

realize that a lot of people in this House thought that.

I missed the tribute on the floor. I got there when he was actually speaking. I came back to my office from actually being down and meeting on this particular bill. I realized later what everybody said about him. I guess we always say nice things about each other, but I do not know of anyone in this House who is truly more respected, liked and admired than the gentleman from New York, Mr. FLOYD FLAKE. He has done an exceptional job, not just in this subcommittee, but in general, and it is with a great amount of sadness that, while it may not be, we still have a coin bill coming along, but it may be the last bill we are going to handle, and I would like to add my homage to what everybody has said about him.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on S. 1026.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PROGRAMS UNDER THE ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 317) providing for the agreement of the House to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2472, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 317

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill H.R. 2472, to extend certain programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment to the text of the bill be, and the same is hereby, agreed to with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate, insert the following:

SECTION 1. ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS.

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) in section 166 (42 U.S.C. 6246) by striking "1997" and inserting in lieu thereof "1998";

(2) in section 181 (42 U.S.C. 6251) by striking "September 30, 1997" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "September 1, 1998"; and

(3) in section 281 (42 U.S.C. 6285) by striking "September 30, 1997" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "September 1, 1998".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DAN SCHAEFER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DAN SCHAEFER].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we will be sending back to the other body reauthorizes a provision of the Energy and Conservation Act related to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the U.S. participation in the international agreement for 1 fiscal year.

These provisions, which expired September 30, assure that if there is an energy emergency, the President's authority to draw down the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the ability of U.S. oil companies to participate in the international energy agreement without violating antitrust laws is preserved for another year.

As I stated when the House passed this bill earlier this year, because of their importance to the U.S. national energy security, I believe these programs should not go unauthorized. At the same time, I believe requiring them to be reauthorized annually is appropriate as long as oil from the Reserve continues to be sold for budgetary purposes.

□ 2330

It is my hope that when DOE completes its review of the SPR policies, we can work with the administration and the appropriators to develop a coherent and consistent policy regarding the future of the reserve.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will not have any speakers. I rise in support of the bill. I would like to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER.

I thank the chairman for his leadership and for his hard work to ensure that the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is reauthorized. EPCA provides the authority for the U.S. to cooperate with their international allies during world oil crises, to alleviate shortages in calm markets.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] for his work and agree that we must have EPCA in

place, particularly in light of the ongoing events in the Middle East.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to propose to my good friend from Colorado also that while this simple extension of existing authority is a good thing, we need to take a closer look early next year at the need to update EPCA's antitrust provisions.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I thank the gentleman again for his remarks, and I agree that the Committee on Commerce and other affected committees should take a closer look at this issue to ensure that our national interests are fully protected and we can meet our treaty obligations.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER. I think we ought to get on top of this sooner rather than later next year, when we have time to consider the matter thoroughly. We ought not to wait until EPCA expires next September. Maybe by then we will be comfortable providing for a longer-term reauthorization.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the comments of my colleague. We have worked very closely together in the past, and I want to continue to do that, particularly on this issue and any other issue that deals with our committee. But we have to ensure that we have energy policy in this country that is going to be best for the American citizens.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a sense of profound disappointment to speak reluctantly in support of H. Res. 317, and only because we have no better alternative. Notwithstanding disturbing hourly reports from the Middle East, Members of the House has been presented with an unpleasant and wholly unnecessary choice. We can either vote for this barebones, better-than-nothing reauthorization of the most essential parts of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act—our nation's first line of defense in dealing with an international oil crisis—or we can take our chances that the Act, which has already been allowed to lapse, will not have to be deployed during the next 2 months while the Congress is out of session.

Since 1984, the United States has sought to persuade our international partners to graduate from a cumbersome and outdated oil allocation plan to a more market oriented "coordinated stock drawdown" policy under which each country would release petroleum stocks to forestall any shortages. This type of approach, which was tried out during Desert Storm, shows great promise and has finally been accepted by our allies and the International Energy Agency.

Neither of these policies, however, can work without the cooperation and assistance of both U.S. and international oil companies. In times of severe supply shortages or market instability, the I.E.A. needs real time information about the location and movement of oil stocks and refined produces with only these companies can provide. EPCA was drafted with an appreciation of these need for partnership,

and included from the beginning a "limited antitrust defense" to ensure companies are not prosecuted for actions they are requested to take by government during an oil emergency.

This is exactly the type of voluntary co-operation Congress should be encouraging. For three years now, the Administration and the U.S. oil industry have been asking Congress to update EPCA's antitrust provisions to permit them to assist the U.S. government and the I.E.A. in carrying out a coordinated stock drawdown. The Senate's bill includes language supported by both the Administration and industry.

Unfortunately, H. Res. 317 does not address the antitrust issue. Hearings have been held, testimony has been provided, and no objection has been voiced to the type of changes the Administration has proposed and the Senate has adopted. This is an entirely unnecessary omission, and represents a failure by the House and its leadership to properly discharge their responsibilities. Let no one be mistaken—in the event that international oil markets suffer a severe shock in the coming months, the I.E.A. will be hamstrung in its ability to temper the impact on consumers and financial markets because U.S. oil companies will not be able to participate fully. This is a mistake which could have been averted had the necessary homework been done at the proper time.

While I support H. Res. 317 and urge members to vote for the resolution, I do so with a sense of regret and measure of anger at the choice with which this body has been presented.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership on this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DAN SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.R. 317.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996 AMENDMENT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2920) to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to modify the requirements for implementation of an entry-exit control system.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2920

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1 Modification of Entry-Exit Control System.

Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), strike "Act," and insert "Act (and not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act in the case of land border points of entry).";

(2) in subsection (a)(1), strike "and" at the end;

(3) in subsection (a)(2), strike the period at the end and insert "; and";

(4) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

"(3) not significantly disrupt trade, tourism, or other legitimate cross-border traffic at land border points of entry."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has required the Immigration and Naturalization Service to develop and implement a system to track the entry and exits of those crossing our borders. The purpose of this bill is to make sure that such a system will not substantially impede trade or traffic across our borders, both northern and southern.

The intent is, first, to set a reasonable time frame for the development and implementation of an exit/entry system and, second, to reaffirm that it is the policy of this Congress that such a system is to be developed so that, upon implementation, it will not substantially impede trade or border crossings.

Understandably, this matter may be of particular concern to those States along our northern border. Unlike the southern border, there are relatively few northern border entry points and they already are congested by high volumes of traffic frequently using one- and two-lane highways and bridges. Any further slowdown in the flow of such traffic could be seen as hurting the economies of many States, especially New York, Michigan, and Washington State, but also Minnesota, Wisconsin, Maine, Pennsylvania, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Vermont, and New Hampshire.

States along our southern border, where 2½ times as many individuals were inspected than were along our northern border in fiscal year 1997, are more experienced in addressing these kinds of problems. For instance, today in San Diego thousands drove across the border and were monitored electronically. Some entry points on our southern border have as many as 23 lanes to speed traffic.

Increased trade with Mexico has spurred investments in the construction of major new crossings elsewhere. What this bill does is reassure all Americans and our neighbors both to the north and to the south that, as the United States exercises its right to control its borders, it is also committed to facilitating trade.

We should expand our Nation's capacities to trade with our neighbors as well as facilitate the lawful crossing of citizens on both sides of our borders. Unfortunately, many people enter our country along our northern and southern borders legally but, wrongfully, never return home. Forty percent of the estimated 5 million illegal aliens in the country today entered in such a manner, overstaying their visas.

The United States needs to develop an entry-exit system to fairly and effectively address these illegal overstays, but we must do so in a manner that does not significantly disrupt trade, tourism, or other legitimate cross-border traffic.

Some may suggest this bill would set a different standard for people crossing our northern border. Any such suggestion is contradicted by the facts. This bill treats our southern and northern borders exactly the same. It makes no distinction.

Again, this bill is an affirmation of two important national policies; one, that we have a right and duty to control our borders; and, two, that it is in the best interest of the United States and our neighbors both to the north and south to act so as to facilitate trade and border crossings.

Our task in the House today is to ensure that border crossings will not be substantially impeded while we also protect the Nation's interest in being able to control our borders. And that is exactly what this bill does.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT], the ranking minority member.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2920.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, I have had the opportunity this year to learn a great deal about America's borders and the importance of securing the borders against illegal immigration, narcotic, and alien smugglers, and potential terrorists. Because of this, I have supported efforts by the chairman of our subcommittee to increase security along the southwest border of the United States.

Because of the success along the southwest border, pressure has increased along the northern border. I recognize that there is a long tradition of openness between the United States and Canada along the northern border, but times are changing, and I believe our policies must adjust to reflect these changes.