

price by a factor of three or four while the expenses are not affected by the gouging activity, then the profits might be going up by 800 percent, 1,200 percent.

That is indeed what is happening for a few huge corporations based in Texas who are, with such a powerful friend in the White House, able to avoid commonsense rate regulation on the electricity they are selling in California.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I know we only have a couple more minutes, so I am going to try to wrap up. If the gentleman from California would like to add to this, please do not hesitate.

I just wanted to point out, I started out this evening by saying that actions speak louder than words. Really, I think that describes what we are seeing from this administration and from the President. We are seeing a lot of rhetoric about conservation and no action.

The gentleman talked about the budget. Two things I wanted to mention. We know that renewable energy programs were slashed by 50 percent in the President's budget proposal. But what he did in his energy plan that he came out with last week, and I think it is really hypocritical and really outrageous, he recommended the creation of a royalties conservation fund. This fund would provide money in royalties from new oil and gas production in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to fund land conservation efforts, and it would also pay for the maintenance backlog at national parks.

So what we are basically being told is that we have to destroy the wilderness, the Arctic wilderness, in order to protect the national parks, or to provide money for other land conservation efforts. I just think it is a slap in the face to any conservation or environmental efforts to suggest that that is the way we are going to fund these things, and then just go ahead and cut all things in the Federal budget.

I think the only thing we can do is to continue to speak out, as the gentleman has so well done. I know the gentleman is probably going to be back again tomorrow night or another night this week, and I plan on doing the same thing, because we have to get across to the public that as much as the President has a lot of rhetoric about conservation, his energy policy really is a disaster for the environment, and is not going to do anything, either long-term or short-term, to deal with the problems that we face now with gas prices or blackouts. Does the gentleman wish to add anything else?

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, especially because his State is not facing quite the disaster we are facing in California.

I think it is simply outrageous that we in California are prevented from having the kind of rate regulation at the wholesale level that we all want, that we so desperately need, and that we are precluded from having by Federal preemption.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we will continue until we get that opportunity. I want to thank the gentleman again.

CORRECTING RECENT MISSTATEMENTS MADE ON THE FLOOR REGARDING PRESIDENT BUSH AND THE ENERGY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise not just in opposition but in absolute dismay that for the last hour my colleagues have spoken so many disingenuous statements that I absolutely had to come to the well. I did not plan on speaking today. It was only watching this from my office that made me realize how important it was that somebody come here without a prepared speech but with a few of the facts that can set the record straight.

First of all, I think the most important one is when Members start to talk about dollars given to the President, they should be very careful not to say they came from companies. In fact, President Bush accepted no soft dollars. He did not receive a single penny from the utility companies, as was alleged, or from any other companies.

My colleagues simply looked at the employers of individual contributors, or the sources of employees, individual employees from PACs who gave to President Bush. If we went to the other side, any of the other candidates, we would find the same. It is wrong to talk about money as being tainted when it comes from individual Americans, as every penny President Bush received did.

Additionally, my friends forget to note that Governor Gray Davis showed an absence of leadership for 2 full years on this subject, and President Clinton showed an absence of any regard for California as our prices skyrocketed. It was only when President Bush was sworn in that the FERC, under his leadership, began ordering price rollbacks and refunds for excess charges.

More importantly, I am here to speak for the President, not because I have his permission, but because he will not speak for himself. He will not defend himself. He has led both sides of this aisle, and refused to disparage those who disparage him.

President Bush has made an unprecedented reaching out to the other side to ask for what they want done, and he has tried to grant every single request he could. In the President's first 100 days, he invited Republicans and Democrats to the White House on more than ten occasions. Once, the entire House was invited.

One of the most heinous of all lies that was told here tonight, maybe unintended but certainly untrue, was that these prices have skyrocketed. When they quote the prices that are

available on the spot market, they quote the last kilowatt, the last megawatt, that was purchased on a daily basis.

I think it is only fair that the people of California and of Oregon and of Washington recognize that these companies that deliver power now have the power to lock in long-term rates again. Those companies in California, such as the city of Los Angeles and other municipal authorities, enjoy much lower prices because they have long-term commitments and buy very little on the spot market.

Even today, most of the private power under the Governor's control in the State of California is bought on the spot market. Once the Governor shows the leadership to get those long-term contracts in place, those contracts are at dramatically lower prices, nearly where they should be.

There was a claim here tonight of criminal collusion, of conspiracy. I challenge my colleagues here tonight to find any evidence of that, and if they do, I will challenge the administration and the Attorney General to prosecute. But to simply sit on the floor and claim that unlawful behavior is going on is intolerable.

The President in his first 100 days has taken on conservation, and in a big way. The President has announced that, unlike the previous administration that for 8 years did not improve CAFE standards a bit, that he will improve vehicle economy, fuel economy, and environmental standards, if for no other reason than that it is the right thing to do.

He has announced that SUVs in the near future will no longer be exempted, as they once were. They will not be treated as light trucks, they will soon be treated as automobiles, thus bringing an end to one of the most illogical growths in gas guzzlers ever to face America.

I have little time here tonight, and so much that I could rebuff. I wish I could go on longer, because the people of California need to know and need to hear that lower prices will come from leadership, which has not been shown in California and has been shown in Washington.

THE TRUTH ABOUT CALIFORNIA'S ENERGY CRISIS AND THE DEATH TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments just made by the gentleman from California.

I cannot believe the comments that I heard in the last 30 minutes from the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). I have great respect for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE). He and I have

shared this floor many nights on special orders. I have never heard the kind of comments that I heard this evening from my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey. Let me quote exactly what he said.

Referring to the President of the United States, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) said, "The only reason that the crisis exists is because," referring to the President, "he is getting special-interest money."

If the gentleman from New Jersey is suggesting, and I am not sure, I do not think he is, I think this is way below the gentleman from New Jersey; the gentleman from New Jersey is, in my opinion, a man of great integrity; but if he is suggesting that the President of the United States has accepted bribes from an oil company, he has an inherent responsibility, in fact, he has a fiduciary responsibility, to tomorrow morning go immediately to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to the U.S. Attorney's Office and present the evidence that he has against the President of the United States for bribery.

Short of that, he should never, ever make those kind of remarks on this House floor, at least in my presence. There was no justification whatsoever, and I second the gentleman's remarks.

This floor is an exercise of freedom of speech. This floor, Mr. Speaker, is for us to debate among each other. I know that tempers get short once in a while. I know we all believe intensely in our positions. But before Members allege what is considered to be a high crime, to me almost equal to crime of treason, and that is acceptance of a bribe, Members darned well better have their evidence before they do that to a colleague or to a President of the United States. That evidence, in my opinion, is not in existence.

Let me conclude those comments by telling Members once again, I do not think that is what the gentleman from New Jersey intended. It is what he said. I do not think that is what he intended, because, as I said earlier, in my opinion, the gentleman from New Jersey, while I rarely agree with him, I consider him a gentleman. I consider him professionally to be a man of integrity. But his comments this evening were out of order.

Now let us talk about the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). Of course, the gentleman makes these remarks because he is unrebuted for an hour. The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), all of us, we know on my side of the party we have some very partisan politicians. On the Democratic side of the party, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is among the most partisan politicians in these Chambers.

Now, there is nothing wrong with that. But I ask Members not to come to these Chamber floors and pretend, or we should be very clear so we do not pretend exactly where a person's position is politically. The key here is to plan for the future of California. The

key is not to spend one's entire time up here trying to insinuate that the President, and let me give a few quotes from the gentleman, that they want to eliminate conservation.

I defy the gentleman from California to show me one Congressman, Republican or Democrat, show me one Congressman who wants to eliminate conservation. Just show me one, I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). There is not anybody on this House floor, there has never been anybody on this House floor, and I doubt that there is ever going to be anybody on this House floor that wants to eliminate conservation.

That is the kind of exaggeration that creates the partisan battles, or certainly does not move us forward in a positive direction to plan for California's future.

Now let us talk about the accusations that somehow President Bush is responsible, because after all, he has been in office 120 days or something, a little over 100 days, that somehow he is responsible for the problem in California.

I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), he sounded like a defense attorney this evening: Blame everybody; make sure the gentleman's client is protected and without blame, but blame everybody else. We are not going to get anywhere around here doing that.

Let me point out, there are 50 States in this union. There is one State suffering rolling blackouts, one State. It is California. There is one State in the last 10 years that has refused to allow electrical generation plants to be built in their State. That is California. There is one State in the Union out of those 50 States that has refused to have natural gas transmission lines. It is California. There is one State that allowed deregulation, allowed the price caps to come off electrical generation companies. It is California. Now they are beginning to reap some of what they sowed.

I heard comments, and let me find it here, that we have been told, apparently by the administration, we have been told to do everything possible to make California suffer. I say to the gentleman from California, I do not know one person on this floor, Democrat or Republican, that really, truly wants California to suffer.

I know a lot of Congressmen like myself that would like the leadership, the Governor of California, to quit blaming everybody else and to help pull himself up by his bootstraps. But I do not think anybody in here has said California ought to suffer. We want California to learn from its lessons, and frankly, we are all learning from the mistakes California made with deregulation. We are all learning from that. There would have been other States that would have deregulated, but they did first, and there are some problems with it.

□ 2045

What we wanted to do with California is help, but you cannot help shift all the blame to Washington, D.C. Washington, D.C., California, should not be the solution for your problems. In California, you need to lift yourself up. You need a governor who is willing to say, all right, we will put in generation facilities. All right, we are going to have to pay the price, even though it is expensive. We are going to have to pay the price to allow electrical generation plants to go in there.

Let me tell my colleagues I have been to California. I think it is a beautiful State, by the way. I like California, but I have been to your airport and I have been to your hotels. You do not hesitate to raise the price for tourists to pay for your stadiums down there and for your recreational facilities.

I have gone to your airport and they add some kind of tax. I feel like I am getting gouged. Let us take a look at what we are trying to accomplish here. What we want to do is help plan for California's future, but have the direction come from your governor of that State. The governor of your State's time would frankly be much better spent, instead of this blame game, getting down to brass tacks and figuring out how to get a gas transmission line into that State, how to build some electrical transmission lines in that State, how to build electrical generation facilities in that State.

It would be a very serious mistake for any of my colleagues on this floor, it would be a very mistake for us to really want California to suffer. It would be a serious mistake for anybody on this floor to turn their back on California. It would be a serious mistake not to look into the allegations that perhaps somebody intentionally violated the law by withholding a supply.

But with that said, it would also be a serious mistake not to allow some electrical generation to be built in that State of California. It would also be a serious mistake for us to say that we do not need to look for more supplies.

I wanted to bring a chart up here. This is growth in the U.S. energy consumption and it is outpacing production. This is what happened to California years ago, drip by drip by drip. California under its leadership, these are not the people, these are the people's elected representatives, continued to oppose, while demand went up, supply was stagnated in part because of the fact they will not allow additional supply sources to come on board.

The result is exactly what is happening, and, frankly, we have to take a serious look at it across the country. We are all going to benefit from California's ills in that we will learn what not to do. I do not think a State should deregulate their electrical business. I think it is a mistake.

I have been opposed to deregulation. Here is our problem: This is the energy production. At this career's growth's

rate, that green line, that is our energy production. It is flat. This is our energy consumption. This is the gap. This is the projected shortfall.

Now contrary to what the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) said I do not know one Member of Congress in here who is opposed to conservation. But the reality of it is conservation cannot fill that entire gap. Look where we are. Conservation can make a big hit there.

Mr. Speaker, I gave a speech on this floor last week suggesting everything from checking the direction that your ceiling fans are turning to only changing your vehicle oil in your engine every 6,000 miles instead of every 3,000 miles. But the fact is, conservation helps, and it is important. It makes common sense. It is good practice for future planning in this country.

Conservation ought to be adopted on a permanent basis, but we also have to face the reality that even with conservation, you still have a gap in there. We have to produce more.

You say well, it is these big oil companies. And I cannot tell my colleagues how many times I heard the gentlemen say big oil company, big oil company. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) said it. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) said it. The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) said it.

I will bet my colleagues that all three of them this evening right now as I am speaking are probably driving home in a car. I doubt they walked. When they get home, I will bet you they turned the lights on in their house. If it is hot, I bet they have the air conditioning on. If it is cold, I bet they have the heater on.

My guess is that my three colleagues are going to also take a shower. My guess is it is not going to be with cold water, they probably will have warm water, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

We get into this problem of exaggeration when you keep talking about big oil and special interests money. We want to help plan for the future of this country. We do not want to leave California abandoned out there.

California, by the way, I say to colleagues is, I think, it is the third or seventh, I think it is the third strongest economy in the world, what is bad for California frankly in a lot of cases is bad for the other 49 States, but by gosh, California has to help pull the wagon.

They cannot ride the wagon all the time. They have to help pull the wagon, and what I mean by that is, you cannot continue, California, to depend on your neighbors for electrical generation, for natural gas transmission, for electrical transmission.

I am not asking you to carry an unfair burden, California. I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) I am not asking the gentleman to carry something unfairly. I am just saying, by gosh, if you want to sit by

the campfire at night, you ought to help gather the firewood.

Instead of sitting by the campfire and saying well, keep the fire warm but by the way let us not use as much firewood, well, then maybe you ought to move away from the campfire instead of enjoying the comforts of the campfire to continue.

I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), if you want to enjoy the comforts of the campfire, by gosh, you can help gather some wood and you can throw a log on once in a while. I do not think we need a bonfire out there. I think we can have a campfire.

I was surprised by the partisan remarks that were made this evening. And by the way, on the tax bill that passed out, judging from the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), this is a Republican bulldozer going through the U.S. Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, that tax plan is going to be passed on a bipartisan basis. Many of your colleagues, I say to the gentleman are going to vote for this tax bill, and they ought to vote for this tax bill.

Many of your colleagues in the United States Senate, my guess would be, will be voting for this tax bill.

This is a bipartisan vote we will be taking this week. Why? Because it needs a bipartisan solution. What about the energy problem? That needs a bipartisan solution.

Let me point out, that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) was talking about how somehow the President was responsible for the shortage of supply and power that may occur up in the Northwest. He spoke, first of all, of the Western States. I can tell the gentleman from Washington I am from a Western State.

As the gentleman knows, I represent the mountains of the State of Colorado. So the gentleman does not speak for the entire Western United States, but your problem in Washington State is not Washington, D.C., although Washington, D.C. is a problem for a lot of things. Your problem in Washington State is something the President does not have a lot of control over, and that is rainfall.

Take a look. In fact, I have a poster here to give the gentleman an idea. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) speaks about the Pacific Northwest, the second worst drought on record. That is not the doings of President George W. Bush. The gentleman or the gentlewoman that made that, if you have direct contact with them, you are doing pretty good.

This is the second worst drought on record, and that is why the mighty Columbia River is way down. That is where your power shortage is coming from. It is not because Washington State refused to put in transmission lines like California.

It is not because Washington State refused to build generation facilities like California. Washington State, in

fact, was prudent, and Washington State did not deregulate their electrical generation. So for Washington State, it is an act of nature that is creating some problems.

By the way, I think these problems are nationwide frankly, and the other 49 States, we actually are going to be fine with electrical supply here in the next year or so. We have a lot of facilities that are going on online.

My point, before I move on to the death tax, that I am saying to my colleagues is nobody on this floor really wants to abandon California. Sure, we all get upset with California. It is like as I said earlier, if you are going out camping and you set up a campfire and you have one member of your camping team that is not bringing any wood to the fire but continues to sit around and enjoy the fire, does not help cook breakfast but continues to eat breakfast, does not help wash dishes but continues to use the dishes, yes, you get upset with them.

But does that mean that you abandon them somewhere in the mountains? Of course, you do not. You try and sit down with them and say, look, you are not doing your fair share. We need to plan for your future and our future.

That is what we are saying to California. We want to plan with you, but, by gosh, you have to do a little self help. And one of the best things you can do for self help is get your governor off the airwaves and tell the governor in the State of California to sit in the office, put some pencil in paper and let us have some conservation. By the way, California does exercise good conservation.

But there are some other things we can do. Let us get the governor from California to approach us on a non-partisan basis and come up with some solutions.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that my colleague from South Dakota would like to speak on this topic before I move on to the death tax.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) moves on to the death tax, I would like to echo a couple of things that he was saying. And I too was in my office and I heard much of the discussion of our colleagues on the other side prior to the gentleman assuming your discussion here on the floor.

I just wanted to point out that this is the President's energy proposal. It is about 170 pages long and I will put that next to the last administration's energy proposal, which I cannot find, oh, that is right. They did not have an energy proposal for the last 8 years.

This President has assumed leadership, has taken the initiative, has put together a comprehensive, specific and detailed plan to help address this country's energy problems.

And as the gentleman from Colorado noted earlier, you know we come over here a lot of times and things get a little hot from time to time, but this is

not a partisan issue. This is not a Republican problem or a Democrat problem. This is an American problem.

President Bush has laid out an American solution. My colleagues came out here and talked a lot about how it is heavy on oil, on fossil fuels, and that sort of thing.

But if we look at the proposal specifically in here of the 105 specific recommendations in the President's plan: Forty-two of those recommendations have to do with modernizing and increasing conservation and protecting our environment; thirty-five of those recommendations have to do with diversifying our supply of clean, affordable energy and modernizing our antiquated infrastructure; twenty-five of the recommendations help the U.S. strengthen its global alliances and enhance national energy security; twelve of these recommendations can be implemented by executive order; seventy-three of them are directives to Federal agencies, and 20 are recommendations that are going to have been acted on by Congress.

This is a specific plan and the balance of this plan, in fact, almost half of the entire plan with respect to the recommendations have to do with one conservation or other alternative sources of energy.

I come from South Dakota. We care a lot about ethanol. We think ethanol is an important part in the solution to this country's energy future. But we also understand that it is a bigger and more comprehensive issue that is going to require an increase in supplies not just of ethanol but of many of the other sources of energy that we currently depend upon in this country.

But the point I would make to the gentleman from Colorado and just agree with what he has said earlier is that this is something and South Dakota cares deeply about what happens in California. California I think also has been there for South Dakota in the past.

But if you look at the record of this Congress in reacting to problems that have been created over a long period of neglect, and I will use the example when I came to Congress in 1996, it was 2 years after the 1994 Congress came here.

But we came here to try and deal with what had been 40 years of overspending by Congresses that were controlled by liberals. We had this huge debt and deficits piling up year after year after year. Well, after a 5-year period now we have basically gotten our fiscal house in order.

Welfare reform was another example of something that had been ignored for years and years and years. We had a welfare program that was spending billions and trillions of dollars and not solving any of the problems. And so we came here, came up with welfare reform proposal before my time. Actually that happened in 1995 or 1996 before I arrived on the scene. But, nevertheless, it was a solution to a problem that had

been created by years and years and years of neglect.

Social Security and Medicare, the Federal Government and Congress had for years and years and years been spending that. We have now walled that off as of the last 3 years since we have had control of this Congress and addressed a problem that had been ignored and neglected for years and years and years by our friends on the other side.

This is a problem that has been created by years of neglect. We have before us this proposal. I hope that this Congress will act on a number of these recommendations, a proposal which is comprehensive. It is 170 pages long, which is detailed, which is specific, and which is balanced in the approach that it takes.

□ 2100

It calls on the need for the best and the brightest in this country in the area of coming up with solutions that are conservation oriented, those solutions that deal with renewables like ethanol and wind and other things that are important to my part of the country, and creates tax credits and tax incentives for development of those types of energy alternative energy sources, and, yes, also look for more supply because we just flat have to. If one looks at our growing dependence upon other sources of energy from outside this country, we have no alternative.

So the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is exactly right. I am disappointed to hear the rhetoric and the tone that is already occurring on this floor, because we have a responsibility as the Congress of the United States to work and to solve what is an American problem. It is going to afflict everybody in this country.

I have been to the gentleman's district in Colorado. I know the people that he represents care deeply about the price of gasoline. That is about all I hear about in South Dakota these days. We have to come up with solutions.

That is what this plan, the President has given us an opportunity to work with something. This may not be the final product. We are going to work through the Congress. This is open to discussion and to debate. But to hear the other side get up here on this floor time after time after time, speaker after speaker after speaker, and show no evidence or no inclination or no desire to work in a bipartisan way, to try and take a plan that has been presented by the President of the United States, the first plan that we have seen, I might add, in many, many years through the administration, the last two 4-year terms of that Presidency in which their party controlled the White House, we now have a President who has taken leadership, who has taken the initiative to present a detailed and specific plan.

They may not like everything in here. I may not like everything in here.

But the reality is we now have a framework and something to work with that gives this country some direction in the area of energy policy, something that has been frankly lacking and absent in the last 8 years.

I, like the gentleman from Colorado, am not going to sit here and tolerate and listen to people get up here and rail on and on and on when this is a proposal that we have in front of us to work with and, as I said earlier, in contrast to the one that we had the last 8 years, which could be the equivalent of my empty hand, because we have not had a proposal. We now have some specific direction.

We have a responsibility as a Congress to work together as Republicans and as Democrats to try and solve the energy crisis in this country. It is something that affects everybody in America. It affects their pocketbooks in a very profound way.

The people in Colorado that the gentleman represents, the people in South Dakota that I represent, we have a responsibility and an obligation, I believe, as the Congress of the United States to come together and to work in a constructive way, not in a destructive way where we sit there and point fingers and holler and talk about contributions from oil companies and how the special interests are running this debate.

They know better than that, and the American people know better than that. I believe the American people are going to rally behind the efforts that are being made for the first time in a long time to address what is a serious and perplexing and chronic problem in this country that is desperately in need of a solution. We need to work together toward that end.

I am glad that the gentleman from Colorado is here and is pointing out some of these issues and look forward to working with him as well as with my colleagues on the Democrat side, many of whom have gotten up tonight and had nothing to offer but criticism.

Yet, I hope that, when it is all said and done, that we can come together and work in a constructive way for the betterment of America and do something that is meaningful in terms of addressing what is a very, very serious crisis, an energy crisis that is affecting every American no matter where you live. Whether it is in California or Colorado or in South Dakota, we all need to work together to try and solve this problem.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding to me and look forward to working with him as we begin the process of trying to implement solutions to this very serious problem.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Just to reiterate a couple of things, it is the first energy policy we have had in 9 years. Why? Because we need to plan for the future of this country, and we need to have some type of blueprint. We need to put things up on the table

for discussion, not for obstruction policy or strategy, but for discussion. That is exactly what this energy plan does.

I should say that the remarks, first of all, I want people to know that, as we talk about this side of the aisle, the Democrats, obviously I am a Republican, the Democrats, we have a lot of Democrats who are working very constructively to help us put this plan together. We have a lot of Democrats that want to work with us. But what we have heard this evening is the liberal side of that party. All we heard was a partisan attack.

Now, I realize that they are not going to join our efforts, which, by the way, is a bipartisan effort, both Republicans and Democrats, to put an energy policy into place. But at least they should refrain or at least adjust the tone of their attacks that frankly cannot be substantiated.

I mean, we heard comments tonight, I heard that this plan calls for the complete, mind you, complete destruction of the Arctic National Wildlife in Alaska, that it wipes out all types of conservation, wipes out all efforts at conservation. I mean, these kind of exaggerations do not get us anywhere.

What does get us somewhere, frankly, are the Democrats and the Republicans, and there are a lot of them who are doing it as we speak, are sitting down with this administration, coming up with a policy to plan for our future.

One other point I would make, and then we probably ought to move on to the death tax. But the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) brought up the dependency of this country on foreign supply of energy. I mean, if one wants to put our environment at risk, and, by the way, I am very sensitive about that, as my colleague knows, my district is a beautiful district as is his; but if one wants to put an environment at risk, if one wants to put the future generations of this country at risk, one continues on the policy of increasing our dependency on foreign oil.

Maybe the gentleman would like to comment on that. But I am telling my colleagues, his point, that is the most dangerous thing we have got out there. This thing in California is going to work itself out. Our situation, we actually have lots of electrical supply coming on for 49 of the 50 States here in the next year and a half. This is going to work out. But the kind of the iceberg under the water is this continued inching up and dependence on dependency on foreign sources for our energy needs.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINNIS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado is absolutely right. Again, as he noted, he has an absolutely spectacular landscape in his district. Like my State of South Dakota, most of the people in my State care very deeply about the environ-

ment. Most of them tend to be very conservation oriented to start with. That is part of the ethic that comes in places like South Dakota.

Yet we have a very, very serious crisis. The gentleman from Colorado has hit it exactly on the head; that is, the fact that today we are dependent to the tune of almost 60 percent of all of our oil coming into this country, or oil that we use in this country is coming from sources outside the country. That is something that we cannot sustain and that grows every year. It has grown actually, I think, since President Clinton took office. It was about 40 percent. It is about 60 percent today.

So as I said earlier, we have had basically 8 years of neglect where essentially Saddam Hussein has been Secretary of Energy in this country. That has to change. That is exactly, I think, the realization that people in this country have come to.

It certainly is, I think, evidenced in the President's proposal which acknowledges the fact that we have to do something to increase our supply in this country, and we have to do it in an environmentally friendly way. The new technologies that enable us to develop some of those oil resources I think are remarkable and will make a profound difference in where we head in the future.

But the gentleman from Colorado is absolutely right. This crisis exists today. If we do not as a country become energy independent, become energy self-sufficient, find more and more ways of producing more energy in this country, and if we have to continue to depend upon very unreliable and unstable areas of the world, I think for our energy supplies, we are going to be in a world of hurt down the road.

So I look forward to the opportunity again to work in a bipartisan and constructive way to try and solve this problem. It is a problem. It is a crisis. It needs to be dealt with. The President has laid down the first marker. He has put something on the table. We may not all like it. I mean, the Democrats may come in here, and they may not like every aspect of this; but at least we have a plan.

It is comprehensive. It is specific. It is detailed. It addresses conservation. It addresses renewables. It addresses development, exploration in a balanced and reasonable way of our oil resources. That is where we start. Let us get to work and start attacking this problem, because it has been overlooked for far too long.

I know the gentleman wants to get on and discuss the death tax.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's time this evening. I say to the gentleman from South Dakota, it is kind of fun, because when we speak about conservation, there are lots of neat things. I told my staff over the weekend, I said, why do you not all put your heads together over the weekend, each one of us, including myself, let us come up

with 10 separate items of what we can suggest to our constituents of ways we can conserve and make them as painless as possible.

For example, as I mentioned earlier, most car manuals, the engineers that design the cars, build the cars and test the cars, in most car owners' manuals, you will find you should change the oil in your car every five or 6,000 miles. Yet, if you pick up your newspaper and advertising, you will see the quick lube outfits and so on market you and convince the American public that you need to change your oil every 3,000 miles. You do not have to change it every 3,000 miles. Follow the owners' manual. That is painless. Not only is it painless, you can put money in your pocket.

So I just did this to reiterate the emphasis of the gentleman from South Dakota on what the President has said about conservation. Conservation can begin to close that gap that we have right here in the blue that the gentleman spoke of. If we continue to allow this to go without additional supply and without conservation, our dependency on foreign oil, of course, increases.

So I will wrap it up with that. Again, I appreciate the gentleman's time.

Mr. Speaker, I intended to come to the House floor this evening. Last week, I had, really, the privilege to meet two wonderful and very, very brave families. Ken and Bambi Dixie from Parker, Colorado. Ken and Bambi lost their two youngest sons tragically as a result of a poisoning last year, as a result of carbon monoxide coming out of the back end of a houseboat, as a result of a defect that could have been avoided, should have been avoided, should have never existed in the first place. Their friend Mark Tingee and his wife, Polly, were also on the boat at this time that this horrific tragedy took place.

Now, why are they courageous? A lot of us in this country have suffered tragedy. I do not know a lot of people that have suffered tragedy as the Dixies suffered. But, nonetheless, the courageousness of this couple was that they were willing to come out and relive this tragedy over and over again last week here on Capitol Hill with testimony in hopes of saving some lives this summer so that, when people are recreating out there in the lake, they are not poisoned as a result of houseboat usage, on improper venting on carbon monoxide.

So tomorrow evening, Mr. Speaker, I hope to have an opportunity to address my colleagues and go in some detail. I hope they listen because the message we need to take back to our constituents about the possibility of this defect, the existence of it, and the tragic results of it is very important. Thank goodness we had somebody as brave as the Dixie family and as brave as the Tingee family to come forward. So I am going to speak on that tomorrow night.

I want to spend the balance of my time talking about the death tax. When I take a look at our tax system in this country, I am not sure one can find a tax that is more punitive, that is more unjustified than what is called the death tax.

Now, the death tax is imposed upon the assets or the property that an individual has accumulated during their lifetime. Now, this is property upon which taxes have already been paid. This is not property where, for some reason or another, taxes were evaded or taxes were avoided. This is property in which taxes have already been paid. In other words, the due tax owed to the government has been paid.

The tax bill, zero, until the moment of your death. Upon the moment of your death, the government comes into you, to your property, to your future generations, and as a punitive measure takes your property or takes a good share of your property if you qualify for the death tax.

Now, the death tax came about theoretically to help finance World War I. But where you really see the fundamental origins of the death tax is when this country was moving towards kind of a socialistic angle, and they were angry at the Carnegies and they were angry at J. P. Morgan and they were angry at the Rockefellers. They said we should go and redistribute wealth. That is what really started this ball rolling.

But now what has happened is a country, which is the greatest country in the history of the world, our country, now our country is one of the leading countries in the world, discourages small family farms or family businesses from going from one generation to the next generation.

Now, why do I say small? Because it was with some interest I noticed that the father of Bill Gates, Mr. Gates we will call him, it is not Bill Gates, I am not sure he agrees with his father, but Bill Gates, Sr., very, very wealthy man spoke about how important it was to keep the death tax in place.

Do my colleagues know where he spoke from? He was speaking from the foundation offices. What does that mean? Well, the foundation was created to help avoid these death taxes. So the wealthy, some of the wealthiest people in this country have already pretty well protected themselves against this punitive measure.

It is the small. It is the small kid on the block. It is the farmer or the rancher or the contractor who has a bulldozer, a dump truck and a backhoe; and, all of a sudden, one day, they are doing business, and because of some tragedy, he loses his life or she loses her life. The next day, the next generation is being taxed, so that they cannot continue the business.

□ 2115

The wealthy families in this country, and I have no objection to wealth, I think that is one of the great incen-

tives that has made this country a superpower, but the fact is the wealthiest people of this country have prepared for the death tax. They have teams of lawyers and they have done estate planning, but there are a lot of families who have not had either the resources or the knowledge of the tax law to be able to help protect the next generation.

I was asked a question not long ago when I was down in Durango, Colorado, and they said, you know, in this country, nobody should have the right to inherit. Well, I guess if there is not a will, there should be a right to inherit, it should not go to the government. However, although you may not have the right to inherit, you certainly ought to have the right to bequeath, to give this property to people of your choosing, and most of the time, all of us would like to give that property to our children.

I will tell you about my personal experience. A goal of my wife and myself, our dream in life is to give something to our children. Not just give it to them, they are going to work hard, and they have worked hard. In fact, I graduated two of them from college last week. I have the other in college. I am pretty proud of them, as my colleagues are of their children. But during our life, we hope to give them some kind of a little start like my parents helped me. They gave me a lot of love, and that is what we are giving to ours. My father and mother had six children. My mother and father worked very hard in their careers and they were able to provide a college education to their children, and then we were on our own. All of us want to do that. And why should a death tax step in; why should the government come in and destroy the opportunity for one generation to help the next generation?

I thought I would just read a couple of examples here. Years ago, Tim Luckey's great grandfather started a farm in Tennessee. When his grandfather and then his father inherited the farm, both of them paid inheritance tax. Someday Tim hopes to inherit the farm, and when he does, he will have to pay the tax again. Notice I say "again." If party A owns a farm and dies, and party B inherits the farm, then party B pays those taxes. But if party B all of a sudden dies, say a year later in some kind of accident, the property now is inherited by C, and the property is taxed once again. There are multiple layers of tax on that property.

And I am not talking about like Mr. Gates and some of his cronies that signed that letter. We are not talking about the super wealthy. We are talking about a lot of people in this country today, farmers and ranchers and small business people. They have paid their taxes and they are going to be punished as a result of this death tax. But we are about to eliminate it. That is the good news, both Democrats and Republicans, not the liberal wing of the Democratic party. I did not say all the

Democrats. I understand that. But the conservative Democrats and the Republicans have all joined together. We are in the process of beginning the repealing of the death tax, and that is part of that tax package that is going to go to the President by Memorial Day.

Brad Efford owns a lumber yard in Columbia, Missouri. He pays \$36,000 a year just for a life insurance policy so his children can inherit the yard unincumbered. What is interesting is the untold number of businesses, as this article goes on, the untold number of businesses that prior to an owner's death are sold precisely to avoid the death tax. By selling before death, a small business owner may avoid the death tax in exchange for paying a capital gains tax at the rate of 20 percent.

That is important to know. What we are saying is if you have the business upon your death, we are going to grab it, or force you to sell it. Or if you like to, you go ahead and go out and sell your lumber yard, or we are going to force you to go out and sell that small contracting business you have.

When I was in Durango, Colorado, speaking to this group, where the question, do you have a right to inherit came up, another couple, who were interior decorators, and they were pretty proud of the business they had built up, it was a wife-and-husband team, they had put together apparently a fairly lucrative interior decorating business in this small town of Durango. What the couple did not realize is that if either one of them were killed in an accident, and the business went to the remaining spouse, or if both of them were killed, let us say both were killed, as happens in this country or throughout the world, if both of them were killed, that interior decorating business they worked so hard, if they had a couple of children beginning to learn the business, that business would evaporate because of the need to pay those taxes.

Let me read a couple other letters. I am very sensitive about what is happening to our open spaces in the State of Colorado, up in our mountains. Here is another letter. "The fate of 1,810 acres of ranch land featuring stunning views and prime elk habitat north of Carbondale will be determined at auction. The ranch now belongs to the son and daughter of the owner. The estate taxes are basically forcing this sale. They were just raising cows on it, but with the value of the land as it now is, we can't afford to raise cows. We have to sell the land just to pay the death taxes."

Let me go on. This is from Anthony Allen. Mr. Allen writes: "Mr. McInnis, I am writing to encourage you to keep the repeal of the 'Death Tax' on the front burner. As an owner of a family business, it is extremely important that upon our death, the business will be able to be passed to our daughter and our son, both of whom work in the business, without the threat of having to liquidate to pay inheritance taxes

on assets that have already been taxed once. Of all the taxes we pay, this tax is truly double taxation." It is punishment.

"I am aware that several wealthy people, i.e. William Gates, Sr., George Soros, have come out against the repeal of the death tax. This is one of the most self-serving demonstrations I have ever seen. They have theirs in trusts, foundation, offshore accounts and will pay no taxes," or limited taxes. "Whatever their political motivations are, they certainly don't represent or speak for the vast majority of business owners or farmers in this country."

Now I have heard some people say, well, look, only the top 2 percent are going to pay this tax. But look what it does to a community, and I could give hundreds of examples. Go into a community like the community in my district, when we had a person who was the largest employer, the largest contributor to his local church, the largest owner of real estate, the largest bank accounts in town, and they hit that family with the death tax.

Do my colleagues think that money that went to the government stayed in that small community in Colorado, where previously it had helped the church and the bank and the people with jobs and the real estate market, et cetera, et cetera? No, that money is transferred. The bulk of it goes straight to Washington, D.C. for redistribution somewhere in the country. And I would bet money that not one single penny goes back to that community. So no one should be bamboozled on this top 2 percent. Take a look at what it does to families.

John Happy writes this letter. John, thanks for writing. "Dear SCOTT: I wish there were some way I could help get this death tax eliminated. It is the most discriminatory and socialistic tax imaginable. I can't, for the life of me, understand how this tax was ever passed in our system to begin with. How can anybody advocate taxing somebody twice? I don't care," and this is his quote. This is what John says. "I don't care if it's a millionaire or a pauper, it is not the government's money. The taxes have already been paid." It is not the government's money. The taxes have been paid. "Why should a family working for 45 years and paying taxes on time every year be forced into this position? Sincerely, John."

Marshall Frasier writes me a letter. "Dear SCOTT: I was encouraged by the President's fight on the death tax and the repeal of that. We've operated a family partnership since the 1930s. My parents died about 5 years apart in the 1980s and the estate tax on each of their one-fifth interest," listen to this, "the estate tax on each one-fifth interest was three to four times more than the original cost of the ranch." Three to four times more than the family member paid to get their share of the ranch. "Eliminating the death tax and reducing tax rates will go a long ways

towards helping retain open space, providing jobs, and allowing one generation's business to go on to the next generation."

You know, this is a great country we live in, but the United States of America should have the policy of encouraging family business to go from one generation to the next generation. The United States of America is about to adopt a policy to repeal the death tax so that one family can have their dreams alive so that upon their death, no pun intended, that upon their death, the next generation can carry on for maybe the next generation. It is fundamentally important for the foundation of our country that we encourage family activities, family businesses to go from one generation to the next.

Let me go on to another one. This is a college student who writes me this letter, Nathan Steelman. "Dear Mr. McINNIS: I am a college student at the University of Southern Colorado in Pueblo, which is in your district. My parents and grandparents are involved in a typical family farm, a farm that has been in the same family for 125 years.

"My grandpa is 76 years old, and he is in the last years of his life. My parents have been discussing the situation for the past several months. My parents worry about this death tax. They worry about how are they going to keep the farm running once grandpa passes away. The eventual loss of grandpa will trigger this tax upon my family. My parents hope they can pay the tax without selling part of the family operation that they have worked so hard in maintaining over the years. The outcome doesn't look very good.

"Farmers and ranchers are having a tough enough time keeping family operations running the way it is. Statistics show that 70 percent of all family businesses do not survive a second generation, and 87 percent don't survive the third. My family, Mr. McInnis, has worked very hard to keep the family farm running this long. We feel as if we are being penalized for the death of a family member. From what I understand, the opposition is concerned about what many of the individuals who are affected by the death tax are those with very wealthy businesses. Statistics show, however, that more than half of all the people who pay death taxes had estates worth less than \$1 million. My family falls in that category. It just doesn't seem fair to me, Mr. McINNIS.

"Mr. McINNIS, my family's farm is not located within your district, but when I moved to Pueblo, I felt like I needed to express concerns to somebody. This death tax should be abolished."

Chris Anderson, another young man. "I'm 24 years old. I currently run a small mail order business. I'm not a constituent of yours, I reside in New Jersey. However, I listened with great interest as you spoke on the death tax not long ago. In all likelihood, I will

not face the problems you are outlining, at least not in the near future. I am not in line to inherit a business. My families have no wealth. However, I'm soon to be married, and I look forward to having a family, and perhaps one day my children will want to follow in my footsteps. I hope and pray they will not face the additional grief caused by this death tax.

"A 55 percent tax is at best a huge burden on a family business and the loved ones of the deceased. At worst, it can be the death blow that ruins what could otherwise have been a future for another generation.

"This letter is not a plea for your help. I just want you to know that although I'm not a victim of this tax, I appreciate the effort against it. I firmly believe, and have always believed, that success in family is firmly rooted in our country. I spent a few years working for a small family business, not just myself, but several workers depended on the income they derived from that business. So it's more than just the owners, it's also the people that work for these businesses. Hope your constituents recognize how important this is to repeal the death tax."

Well, Chris Anderson, I have got good news for you. Chris, we are about to do it.

□ 2130

The President's tax plan has by now passed the Senate. It will come to the House tomorrow, and we will put some conferees together. This marks a special moment for those of us who care about a future generation and those of us planning for our own family future. We are about to see the death knell of that unfair and punitive death tax.

It is about time. It is about time that this country finally recognized what a rotten policy it was to put a tax in that taxed you upon your death, that prevented in many cases small farms and small businesses from going from one generation to the next, that sent out a terrible message, a message that suggests that the transfer of wealth is what creates capital, instead of the innovation of products. I am pleased to be a part, and I congratulate those Democrats that have joined us.

Mr. Speaker, by the way, I want the gentleman to know that by Memorial Day all of us on this floor will have an opportunity to once and for all repeal the death tax. I urge every one of my colleagues to vote to get rid of that death tax. If you do not, I hope that you have a good reason why you decided that this country should continue to tax somebody upon death.

Mr. Speaker, my time is about up. Let me conclude with three quick remarks: One, I am pleased we are getting rid of the death tax.

Number two, to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), partisan,

highly emotionally charged statements of special interests, et cetera, et cetera, are not going to help California. We have to come together as a team to help California, and we are willing to do it as long as you are willing to pitch in. If California wants to pitch in, we ought to help them out of this situation.

Finally, colleagues, I hope tomorrow you have time to sit and listen to my remarks about the Dixie family and the terrible tragedy that they went through; but the bravery and the courageousness that they, along with the Tinge family, have been able to show as an example so that hopefully this tragedy will not be repeated this summer as that tragedy unfolded last summer for the Dixie family.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI). The Chair reminds all Members that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to those outside the Chamber.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of travel complications.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and May 22 on account of official business in the district.

Mr. LEVIN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a funeral in the district.

Mr. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and May 22 on account of the death of his sister.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending daughter's graduation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, May 22, 23, and 24.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ISSA, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 22, 2001, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2003. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Commander of Whiteman Air Force Base (AFB), Missouri, has conducted a cost comparison to reduce the cost of the Heat Plant function, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2004. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Commander of the U.S. Air Force Personnel Center is initiating a single-function cost comparison of the Personnel Computer Support function at Randolph Air Force Base (AFB), Texas, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2005. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Applicability of Section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act to the Purchase of Securities from Certain Affiliates [Miscellaneous Interpretations; Docket R-1015] received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2006. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Applicability of Section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act to Loans and Extensions of Credit Made by a Member Bank to a Third Party [Miscellaneous Interpretations; Docket R-1016] received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2007. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Assessment of Fees [Docket No. 01-08] (RIN: 1557-AB90) received May 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2008. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Market Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Definition of Terms in and Specific Exemptions for Banks, Savings Associations, and Savings Banks Under Sections 3(a)(4) and 3(a)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [Release No. 34-44291; File No. S7-12-01] (RIN: 3235-A119) received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2009. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on Federal Government Energy Management and Conservation Programs during Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6361(c); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2010. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human

Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicaid Program; Home and Community-Based Services [HCFA-2010-FC] (RIN: 0938-AI67) received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2011. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption; Alpha-Acetolactate Decarboxylase Enzyme Preparation [Docket No. 92F-0396] received May 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2012. A letter from the Chairman, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, pursuant to Public Law 104-191, section 263 (110 Stat. 2033); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2013. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2751 nt.; to the Committee on International Relations.

2014. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2015. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Entity List: Revisions and Additions [Docket No. 9704-28099-0127-10] (RIN: 0694-AB60) received May 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2016. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning compliance by the Government of Cuba with the U.S.-Cuba Migration Accords of September 9, 1994, and May 2, 1995; to the Committee on International Relations.

2017. A letter from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2018. A letter from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2019. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2020. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2021. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2022. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform