

around and talked about these, but the reality is, his budget and the numbers that are reflected by that budget and what we have here is documents and working documents tells a different story.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I am saying. We do not know what is in that tax bill. As I understand it, there is no Democrat in the room where the tax bill is being written, although they call it a conference committee. But we do know that when they emerge, one-third to one-half the benefits will go to income tax reductions to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. That is not in return for that group or any other group investing in clean coal or conservation; that is just a tax cut.

So while the President's plan calls for tax credits for conservation, for renewables, there is nothing in the tax bill that provides the tax credits that the President does the press conference about. That is why perhaps the real view of this administration, one that they have back-peddled from when it hit a fire storm, but their view was reflected in the comments well-known by the Vice President when he said, conservation may be a personal virtue, but it is not the sufficient basis for a comprehensive energy policy.

I think we need to respond. And that is, excessive energy company profits and environmental despoliation and destruction is not a sufficient basis for a comprehensive energy policy. What we need short-term for California are those rate regulations, and what we need in addition to some of the infrastructure improvements that the President talks about is a real dedication to conservation, to research, renewables, and "real" means you put it in the budget and you appropriate money for it. Not a real good pamphlet, but a real good law.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, being from California or going to New York or these research institutions where they are doing the research, these people are so optimistic, the researchers. They are looking at fuel cells and alternative fuels and different ways, rather than to use fossil fuel for the future. I mean, when we think of our country and this whole new technology and new economy that we are going through. I think if, in 1960, President Kennedy could say, we need to get a man to the moon and we could develop that technology that did that by July of 1969.

I am very familiar with that, of course, because it came out of the area that we represent, that certainly, with all of the new technology, with the research, if we just put money into that and let these people go at it, that in 5 or 6 years, we would completely change the type of energy that we use to run our cars and run our businesses and our homes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I can just add some of the statistics to back this up. Earlier we were talking about

getting plants permitted. During the 8 years in which we had a Republican governor, we had zero plants permitted. Just in the last 2 years under a Democratic governor, 14 plants permitted, seven are under construction, four of them are going to be on line this summer, another four or five will be on line before we hit the problems of next summer. We will have 8,500 megawatts on line. That is moving forward.

But getting back to renewables and research, as I said, the budget put forward by the President cuts renewables and research and energy efficiency by about a third. We were talking about how successful energy conservation has been. Americans have saved 4 times more energy through efficiency, conservation and renewables over the last 20 years than has been produced from new sources, new finds, of fuel in the United States.

And Americans have saved \$180 billion, I might have thought it was \$200 billion earlier, \$180 billion over the last 20 years. That is just because we are using less energy than we would have, because we have got this technology and that is saving \$200 for every dollar that the United States has invested in developing these renewables, developing conservation systems. If we go up to a wildlife refuge and we drill for oil, we get the oil, we destroy the environment, and then the oil is gone. If we invest in the technology that allows us to use less oil, we use that technology this year and next year, the technology is never gone, the technology, if anything, is improved year after year. That is why if we are looking for a long-term solution, we cannot get it unless we have a real dedication, not just a press office dedication, to renewables, to conservation, and to research.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for taking this hour to discuss and to dispel some of the myths that people around the country have heard about Californians and about what we are facing there. I hope that many of them will take the time to read the real information and to understand that where California goes, so does the rest of the Nation. I want to thank my colleague for the time given.

□ 1830

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Orange County for participating in this special order. I think we have covered the subject well.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSBORNE) laid before the House the following communication from RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 1092(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act, I hereby appoint the following individual for appointment to the Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry: R. Thomas Buffenbarger of Brookeville, Maryland.

Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about an issue that I care very much about and one I hope that will garner the attention of this House during the 107th Congress. It is an issue that is seldom discussed, unfortunately, although I consider it to be one of the most significant problems, one of the most significant issues facing the United States from a domestic policy standpoint, and that issue is massive immigration into this country. I hope that we can demonstrate tonight to everyone, to my colleagues and to those listening, the numerical realities of mass immigration and some of the burdens that come with it.

Mr. Speaker, since 1970 more than 40 million foreign citizens and their descendants have been added to the local communities of the United States of America. Just last month, The New York Times reported that the Nation's population grew by more in the 1990s than in any other decade in the United States history. For the first time since the 19th century, the population of all 50 States increased, with 80 percent of America's counties experiencing growth. Demographic change on such a massive scale inevitably has created winners and losers here in America. It is time that we ask ourselves, what level of immigration is best for America and what level of immigration into America is best for the rest of the world?

Now, as we have witnessed, Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker spent some time discussing the problems of energy in California specifically, or I should say the lack thereof. Of course this is a monumental problem facing the Nation. Something almost unbelievable is happening to us, a Nation, the richest Nation on the face of the Earth is now experiencing, in one of the richest States of that Nation, rolling blackouts, energy shortages. How can this be? The previous speaker had some idea as to why it occurred. But, of course, it is only a symptom, Mr. Speaker. All of the problems experienced by California and that will most certainly be experienced by other