

CCNY moved its campus uptown in 1909, 17 Lex continued to house the downtown business campus. CCNY grew into City University of New York, which today educates 200,000 students on more than 18 different campuses.

In 1919, CCNY's business campus became an independent entity known as the School of Business and Civic Administration, which changed its name in 1953 to the Bernard M. Baruch College of Business and Public Administration, in honor of the economist and financier, Class of 1889, who advised six U.S. Presidents from Wilson to Truman. By 1968, Baruch College emerged as a separate senior college in the CUNY system. Today, Baruch College enrolls over 15,000 students and enjoys a national reputation for excellence in business education and public administration.

Baruch College continues to open doors for young people from all types of backgrounds. U.S. News and World Report has called Baruch College the most diverse school in the United States.

17 Lex is about to undergo its third incarnation, thanks to a \$200 million capital project approved by CUNY. The new building will, no doubt, continue the tradition of educational excellence available at this location for the past century-and-a-half.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the visionaries who believed that everyone should have an opportunity to have higher education and I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in celebrating a new beginning for 17 Lexington Avenue, the site of the first free public institution of higher education.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE
ENERGY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, today I will vote against the Boehlert-Markey amendment. I support increasing fuel efficiency standards for SUVs, light trucks and minivans as a way of improving our air quality and reducing our reliance on foreign oil. I also support using alternative fuels and much needed flexible fuel vehicles that can burn the home grown ethanol-based gasoline E85. This amendment asks me to make a false choice between higher fuel efficiency standards and an increasingly successful clean air program in the Twin Cities. It will stop the production of clean air vehicles at Ford Motor Company's St. Paul plant that use E85 fuel. This amendment could have done both—raise fuel efficiency standards and protect this clean air program. I will unfortunately oppose it today.

The St. Paul-Minneapolis metropolitan area has shown the nation that alternative fuels can help clean our environment and sustain our economy. E85, a fuel that is 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gasoline, helps our cars and trucks burn cleaner, reducing air pollution

while at the same time helping Minnesota's farmers and our rural economy.

The Twin Cities leads the nation in the number of gas stations that offer E85 with over 60 fueling stations throughout the metro area. It will not matter how many stations we have if we are not manufacturing the cars and trucks that use this innovative fuel.

And that is the problem I have with this amendment. Currently, our St. Paul Ford plant receives a credit for producing Flexible Fuel Vehicles that can use a combination of gasoline or another hybrid fuel like E85. Manufacturers like Ford use this credit as an incentive to produce these types of cars and trucks. The Boehlert-Markey amendment would shift the credit from the number of vehicles produced to the actual consumption of the alternative fuel, whether it's E85 or something else.

I agree with the amendment's authors about CAFE standards. However, it is equally important for us to provide incentives for people to consume home grown fuels. Because so little E85 and other alternative fuels like it are consumed nationwide, would we be reintroducing the age-old chicken and the egg conundrum? Do we need the cars to encourage the use of the fuel, or do we need the fuel before the cars? Would this be a disincentive to car and truck manufacturers to make automobiles that run on multiple fuels? Would we be providing a disincentive to car and truck manufacturers to make consumption of alternative fuels, and do not provide incentives for manufacturers to make these cars and trucks, we will be left without both.

What's more the Ford Motor Company plant in St. Paul has been a leader in manufacturing trucks that run on E85 and other innovative fuels. Ford, the Minnesota Corn Growers, American Lung Association of Minnesota, the U.S. Department of Energy, and Minnesota Department of Agriculture and others on the E85 Team have been instrumental in our area in promoting these clean-air vehicles and the alternative fuels that run them.

Mr. Chairman, this isn't an easy decision for me. We need to increase the fuel efficiency standards of all our cars and trucks and continue to work on improving our air quality. We put ourselves on the moon. Surely we can raise the efficiency of our automobiles. However, I know what the negative impact could be on the production of clean air vehicles and clean air in St. Paul. I unfortunately have to oppose this amendment today.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE
ENERGY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, we must reduce our nation's dependence on foreign oil. And while I believe our nation needs a comprehensive energy policy as a matter of na-

tional security, we also have an obligation to ensure that this need is met in a manner that does not jeopardize our financial security. This bill takes a balanced approach to meeting our nation's energy security needs. But, it fails to pay for any of these proposals which have a cost of \$34 billion.

H.R. 4 contains numerous provisions that I have supported in the past and will continue to support in the future under fiscally responsible circumstances. In fact, H.R. 4 includes a provision based upon a bill that I introduced during both the 106th and 107th Congresses that would extend the section 29 tax credit for the production of unconventional fuels such as coalbed methane. My version of this legislation [H.R. 794] was modified slightly and included in the Ways and Means portion of H.R. 4. I have worked for months to ensure H.R. 794's inclusion in a comprehensive energy measure. And while I would like to be able to vote for this provision, I cannot in good conscience support final passage of a bill that includes \$34 billion in tax expenditures that are not offset with comparable spending reductions. This is fiscally irresponsible. Such action threatens to spend money from both the Social Security and Medicare Trust funds on which the seniors in my district rely.

Further, as a member of the House Renewable Energy Caucus, I have supported measures to encourage and increase the use of renewable and alternative energy sources. This bill includes tax incentives for energy efficiency programs and renewable energy sources such as wind and solar production that I would like to vote for, and I would support if these incentives were paid for and handled in a fiscally responsible manner. As well, H.R. 4 contains tax incentives for domestic production from marginal wells that I have supported in the past and that would increase our national energy supply.

Last month I supported funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. I would like to support the LIHEAP reauthorization included in H.R. 4. I made a promise to senior citizens and other people in my district that I would not spend Social Security and Medicare Trust funds. That's a promise I intend to keep.

Two months ago, we were hailing surpluses "as far as the eye can see." There was even concern that we not pay down our national debt too quickly. Today, we are watching these surpluses disappear before our very eyes.

Two days ago, the House passed an appropriations bill that spent \$1.3 billion more than the budget resolution. I voted against the bill because in order to do this, we will have to borrow from other priority programs or from the Medicare and Social Security surplus funds.

If Congress adopts this new policy of borrow and spend it not only endangers the Medicare and Social Security surpluses, it places us back on the road to deficit spending. We must not travel down this road again.

It's time we made some tough choices. This Congress made a commitment to the American people that we would not vote to spend one single penny of the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds. We must honor that commitment. Spending restraint, fiscal responsibility, and honoring our commitments do not come about by good intentions, but by resolute actions.

Today, I reluctantly vote against this energy package because it fails to provide any offsets to pay for its provisions. This is a particularly difficult vote for me because this bill contains a proposal I authored and many other good provisions.

In an effort to honor our commitments to ensure financial responsibility, I will adhere to the levels in the budget resolution enacted by a majority of this Congress. I will oppose any efforts that reduce revenues without offsets.

The expenditures contained in H.R. 4 are not accounted for in the budget resolution and, despite sound energy policy this bill promotes, it busts the budget and threatens the Social Security and Medicare Trust funds. I urge my colleagues to honor their commitment to preserve this country's fiscal integrity; I urge my colleagues to either find a way to pay for these tax cuts or to vote no on H.R. 4.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE
ENERGY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill. (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to remind my colleagues of a critical provision of H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act, which passed this House yesterday. The provision authorizes critical funds for our nation's nuclear engineering education programs, and is identical to a bill introduced by Congresswoman Judy Biggert.

For over 50 years, the United States has been the leader in nuclear science and engineering. However, the energy crisis in California has awakened our nation to energy supply constraints. Nuclear power accounts for 20% of our energy supply and is the key to solving our energy supply needs.

This bill authorizes \$240 million over five years for university nuclear science and engineering programs at the Department of Energy.

The supply of bachelor degree nuclear scientists and engineers is at a 35 year low, and the number of universities offering nuclear engineering degrees is half of what it was 20 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, the provision we passed yesterday is a critical foundation for tomorrow's energy supply.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE
ENERGY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday August 1, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill. (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4, otherwise known as the Securing America's Future Energy (SAFE) bill, is anything but safe for rural America. This legislation, which was originally designed to encourage energy conservation, energy reliability and energy production, leaves rural America behind and in a cloud of dust. Proving once again that the majority is more intent upon rewarding campaign contributors than in addressing the needs of consumers in rural America.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, while initially well-intentioned, does not take into account the unique differences that America's rural communities face in an ever-changing electricity environment. Much of rural America is served by not-for-profit rural electric cooperatives, cooperatives that are not in the business of making money, but serving their consumers. These cooperatives do not seek out to price-gouge, but rather they seek to provide reliable and affordable electricity to their consumers in an efficient manner. The bill we are considering will allow investor-owned electric companies that are currently reaping record profits to receive \$33 billion in tax breaks for huge companies to spend overseas!

Mr. Chairman, when this body considers industry-specific legislation, it should consider all the unique aspects of the particular industry. Indeed, sound public policy is advanced when the differences between the sectors are taken into account. One important area that this Congress must study more carefully are the differences between the needs of rural America and urban and suburban America. This legislation does not meet this test.

H.R. 4 prevents rural electric cooperatives from participating in the new competitive marketplace. For all our talk about a level-playing field and a competitive marketplace, we fail to foster such a thing by excluding rural electric cooperatives from the same benefits that we provide to investor-owned utilities. It is critical that we provide a level playing field for all sectors of the electric utility industry—municipals, investor owned, and cooperatives—when considering public policy.

Bypassing this legislation, we are in essence saying that one sector of the industry should be favored over another. We are also saying that the electric needs of rural America and American farmers are less important than our population centers. The SAFE bill provides investor-owned utilities with billions of dollars worth of capital gains relief that comes at the expense of higher electricity rates to consumers.

The Congress needs to reconsider this poor public policy legislation and come back after the August recess to address these inequities and finally consider legislation that is good for all of America, urban and rural.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE
ENERGY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM NUSSLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill. (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, as the House considers H.R. 4, the Saving America's Future Energy Act, I rise to express my concern about an amendment offered by my colleagues from California to exempt their state from the oxygenate requirement of the Clean Air Act.

In 1990, Congress approved the Clean Air Act Amendments to require that gasoline sold in certain areas of the country, including California, contain at least 2 percent oxygen, "Reformulated Gasoline," which can be derived from adding an oxygenate to gasoline. The goal of the oxygenate requirement is to lower pollution in areas of the country that have the highest levels of air pollution.

There are two main substances that are used to meet the oxygenate requirement: Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE) and ethanol, a fuel derived from corn. Following the 1990 law, the Chicago and Milwaukee reformulated gasoline areas chose to use ethanol and, to my knowledge, have not reported any problems with groundwater contamination, but have reported significant improvements in their air quality. Meanwhile, many of the reformulated gasoline areas in California, the Northeast, and several other areas of the country, chose to use MTBE. These areas are now reporting that about 80 percent of their drinking water contains MTBE, which does not biodegrade and which the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has classified as a potential human carcinogen.

For the last few years, California and other parts of the country have sought to solve the problem of MTBE groundwater contamination by removing the oxygenate requirement altogether. In fact, the State of California has petitioned both the Clinton administration and the Bush administration to grant a waiver to exempt the entire State from the oxygenate requirement. On June 12, the President opted to deny this request citing that the EPA has determined, time and again, that the addition of oxygen to gasoline improves air quality by improving fuel combustion and displacing more toxic gasoline components.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the only prudent way to address this problem correctly is to replace MTBE in the United States with ethanol. Indeed, the transition for ethanol to reach California drivers is expected to be neither long nor difficult. It is my understanding that California will need 600 million gallons of ethanol annually to replace MTBE. Ethanol producers currently have the capacity to supply 2 billion gallons per year. This year alone, ethanol producers have already begun the process of shipping 150 million gallons to the State, cost-effectively and with no transportation impediments. In fact, letters delivered to California on