 percent			\$2,000

“(B) INCREASE IN CREDIT AMOUNT FOR REGENERATIVE BRAKING SYSTEM.—In the case of a qualified hybrid vehicle that actively employs a regenerative braking system which supplies to the rechargeable energy storage system the applicable percentage of the energy available from braking in a typical 60 miles per hour to 0 miles per hour braking event, the credit amount determined under subparagraph (A) shall be increased by the amount specified in the following table:

“Applicable percentage		Credit amount increase is:	
Greater than or equal to—		Less than—	
20 percent		40 percent	\$ 250
40 percent		60 percent	\$ 500
60 percent			\$1,000

“(2) QUALIFIED HYBRID VEHICLE.—The term ‘qualified hybrid vehicle’ means an automobile that meets all applicable regulatory requirements and that can draw propulsion energy from both of the following on-board sources of stored energy:

“(A) A consumable fuel.

“(B) A rechargeable energy storage system.

“(3) MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POWER.—The term ‘maximum available power’ means the maximum value of the sum of the heat engine and electric drive system power or other non-heat energy conversion devices available for a driver’s command for maximum acceleration at vehicle speeds under 75 miles per hour.

“(4) AUTOMOBILE.—The term ‘automobile’ has the meaning given such term by section 4064(b)(1) (without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (C) thereof). A vehicle shall not fail to be treated as an automobile solely by reason of weight if such vehicle is rated at 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight rating or less.

“(5) DOUBLE BENEFIT; PROPERTY USED OUTSIDE UNITED STATES, ETC., NOT QUALIFIED.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a)(2) with respect to—

“(A) any property for which a credit is allowed under section 25B or 30,

“(B) any property referred to in section 50(b), and

“(C) the portion of the cost of any property taken into account under section 179 or 179A.

“(6) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) TREASURY.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary

or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

“(B) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—

“(A) TREASURY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to specify the testing and calculation procedures that would be used to determine whether a vehicle meets the qualifications for a credit under this subsection.

“(7) TERMINATION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply with respect to any vehicle placed in service during a calendar year ending before January 1, 2003, or after December 31, 2006.

“(g) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) SPECIAL RULE FOR PROPERTY FINANCED BY SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING OR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS.—

“(A) REDUCTION OF BASIS.—For purposes of applying the energy percentage to any property, if such property is financed in whole or in part by—

“(i) subsidized energy financing, or

“(ii) the proceeds of a private activity bond (within the meaning of section 141) the interest on which is exempt from tax under section 103,

the amount taken into account as the basis of such property shall not exceed the amount which (but for this subparagraph) would be so taken into account multiplied by the fraction determined under subparagraph (B).

“(B) DETERMINATION OF FRACTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the fraction determined under this subparagraph is 1 reduced by a fraction—

“(i) the numerator of which is that portion of the basis of the property which is allocable to such financing or proceeds, and

“(ii) the denominator of which is the basis of the property.

“(C) SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘subsidized energy financing’ means financing provided under a Federal, State, or local program a principal purpose of which is to provide subsidized financing for projects designed to conserve or produce energy.

“(2) BUSINESS USE.—The rule similar to the rule of section 25(B)(d)(5)(B) shall apply for purposes of determining the business use of a vehicle.

“(3) CERTAIN PROGRESS EXPENDITURE RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 46 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this section.

“(4) DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Property which would, but for this paragraph, be eligible for credit under more than one provision of this section shall be eligible only under one such provision, the provision specified by the taxpayer.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 48 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 48. REFORESTATION CREDIT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the reforestation credit for any taxable year is 10 percent of the portion of the amortizable basis of any qualified timber property

which was acquired during such taxable year and which is taken into account under section 194 (after the application of section 194(b)(1)).

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subpart, the terms ‘amortizable basis’ and ‘qualified timber property’ have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 194.”.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 39 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) NO CARRYBACK OF ENERGY CREDIT BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.—No portion of the unused business credit for any taxable year which is attributable to the energy credit determined under section 48A may be carried back to a taxable year ending before the date of the enactment of section 48A.”.

(3) Paragraph (3) of section 50(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“In the case of the energy credit, the preceding sentence shall apply only to so much of such credit as relates to solar energy property and geothermal property (as such terms are defined in section 48A(e)).”.

(4) Subclause (III) of section 29(b)(3)(A)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “section 48(a)(4)(C)” and inserting “section 48A(g)(1)(C)”.

(5) Subparagraph (E) of section 50(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “section 48(a)(5)” and inserting “section 48A(g)(3)”.

(6) Subparagraph (B) of section 168(e)(3) of such Code is amended—

(A) in clause (vi)(I)—
(i) by striking “section 48(a)(3)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 48A(e)”, and

(ii) by striking “clause (i)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)”, and

(B) in the last sentence by striking “section 48(a)(3)” and inserting “section 48A(d)(2)”.

(7) Subparagraph (E) of section 168(e)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

“(iv) any combined heat and power system property (as defined in section 48A(e)(5)) for which a credit is allowed under section 48A and which, but for this clause, would have a recovery period of less than 15 years.”.

(8) The table contained in subparagraph (B) of section 168(g)(3) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E)(iv) 22”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 48 and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 48. Reforestation credit.

“Sec. 48A. Energy credit.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after December 31, 1999, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED ELECTRIC VEHICLES.

(a) EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED ELECTRIC VEHICLES.—Subsection (f) of section 30 of such Code (relating to termination) is amended by striking “December 31, 2004” and inserting “December 31, 2006”.

(b) REPEAL OF PHASEOUT.—Subsection (b) of section 30 of such Code (relating to limitations) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(c) NO DOUBLE BENEFIT.—

(1) Subsection (d) of section 30 of such Code (relating to special rules) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any vehicle if the taxpayer claims a credit for such vehicle under section 25B(a)(1)(B) or 48A(f).”.

(2) Paragraph (3) of section 30(d) of such Code (relating to property used outside United States, etc., not qualified) is amended by striking “section 50(b)” and inserting “section 25B, 48A, or 50(b)”.

(3) Paragraph (5) of section 179A(e) of such Code (relating to property used outside United States, etc., not qualified) is amended by striking “section 50(b)” and inserting “section 25B, 48A, or 50(b)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. MODIFICATIONS TO CREDIT FOR ELECTRICITY PRODUCED FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Paragraph (3) of section 45(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to qualified facility) is amended by striking “July 1, 1999” and inserting “July 1, 2004”.

(b) QUALIFIED FACILITIES INCLUDE ALL BIOMASS FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(c) of such Code (relating to definition of qualified energy resources) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) biomass (other than closed-loop biomass).”.

(2) BIOMASS DEFINED.—Paragraph (2) of section 45(c) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) BIOMASS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘biomass’ means—

“(i) closed-loop biomass, and

“(ii) any solid, nonhazardous, cellulosic waste material, which is segregated from other waste materials, and which is derived from—

“(I) any of the following forest-related resources: mill residues, precommercial thinnings, slash, and brush, but not including old-growth timber,

“(II) waste pallets, crates, and dunnage, and landscape or right-of-way tree trimmings, but not including unsegregated municipal solid waste (garbage) and post-consumer wastepaper, or

“(III) agriculture sources, including orchard tree crops, vineyard, grain, legumes, sugar, and other crop by-products or residues.

“(B) CLOSED-LOOP BIOMASS.—The term ‘closed-loop biomass’ means any organic material from a plant which is planted exclusively for purposes of being used at a qualified facility to produce electricity.”.

(c) ELECTRICITY PRODUCED FROM BIOMASS CO-FIRED IN COAL PLANTS.—

(1) CREDIT AMOUNT.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(a) of such Code (relating to general rule) is amended by inserting “(1.0 cents in the case of electricity produced from biomass co-fired in a facility which produces electricity from coal) after “1.5 cents”.

(2) QUALIFIED FACILITY.—Paragraph (3) of section 45(c) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and any facility using biomass other than closed loop biomass to produce electricity which is owned by the taxpayer and which is originally placed in service after June 30, 1999.”.

(3) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 45(b) of such Code (relating to credit and phaseout adjustment based on inflation) is amended by striking “1.5 cent amount” and inserting “1.5 and 1.0 cent amounts”.

(B) BASE YEAR FOR INFLATION ADJUSTMENT FACTOR.—Subparagraph (B) of section 45(d)(2) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustment factor) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In the case of the 1.0 cents amount in subsection (a), the first sentence of this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting ‘1999’ for ‘1992’.”.

(d) CREDIT NOT TO APPLY TO ELECTRICITY SOLD TO UTILITIES UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—Subsection (b) of section 45 of such Code (relating to limitations and adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) CREDIT NOT TO APPLY TO ELECTRICITY SOLD TO UTILITIES UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The credit determined under subsection (a) shall not apply to electricity—

“(i) produced at a qualified facility placed in service by the taxpayer after June 30, 1999, and

“(ii) sold to a utility pursuant to a contract originally entered into before January 1, 1987 (whether or not amended or restated after that date).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if—

“(i) the prices for energy and capacity from such facility are established pursuant to an amendment to the contract referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii),

“(ii) such amendment provides that the prices set forth in the contract which exceed avoided cost prices determined at the time of delivery shall apply only to annual quantities of electricity (prorated for partial years) which do not exceed the greater of—

“(I) the average annual quantity of electricity sold to the utility under the contract during calendar years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, or

“(II) the estimate of the annual electricity production set forth in the contract, or, if there is no such estimate, the greatest annual quantity of electricity sold to the utility under the contract in any of the calendar years 1996, 1997, or 1998, and

“(iii) such amendment provides that energy and capacity in excess of the limitation in clause (ii) may be—

“(I) sold to the utility only at prices that do not exceed avoided cost prices determined at the time of delivery, or

“(II) sold to a third party subject to a mutually agreed upon advance notice to the utility.

For purposes of this subparagraph, avoided cost prices shall be determined as provided for in section 292.304(d)(1) of title 18, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after June 30, 1999.

(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—The amendments made by subsection (c)(3) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1999.

SEC. 205. CREDIT FOR CERTAIN NONBUSINESS ENERGY PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25A the following new section:

“**SEC. 25B. NONBUSINESS ENERGY PROPERTY.**

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the applicable percentage of residential energy property expenditures made by the taxpayer during such year,

“(B) the credit amount (determined under section 48A(f)) for each vehicle purchased during the taxable year which is a qualified hybrid vehicle (as defined in section 48A(f)(2)), and

“(C) the credit amount specified in the following table for a new, highly energy-efficient principal residence:

	Credit Amount:
30 percent property	\$1,000.
40 percent property	\$1,500.
50 percent property	\$2,000.

“(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

“Column A—Description In the case of:	Column B— Applicable Per- centage The applicable percentage is:	Column C—Period For the period:	
		Beginning on:	Ending on:
20 percent energy-efficient building property	20 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2003
10 percent energy-efficient building property	10 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2001
Solar water heating property	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2006
Photovoltaic property	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2006.

“(B) PERIODS FOR WHICH PERCENTAGE NOT SPECIFIED.—In the case of any residential energy property, the applicable percentage shall be zero for any period for which an applicable percentage is not specified for such property under subparagraph (A).

“(b) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of property described in the following table, the amount of the credit allowed under subsection (a)(1)(A) for the taxable year for each item of such property with respect to a dwelling unit shall not exceed the amount specified for such property in such table:

“Description of property item:	Maximum allowable credit amount is:
20 percent energy-efficient building property (other than a fuel cell or natural gas heat pump)	\$500.
20 percent energy-efficient building property: fuel cell described in section 48A (e)(3)(A)	\$ 500 per each kw/hr of capacity.
natural gas heat pump described in section 48A (e)(3)(D)	\$1,000.
10 percent energy-efficient building property	\$ 250.
Solar water heating property	\$1,000.
Photovoltaic property	\$2,000.

“(2) COORDINATION OF LIMITATIONS.—If a credit is allowed to the taxpayer for any taxable year by reason of an acquisition of a new, highly energy-efficient principal residence, no other credit shall be allowed under subsection (a)(1)(A) with respect to such residence during the 1-taxable year period beginning with such taxable year.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) RESIDENTIAL ENERGY PROPERTY EXPENDITURES.—The term ‘residential energy property expenditures’ means expenditures made by the taxpayer for qualified energy property installed on or in connection with a dwelling unit which—

“(A) is located in the United States, and
“(B) is used by the taxpayer as a residence.

Such term includes expenditures for labor costs properly allocable to the onsite preparation, assembly, or original installation of the property.

“(2) QUALIFIED ENERGY PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified energy property’ means—

“(i) energy-efficient building property,
“(ii) solar water heating property, and
“(iii) photovoltaic property.

“(B) SWIMMING POOL, ETC., USED AS STORAGE MEDIUM; SOLAR PANELS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the provisions of subparagraphs (D) and (E) section 48A(e)(1) shall apply.

“(3) ENERGY-EFFICIENT BUILDING PROPERTY.—The term ‘energy-efficient building property’ has the meaning given to such term by paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 48A(e).

“(4) SOLAR WATER HEATING PROPERTY.—The term ‘solar water heating property’ means property which, when installed in connection with a structure, uses solar energy for the purpose of providing hot water for use within such structure.

“(5) PHOTOVOLTAIC PROPERTY.—The term ‘photovoltaic property’ has the meaning given to such term by section 48A(e)(1)(C).

“(6) NEW, HIGHLY ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Property is a new, highly energy-efficient principal residence if—

“(i) such property is located in the United States,

“(ii) the original use of such property commences with the taxpayer and is, at the time of such use, the principal residence of the taxpayer, and

“(iii) such property is certified before such use commences as being 50 percent property, 40 percent property, or 30 percent property.

“(B) 50, 40, OR 30 PERCENT PROPERTY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), property is 50 percent property, 40 percent property, or 30 percent property if the projected energy usage of such property is reduced by 50 percent, 40 percent, or 30 percent, respectively, compared to the energy usage of a reference house that complies with minimum standard practice, such as the 1998 International Energy Conservation Code of the International Code Council, as determined according to the requirements specified in clause (ii).

“(ii) PROCEDURES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of clause (i), energy usage shall be demonstrated either by a component-based approach or a performance-based approach.

“(II) COMPONENT APPROACH.—Compliance by the component approach is achieved when all of the components of the house comply with the requirements of prescriptive packages established by the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, such that they are equivalent to the results of using the performance-based approach of subclause (III) to achieve the required reduction in energy usage.

“(III) PERFORMANCE-BASED APPROACH.—Performance-based compliance shall be demonstrated in terms of the required percentage reductions in projected energy use. Computer software used in support of perform-

ance-based compliance must meet all of the procedures and methods for calculating energy savings reductions that are promulgated by the Secretary of Energy. Such regulations on the specifications for software shall be based in the 1998 California Residential Alternative Calculation Method Approval Manual, except that the calculation procedures shall be developed such that the same energy efficiency measures qualify a home for tax credits regardless of whether the home uses a gas or oil furnace or boiler, or an electric heat pump.

“(IV) APPROVAL OF SOFTWARE SUBMISSIONS.—The Secretary of Energy shall approve software submissions that comply with the calculation requirements of subclause (III).

“(C) DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLIANCE.—A determination of compliance made for the purposes of this paragraph shall be filed with the Secretary of Energy within 1 year of the date of such determination and shall include the TIN of the certifier, the address of the building in compliance, and the identity of the person for whom such determination was performed. Determinations of compliance filed with the Secretary of Energy shall be available for inspection by the Secretary.

“(D) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish requirements for certification and compliance procedures after examining the requirements for energy consultants and home energy ratings providers specified by the Mortgage Industry National Accreditation Procedures for Home Energy Rating Systems.

“(ii) INDIVIDUALS QUALIFIED TO DETERMINE COMPLIANCE.—Individuals qualified to determine compliance shall be only those individuals who are recognized by an organization certified by the Secretary of Energy for such purposes.

“(D) PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—The term ‘principal residence’ has the same meaning

as when used in section 121, except that the period for which a building is treated as the principal residence of the taxpayer shall also include the 60-day period ending on the 1st day on which it would (but for this subparagraph) first be treated as his principal residence.

“(d) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) DOLLAR AMOUNTS IN CASE OF JOINT OCCUPANCY.—In the case of any dwelling unit which is jointly occupied and used during any calendar year as a residence by 2 or more individuals the following shall apply:

“(A) The amount of the credit allowable under subsection (a) by reason of expenditures made during such calendar year by any of such individuals with respect to such dwelling unit shall be determined by treating all of such individuals as 1 taxpayer whose taxable year is such calendar year.

“(B) There shall be allowable with respect to such expenditures to each of such individuals, a credit under subsection (a) for the taxable year in which such calendar year ends in an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined under subparagraph (A) as the amount of such expenditures made by such individual during such calendar year bears to the aggregate of such expenditures made by all of such individuals during such calendar year.

“(2) TENANT-STOCKHOLDER IN COOPERATIVE HOUSING CORPORATION.—In the case of an individual who is a tenant-stockholder (as defined in section 216) in a cooperative housing corporation (as defined in such section), such individual shall be treated as having made his tenant-stockholder's proportionate share (as defined in section 216(b)(3)) of any expenditures of such corporation.

“(3) CONDOMINIUMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is a member of a condominium management association with respect to a condominium which he owns, such individual shall be treated as having made his proportionate share of any expenditures of such association.

“(B) CONDOMINIUM MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘condominium management association’ means an organization which meets the requirements of paragraph (1) of section 528(c) (other than subparagraph (E) thereof) with respect to a condominium project substantially all of the units of which are used as residences.

“(4) JOINT OWNERSHIP OF ENERGY ITEMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any expenditure otherwise qualifying as a residential energy property expenditure shall not be treated as failing to so qualify merely because such expenditure was made with respect to 2 or more dwelling units.

“(B) LIMITS APPLIED SEPARATELY.—In the case of any expenditure described in subparagraph (A), the amount of the credit allowable under subsection (a) shall (subject to paragraph (1)) be computed separately with respect to the amount of the expenditure made for each dwelling unit.

“(5) ALLOCATION IN CERTAIN CASES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if less than 80 percent of the use of an item is for nonbusiness purposes, only that portion of the expenditures for such item which is properly allocable to use for nonbusiness purposes shall be taken into account. For purposes of this paragraph, use for a swimming pool shall be treated as use which is not for nonbusiness purposes.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR VEHICLES.—For purposes of this section and section 48A, a vehicle shall be treated as used entirely for business or nonbusiness purposes if the majority of the use of such vehicle is for business or nonbusiness purposes, as the case may be.

“(6) DOUBLE BENEFIT; PROPERTY USED OUTSIDE UNITED STATES, ETC., NOT QUALIFIED.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a)(1)(B) with respect to—

“(A) any property for which a credit is allowed under section 30 or 48A,

“(B) any property referred to in section 50(b), and

“(C) the portion of the cost of any property taken into account under section 179 or 179A.

“(7) WHEN EXPENDITURE MADE; AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an expenditure with respect to an item shall be treated as made when the original installation of the item is completed.

“(B) EXPENDITURES PART OF BUILDING CONSTRUCTION.—In the case of an expenditure in connection with the construction of a structure, such expenditure shall be treated as made when the original use of the constructed structure by the taxpayer begins.

“(C) AMOUNT.—The amount of any expenditure shall be the cost thereof.

“(8) PROPERTY FINANCED BY SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING.—

“(A) REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of determining the amount of residential energy property expenditures made by any individual with respect to any dwelling unit, there shall not be taken into account expenditures which are made from subsidized energy financing (as defined in section 48A(g)(1)).

“(B) DOLLAR LIMITS REDUCED.—The dollar amounts in the table contained in subsection (b)(1) with respect to each property purchased for such dwelling unit for any taxable year of such taxpayer shall be reduced proportionately by an amount equal to the sum of—

“(i) the amount of the expenditures made by the taxpayer during such taxable year with respect to such dwelling unit and not taken into account by reason of subparagraph (A), and

“(ii) the amount of any Federal, State, or local grant received by the taxpayer during such taxable year which is used to make residential energy property expenditures with respect to the dwelling unit and is not included in the gross income of such taxpayer.

“(e) BASIS ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of this subtitle, if a credit is allowed under this section for any expenditure with respect to any property, the increase in the basis of such property which would (but for this subsection) result from such expenditure shall be reduced by the amount of the credit so allowed.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 1016 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (26), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (27) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(28) to the extent provided in section 25B(e), in the case of amounts with respect to which a credit has been allowed under section 25B.”.

(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25A the following new item:

“Sec. 25B. Nonbusiness energy property.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenditures after December 31, 1999.

Page 2, after line 5, insert “**TITLE I—OIL PRICE REDUCTION**”.

Page 2, line 6, strike “2” and insert “101”.

Page 5, line 4, strike “3” and insert “102”.

Page 5, line 16, strike “4” and insert “103”.

Page 6, line 10, strike “section 5” and insert “section 104”.

Page 6, line 12, strike “5” and insert “104”.

Page 6, line 15, strike “section 4” and insert “section 103”.

Page 6, line 17, strike “section 4(1)” and insert “section 103(1)”.

Page 6, line 21, strike “6” and insert “105”.

Page 6, line 24, strike “section 4” and insert “section 103”.

Page 7, line 3, strike “section 5” and insert “section 104”.

Page 8, line 2, strike “section 4” and insert “section 103”.

Page 8, line 7, strike “section 5” and insert “section 104”.

Page 8, line 9, strike “7” and insert “106”.

Page 8, line 10, strike “Act” and insert “title”.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order. The gentleman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes on her amendment.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I kind of knew this was going to happen, but I still think this is a very important part of the debate that is going on today. It seems that we are talking about a lot of issues that are not coming before this House that, quite frankly, probably could give us an energy policy that we would all be proud to be going home with.

We all know that we are talking about issues that are affecting our constituency every day. It is just obnoxious and absurd that we are seeing folks having to pay \$2, and many of these folks just cannot do it. Many of them live in rural areas, they cannot get to work, and they cannot afford that \$2. It is costing them everything they have. Our seniors are trying to get around and they cannot afford it either.

However, I think even within that, since we are going to talk about energy today, that we would be remiss if we did not bring into this debate energy efficiency and renewable energy assistance. For several years now, we have had a bipartisan caucus, an Energy Renewable Caucus here in this Congress, that has continued to look at ways to increase our funding for research. But on top of that, we also have a piece of legislation, H.R. 2380, which is the Energy Efficient Technology Tax Act.

I have to tell my colleagues that I think as we go through this and we look at the fact of being able to develop low carbon energy sources, that if we as the Congress could actually give incentives for this, it would be a marvelous thing for us to do.

Imagine in this world today if we could say to people, both private-owned and business-owned buildings, that we would actually give them tax credits for having energy efficient equipment in their new and existing buildings. Would it not be wonderful if we could give tax credits for new energy efficient homes, up to as much as \$2,000 if they do this? Imagine if we could tell people that we would give them a tax credit for solar systems.

And just to add into this particular part of the debate, do my colleagues

know that the United States used to be the number one issuer of solar energy and we have dropped to number seven in this world economy? That is absolutely absurd.

Then we could do for industry. We could encourage the CHP systems, make effective use of thermal energy that is otherwise wasted in producing electricity. We could encourage accelerated investment in this kind of equipment. In transportation, we could give tax credits for highly fuel efficient vehicles; extend the current tax credit for electric vehicles; expand the credit to include hybrid vehicles, and go on with the idea of what we could do with renewable energy.

Last year, this Congress passed in the tax bill a credit for wind production. We now need to do the same with biomass.

The fact of the matter is that any energy policy that we put together we need to include these very important steps in making sure that we make energy efficient technology more attractive.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, and I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 7?

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BALDACCI

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. BALDACCI:

At the end of the bill insert the following new sections:

SEC. 8. CREDIT FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING HOMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25A the following new section:

“SEC. 25B. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING HOMES.

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount paid or incurred by the taxpayer for qualified energy efficiency improvements installed during such taxable year.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—The credit allowed by this section with respect to a dwelling shall not exceed \$2,000.

“(2) PRIOR CREDIT AMOUNTS FOR TAXPAYER ON SAME DWELLING TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—If a credit was allowed to the taxpayer under subsection (a) with respect to a dwelling in 1 or more prior taxable years, the amount of the credit otherwise allowable for the taxable year with respect to that dwelling shall not exceed the amount of \$2,000 reduced by the sum of the credits allowed under subsection (a) to the taxpayer with respect to the dwelling for all prior taxable years.

“(c) CARRYFORWARD OF UNUSED CREDIT.—If the credit allowable under subsection (a) ex-

ceeds the limitation imposed by section 26(a) for such taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under subpart A of part IV of subchapter A (other than this section), such excess shall be carried to the succeeding taxable year and added to the credit allowable under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

“(d) QUALIFIED ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified energy efficiency improvements’ means any energy efficient building envelope component, and any energy efficient heating, cooling, or water heating appliance, the installation of which, by itself or in combination with other such components or appliances, is certified to improve the annual energy performance of the existing home by at least 30 percent, if—

“(1) such component or appliance is installed in or on a dwelling—

“(A) located in the United States, and

“(B) owned and used by the taxpayer as the taxpayer’s principal residence (within the meaning of section 121),

“(2) the original use of such component or appliance commences with the taxpayer, and

“(3) such component or appliance reasonably can be expected to remain in use for at least 5 years.

Such certification shall be made by the contractor who installed such improvements, a local building regulatory authority, or a qualified energy consultant (such as a utility or an accredited home energy rating system provider).

“(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) TENANT-STOCKHOLDER IN COOPERATIVE HOUSING CORPORATION.—In the case of an individual who is a tenant-stockholder (as defined in section 216) in a cooperative housing corporation (as defined in such section), such individual shall be treated as having paid his tenant-stockholder’s proportionate share (as defined in section 216(b)(3)) of the cost of qualified energy efficiency improvements made by such corporation.

“(2) CONDOMINIUMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is a member of a condominium management association with respect to a condominium which he owns, such individual shall be treated as having paid his proportionate share of the cost of qualified energy efficiency improvements made by such association.

“(B) CONDOMINIUM MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘condominium management association’ means an organization which meets the requirements of paragraph (1) of section 528(c) (other than subparagraph (E) thereof) with respect to a condominium project substantially all of the units of which are used as residences.

“(f) BASIS ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of this subtitle, if a credit is allowed under this section for any expenditure with respect to any property, the increase in the basis of such property which would (but for this subsection) result from such expenditure shall be reduced by the amount of the credit so allowed.

“(g) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—Subsection (a) shall apply to qualified energy efficiency improvements installed during the period beginning on January 1, 2000, and ending on December 31, 2004.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (c) of section 23 of such Code is amended by striking “and section 1400C” and inserting “and sections 25B and 1400C”.

(2) Subparagraph (C) of section 25(e)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “and 1400C” and inserting “, 25B, and 1400C”.

(3) Subsection (d) of section 1400C of such Code is amended by inserting “and section 25B” after “other than this section”.

(4) Subsection (a) of section 1016 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (26), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (27) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(28) to the extent provided in section 25B(f), in the case of amounts with respect to which a credit has been allowed under section 25B.”

(5) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25A the following new item:

“Sec. 25B. Energy efficiency improvements to existing homes.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1999.

SEC. 9. CREDIT FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS BY SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to business related credits) is amended by inserting after section 45C the following new section:

“SEC. 45D. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS BY SMALL BUSINESSES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of an eligible small business, the energy efficiency improvement credit determined under this section for the taxable year is an amount equal to 20 percent of the basis of each qualified energy efficiency improvements placed in service during such taxable year.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—The credit allowed by this section for the taxable year shall not exceed \$2,000.

“(2) COORDINATION WITH REHABILITATION AND ENERGY CREDITS.—For purposes of this section—

“(A) the basis of any property referred to in subsection (a) shall be reduced by that portion of the basis of any property which is attributable to qualified rehabilitation expenditures (as defined in section 47(c)(2)) or to the energy percentage of energy property (as determined under section 48(a)), and

“(B) expenditures taken into account under either section 47 or 48(a) shall not be taken into account under this section.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS.—The term ‘eligible small business’ means any person engaged in a trade or business if the average annual gross receipts of such person (or any predecessor) for the 3-taxable-year period ending with such prior taxable year does not exceed \$10,000,000. Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 448(c) shall apply for purposes of the preceding sentence.

“(2) QUALIFIED ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS.—The term ‘qualified energy efficiency improvements’ means any energy efficient property the installation of which, by itself or in combination with other such property, is certified to improve the annual energy performance of the structure to which it relates by at least 30 percent, if—

“(A) such property is installed in or on a structure located in the United States,

“(B)(i) the construction, reconstruction, or erection of such property is completed by the taxpayer, or

“(ii) such property which is acquired by the taxpayer if the original use of such property commences with the taxpayer,

“(C) depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable with respect to such property, and

“(D) such property reasonably can be expected to remain in use for at least 5 years.

Such certification shall be made by the contractor who installed such property, a local building regulatory authority, or a qualified energy consultant (such as a utility or an accredited energy rating system provider).

“(3) ENERGY EFFICIENT PROPERTY.—The term ‘energy efficient property’ means—

“(A) any energy efficient building envelope component, and

“(b) any energy efficient heating, cooling, or water heating appliance.

“(d) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—Subsection (a) shall apply to property placed in service during the period beginning on January 1, 2000, and ending on December 31, 2004.”

(b) CREDIT MADE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Subsection (b) of section 38 of such Code (relating to current year business credit) is amended by striking “plus” at the end of paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (12) and inserting “, plus”, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(13) in the case of an eligible small business (as defined in section 45D(c)), the energy efficiency improvement credit determined under section 45D.”

(c) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST REGULAR AND MINIMUM TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 38 of such Code (relating to limitation based on amount of tax) is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESS ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the energy efficiency improvement credit—

“(i) this section and section 39 shall be applied separately with respect to the credit, and

“(ii) in applying paragraph (1) to the credit—

“(I) subparagraph (A) thereof shall not apply, and

“(II) the limitation under paragraph (1) (as modified by subclause (I)) shall be reduced by the credit allowed under subsection (a) for the taxable year (other than the energy efficiency improvement credit).

“(B) ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT CREDIT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘energy efficiency improvement credit’ means the credit allowable under subsection (a) by reason of section 45D.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subclause (II) of section 38(c)(2)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting “or the energy efficiency improvement credit” after “employment credit”.

(d) LIMITATION ON CARRYBACK.—Subsection (d) of section 39 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) NO CARRYBACK OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT CREDIT BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.—No portion of the unused business credit for any taxable year which is attributable to the credit determined under section 45D may be carried back to any taxable year ending before the date of the enactment of section 45D.”

(e) DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN UNUSED BUSINESS CREDITS.—Subsection (c) of section 196 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting “, and”, and by adding after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

“(9) the energy efficiency improvement credit determined under section 45D.”

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 45C the following new item:

“Sec. 45D. Energy efficiency improvements by small businesses.”

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be able to address the House in regard to this very important matter.

This is a matter that we in the Northeast were hit with first when there was a heating oil shortage and the price got spiked and we had to divert the gasoline production to home heating oil so that we would have enough fuel oil to make sure that people were able to heat their homes.

About 75 percent of our Nation's home heating oil is consumed in the Northeast. That is why it was important for Secretary Richardson to have an energy summit in Boston and in Maine, to be able to listen to people directly, the truckers, the loggers, the small business people that were impacted negatively by what was taking place both with the high cost of home heating oil and the high cost of diesel fuel oil.

A lot of our agricultural products were not able to get to market. They could not afford to get them to market because of the distance in traveling and the prices people would have to bear. The President, in his radio announcement last Saturday, came forward with a proposal for a Northeast heating oil reserve, which is going to act as a buffer. It is going to be like a beachhead against this happening again so that we will not end up diverting those stocks and dwindling what limited resources we have.

The President also proposed to have tax credits for some of the small stripper wells, well producers in the Southeast that had their wells capped when prices were too low trying to increase production. It would have been a very effective course of quiet diplomacy, as quiet as can be done within the circumstances of an election year, to try to increase the production level that is taking place in this country.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate we were not able to address this issue. The amendment that I offered was going to be able to deal with energy conservation, energy weatherization, issues which the leadership has cut back and gutted over the years and not given the priority that it should be given.

We know firsthand that by being able to make sure that the older homes in the Northeast have the insulation and weatherization and the fuel efficiency of those oil burners that we are going to be able to save oil. It is a shame that we have gone from 35 percent consumption of foreign oil to over 50 percent consumption of foreign oil. We

need to make sure that we are producing less foreign dependency and more independence, which is why my amendment dealt with conservation, weatherization, and tax credits to make sure that small businesses and individual homeowners were able to take the measures themselves to reduce their demands for fuel and increasing our independence.

Mr. Chairman, we had an opportunity to make sure that we were not going to be dependent on any foreign nation; that we were going to take steps to make sure that we told our people that we were in control of our destiny and we were able to develop a comprehensive energy policy which would be able to take care of the short term, with the heating oil reserve, with increased production, and then by having tax relief for small businesses, loggers, farmers, fishermen, people who have been impacted by these higher prices. Those are the people that we are here to speak to.

I am sure that the chairman and other Members of the Congress are concerned about these issues. It is really unfortunate that we were unable to bring these issues up at this time. I know that the chairman is very concerned about it. Being in the Northeast, he has been there and understands the pressures that people go through. It is really unfortunate that we were not able to do that.

The President has to have the authority in the reauthorization. We have got to work together, because the people depend upon us to do this and it is time that we work together and show the American public that we can do what is in the best interest of the country first. Politics should be second.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for his worthy proposal, Mr. Chairman. I have not had a chance to examine it, but it sounds like it is worthy and I hope I can work together with the gentleman at a later date. Regrettably, we do not have jurisdiction over this matter.

Mr. BALDACCI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in 1979, when oil prices hit \$41 a barrel, then President Jimmy Carter called it the moral equivalent of war. At that time, we were only 32 percent dependent on foreign oil. Today, we are almost 60 percent dependent and we are rapidly losing that war.

Our domestic oil industry has been decimated by periodic and well-orchestrated dumping of cheap oil in an effort

by OPEC and others to drive producers at home out of business and replace our oil with their own.

□ 1830

In essence, they have been winning the moral equivalent of war while we stood by seduced by cheap fuel and did nothing. America is at risk, and both sides of the aisle are to blame.

We are no closer today to a sound national energy policy than we were 20 years ago. If we are to ever control our energy destiny again, we must have the courage to adopt a national energy policy that fosters U.S. domestic production, yes, encourages conservation measures, and promotes the development of domestic energy.

Today we are focused on the high price of gasoline. Why were we not concerned when our domestic production was set in a rapid decline by manipulation of these same entities when they dumped oil on our market in 1998, resulting in the loss of over 600,000 barrels of oil per day and nearly 75,000 jobs were lost in the domestic oil patches?

Yes, oil prices are fixed by the OPEC cartel. They run prices down in order to maintain and strengthen their market share by producing more oil. Having achieved their market objectives, then they run oil prices up by withholding production from the market. Neither practice is beneficial to the American consumer. In fact, such OPEC policies are a disaster to the consumer and the producer. With each price/production manipulation cycle, they increase their stranglehold on America itself.

I had hoped to offer two amendments today. However, the Committee on Rules has required all amendments to be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will not be able to offer those amendments at this time.

I wanted to move to set up a bipartisan commission to develop a lucid and definite national energy policy. Currently, our energy policy is a mess. This amendment would require the President to establish a bipartisan commission, similar to the Medicare Commission, to develop a national energy policy based on consideration of the issues I just mentioned.

My second amendment would have required the administration to begin an anti-dumping investigation into whether the oil exporting companies conspired to decrease oil prices by increasing production which forces domestic producers out of business and to close wells. This allows exporting countries to turn around and decrease production, leaving the United States with less domestic producers and then they can demand higher prices. The investigation would commence after the price of oil fell below a certain threshold for 30 consecutive days.

At this time, I would like to ask the chairman to allow me to engage him in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for a provision that requires the President

to provide a description "of the effect that coordination among the countries described. . . with respect to oil production and pricing has had on the United States economy."

I ask the chairman if he agrees that the report provided should include, and would be meant to include, a description of how predatory pricing in the oil markets has also disadvantaged American producers.

Because so many American producers have relatively high costs of production compared to the Saudis, they are especially vulnerable to low prices and the sharp swings in oil prices.

So I ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) if I am correct that the report should include reference to this side of the equation, also.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the long-term intention of the OPEC nations is to raise prices. But in the short-term, they certainly have been manipulating oil prices for predatory purposes.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) is certainly correct to point out the need for a careful review of our Nation's energy policy, and he is correct to call attention to the particular problem of low and volatile prices for our domestic oil producers.

The gentleman called for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to develop a national energy policy similar to the Medicare Commission. Clearly, the interests of domestic producers need to be safeguarded just as much as the interests of all consumers need attention.

I would be inclined to support such a commission, although it would not be primarily within the jurisdiction of our House Committee on International Relations. And it is a jurisdictional issue that has prevented us from addressing the issue at this time.

The definition of "oil price-fixing" does not explicitly refer to the predatory low pricing of oil, but I think that a fair reading of the general intent of the bill would lead one to conclude that any predatory practices were improper and ought to be condemned, just as they are condemned in our antitrust laws. In other words, if OPEC or any other oil exporters manipulate prices to drive domestic producers out of business, that needs to be of critical concern as a matter of our national energy policy.

I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) that I would endeavor to clarify these matters relating to the report and the definition of "oil price-fixing" in conference. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) for sharing his important views on this measure.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this long debate this afternoon; and I have

listened to Members complain that our Republican party does not have an energy policy, that our country does not have an energy policy.

We do have an energy policy in America. It is an energy policy defined over many years but certainly endorsed by the Clinton-Gore administration. It is an energy policy that depends upon foreign imports. It is a policy that says we will not necessarily produce enough energy for our own people. We do not need to. We can just depend upon foreign imports. That is our policy.

We resist the production of our own resources where they are available with all sorts of moratoria against drilling. We refuse to look realistically at the potential of ANWR, will not open it up to drilling and production, even with all the proper environmental controls in place. We have a policy in this country, and the Clinton-Gore administration endorses it; and that is to depend upon foreign imports.

Our Vice President has even written in his book that the gasoline engine was a scourge of mankind and that his policy would be for higher and higher taxes on gasoline to discourage us from even using it. So we have a policy in place. It is import what we need, and we ought to stop using it to begin with. That is our policy. It is pretty sad.

Now, I rose on the floor of this House to support our troops in the Persian Gulf to go and defend those oil fields in Saudi Arabia. I would like to remind my colleagues about what I said that day. Because the highest percentage per capita of the troops who went to the Persian Gulf came from Louisiana. We had a higher per capita of soldiers, men and women, in that battle in the Persian Gulf defending those oil fields than any other State in America. Do my colleagues know how sad that was?

And the reason that was true was we had such an unemployment in the oil fields of Louisiana that more of our men and women had signed up for the Reserves for extra income and signed up with the National Guard for extra income only to find themselves out of work in the Louisiana oil fields while they could be in battle defending somebody else's oil fields.

I made a speech that night and said, I hope I am never called upon again to send another Louisiana man or woman into battle to defend somebody else's oil field when we do not have a national energy policy promoting production at home. But we still do not. We have an administration that still believes it is okay to import all we need and we are at the whim of whoever wants to charge us whatever they want for it. That is the policy we have in America.

I had an explosion at a Shell plant not too long ago in my district. A cat cracker exploded and caused a couple of tragedies, a terrible experience. When that cat cracker exploded and that Shell plant was demolished, that whole community came together, and

we recognized how critical it was to rebuild that plant. I wonder if that plant could have been rebuilt anywhere in America. But we rebuilt it in Louisiana.

We have oil and chemical plants up and down the river in my district producing energy, producing products out of petroleum products for Americans, producing fuel oil, yes, and gasoline and diesel for this country. We accept the risk in Louisiana.

I wonder how many new refineries we could build in this country in the other States of our great Nation. I wonder how many people would permit the building of another refinery. We have done them in Louisiana, and we rebuild them when something happens like what happened at the Shell plant. But we have got a national energy policy that relies upon imported refined products now because we do not have a policy to encourage the refining and production of refined products in America.

Not only is our policy to import crude, our policy is to import the refined products, too. If my colleagues think we have a problem today with prices, just wait and see if ever there is another oil embargo like there was in 1976, just wait and see when the countries that control refined products decide to stop selling to us and the gasoline lines form again and the homes do not have heating oil and we go through a winter where the people suffer through it the way they did in 1973 and 1974. Remember those days.

We do not have an energy policy in America because we are too timid to produce our own resources, and we are too timid to refine our own resources, and we are dependent on other people to do it for us; and then we complain because we do not like the price.

Let us get a good energy policy in America. Let us not depend upon OPEC and foreign countries. Let us start thinking realistically about producing in America, for America, and refining in America the products we need in America instead of depending upon other people. Then maybe we would not need resolutions like this and we would not be crying over the high prices of gasoline.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo what the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) just said. But, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, I want to make several points before we go to final passage.

We have several bipartisan groups in this Congress willing to deal with energy policy. One is called the Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce, which I serve on. One is called the Committee on Ways and Means, which many other Members serve on. One is called the Committee on Resources. One is called the Committee on International Relations. There may be other committees.

What we need to do is begin to address some of these fundamental prob-

lems on a long-term basis, not bring a piece of legislation to the floor that, while well-intended, does nothing but exacerbate the problem and nothing to solve the problem. Let me elaborate on that.

We currently consume in the United States about 17 million barrels of crude oil and refined products. We currently produce about 8½ million. So we are importing around 9 million barrels per day. That is a number that none of us are happy with.

What have we done to maximize domestic oil and gas production in the last 7 years? Absolutely nothing. In fact, we have gone just the other way. We have taken more of the OSC leasing program and put it in moratorium. We have taken the on-shore programs on Federal lands and put them in moratorium. We have enforced stricter and stricter environmental standards on our refineries so that refinery capacity in the United States is declining. We have done absolutely nothing at all except make it more and more difficult to maximize domestic energy production.

So is the solution to pass a bill that alienates not only our OPEC partners but also the non-OPEC countries, like Mexico, Russia, Norway, and Great Britain?

Let me give my colleagues some production numbers. The United States has 21 billion barrels of proven crude oil reserves. The world has 1 trillion and 33 billion. So we are less than 2 percent.

We are producing, obviously, quite a bit at 8½ million barrels per day, but that is nowhere near what we need. The amount of foreign aid, military aid, economic aid, and food aid that we gave the 11 OPEC nations in the last fiscal year was less than \$200 million, \$198 million. That is less than one day's imports if we were to look at it on an equivalent based on \$30 per barrel oil.

Do my colleagues think that OPEC countries are going to think that giving up \$200 million is any great loss to them? That is not a sword. That is not a paddle. That is not even a rubber band. This is a spitball. That is what that is.

Would it not be better to work with OPEC, to work with the non-OPEC producers, to work with our domestic oil and gas and interpretive energy producers in this country to develop a comprehensive energy policy? Would it not be better to do that than to bring this bill to the floor and send the signal to OPEC that we can just rattle our indignation?

No one has suffered any worse than my constituents from rising energy prices.

□ 1845

We have seen gasoline prices at the pump go up 60 to 70 cents per gallon in Texas where I live. We have seen some of our low-income residents have to seek assistance to pay their heating bills this winter. We are not saying we

need high, high energy prices like have happened. But on the other hand we are not saying that we should react in a knee jerk fashion when the solution is no solution at all.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would oppose this legislation, work with the committees that have jurisdiction, that could do some tax incentives like the Committee on Ways and Means, that could do some energy policy initiatives like the Committee on Commerce, that could do some of the leasing provisions like the Committee on Resources and bring forward bipartisan legislation in the very near future to address these problems in a fundamental fashion. I would hope that we would do that and oppose this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3822) to reduce, suspend, or terminate any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to each country determined by the President to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 445, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEJDENSON

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEJDENSON of Connecticut moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 3822) to the Committee on International Relations with instructions to consider effective measures that reduce the high oil prices on the international market created by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and report

the bill back to the House with amendments containing such effective measures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 38, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]
YEAS—382

Abercrombie	Clayton	Frost
Aderholt	Clement	Gallegly
Allen	Clyburn	Ganske
Andrews	Coble	Gejdenson
Armey	Collins	Gekas
Baca	Cook	Gephardt
Bachus	Costello	Gibbons
Baird	Cox	Gilchrest
Baldacci	Coyne	Gillmor
Baldwin	Cramer	Gilman
Ballenger	Crowley	Gonzalez
Barcia	Cubin	Goode
Barr	Cummings	Goodlatte
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Goodling
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Gordon
Bartlett	Davis (FL)	Goss
Bass	Davis (IL)	Graham
Bateman	Davis (VA)	Granger
Becerra	Deal	Green (TX)
Berkley	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Berman	DeGette	Gutierrez
Berry	Delahunt	Gutknecht
Biggert	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Bilbray	DeLay	Hall (TX)
Bilirakis	DeMint	Hansen
Bishop	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Blagojevich	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bliley	Dickey	Hayworth
Blunt	Dicks	Herger
Boehlert	Dixon	Hill (MT)
Boehner	Doggett	Hilleary
Bonior	Dooley	Hilliard
Bono	Doolittle	Hinojosa
Borski	Doyle	Hobson
Boswell	Dreier	Hoefel
Boucher	Duncan	Hoekstra
Boyd	Dunn	Holden
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Holt
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Hooley
Brown (OH)	Ehrlich	Horn
Bryant	Emerson	Hostettler
Burr	Engel	Hoyer
Burton	English	Hulshof
Buyer	Eshoo	Hunter
Callahan	Etheridge	Hutchinson
Calvert	Evans	Hyde
Camp	Everett	Inslee
Campbell	Ewing	Isakson
Canady	Farr	Istook
Capps	Fattah	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Filner	Jefferson
Cardin	Fletcher	Jenkins
Carson	Foley	John
Castle	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Chabot	Ford	Johnson, E.B.
Chambliss	Fossella	Johnson, Sam
Chenoweth-Hage	Fowler	Jones (NC)
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Jones (OH)

Kanjorski	Myrick	Shows
Kaptur	Nadler	Shuster
Kasich	Napolitano	Simpson
Kelly	Neal	Sisisky
Kennedy	Nethercutt	Skeen
Kildee	Ney	Skelton
Kilpatrick	Northup	Slaughter
Kind (WI)	Norwood	Smith (MI)
King (NY)	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Kingston	Obey	Smith (WA)
Kleczka	Olver	Snyder
Klink	Ortiz	Souder
Knollenberg	Ose	Spence
Kucinich	Owens	Spratt
Kuykendall	Oxley	Stabenow
LaFalce	Packard	Stark
LaHood	Pascrell	Stearns
Lampson	Pastor	Strickland
Lantos	Paul	Stump
Larson	Payne	Stupak
Latham	Pease	Sweeney
LaTourette	Pelosi	Talent
Lazio	Peterson (PA)	Tancredo
Leach	Petri	Tanner
Lee	Phelps	Tauscher
Levin	Pickett	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Terry
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Thomas
Linder	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Portman	Thompson (MS)
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Thune
Lofgren	Pryce (OH)	Thurman
Lucas (KY)	Quinn	Tiahrt
Lucas (OK)	Radanovich	Tierney
Luther	Ramstad	Toomey
Maloney (CT)	Rangel	Towns
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Traficant
Manzullo	Reyes	Turner
Markey	Reynolds	Udall (CO)
Martinez	Rivers	Udall (NM)
Mascara	Rogers	Upton
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Riley
McCarthy (MO)	Ros-Lehntinen	Velazquez
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Vento
McCollum	Roukema	Visclosky
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Vitter
McHugh	Ryan (WI)	Walden
McInnis	Ryun (KS)	Walsh
McIntosh	Salmon	Wamp
McIntyre	Sanchez	Waters
McKeon	Sanders	Watt (NC)
McNulty	Sandlin	Watts (OK)
Meehan	Sawyer	Waxman
Meek (FL)	Saxton	Weiner
Meeks (NY)	Scarborough	Weldon (FL)
Menendez	Schaffer	Weldon (PA)
Metcalf	Scott	Weller
Mica	Sensenbrenner	Wexler
Millender-	Serrano	Weygand
McDonald	Shadegg	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Shaw	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Shays	Wilson
Minge	Sherman	Wise
Mink	Sherwood	Wolf
Moakley	Shimkus	Woolsey
Mollohan		Wu
Moore		Wynn
Moran (VA)		Young (AK)
Morella		Young (FL)

NAYS—38

Archer	Dingell	Peterson (MN)
Baker	Hastings (FL)	Pickering
Barton	Hefley	Rahall
Bentsen	Hinchey	Sabo
Blumenauer	Houghton	Sanford
Bonilla	Kolbe	Sessions
Brady (TX)	Largent	Smith (TX)
Cannon	McCrery	Stenholm
COBURN	McKinney	Sununu
Combest	Miller, George	Tauzin
Condit	Moran (KS)	Thornberry
Conyers	Murtha	Watkins
Cooksey	Oberstar	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman	Hill (IN)	Pallone
Bereuter	Jackson-Lee	Royce
Crane	(TX)	Rush
Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Schakowsky
Greenwood	McDermott	

□ 1913

Messrs. COOKSEY, PICKERING, COBURN, ARCHER and LARGENT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. RANGEL, BOUCHER, ABER-CROMBIE and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

“A bill to combat international oil price fixing.”

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.R. 3822, the legislation just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 36

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Congressman KEVIN BRADY’s name from my bill, H.R. 36. His name was inadvertently added to the list of cosponsors, and I ask that his name now be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□

COMBINED ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996-1997 AND 1998

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 Science:

To Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of section 3(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(f)), I transmit herewith the combined annual reports of the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1996-1997, and the annual report for fiscal year 1998.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 22, 2000.