

become a devastating public health issue. That disease is diabetes, and it is wreaking havoc on women, especially African American women.

Recent studies confirm the numbers of women being diagnosed with Type II diabetes each year, and these numbers are increasing in alarming rates.

Mr. Speaker, diabetes kills one American every 3 minutes, and a new case is diagnosed every 40 seconds. No person is immune and no community remains unaffected. Almost 16 million Americans have diabetes, with 60 percent of those being women.

Statistics have shown that women with diabetes have a five-fold higher risk of coronary heart disease than do non-diabetic women. In addition, coronary heart disease is the number one killer of people with diabetes and poses a greater risk for women who develop heart disease. Furthermore, close to three-fourths of deaths in individuals with diabetes will be directly attributable to cardiovascular disease.

Another disturbing aspect associated with this disease is that it is the number one killer of African American women with diabetes and has reached epidemic proportions. An alarming statistic is that 11.8 percent of African American women who are 20 years old or older have diabetes, and about one in four African American women over the age of 55 have diabetes, which is nearly twice the rate of white women.

Statistics reflect that among older populations, women make up 75 percent of diabetes cases. One of the reasons diabetes disproportionately affects women is because there are more obese women than men, and women live longer and maintain less active lives than men. Inactivity puts women at a greater risk for obesity, which is often a direct precursor to diabetes.

The poor health habits of mothers increase the risks of their children developing similar behaviors and health challenges. Therefore, it is vital that we highlight the importance of educating women about healthy living.

It is also important to conduct more diabetes-related research studies. Diabetes research has been an invaluable tool, that has paved the way to extraordinary breakthroughs for women.

□ 2130

However, more research must be funded and conducted as a standard protocol for women's health initiatives. We must research new and progressive treatments for women with diabetes and promote prevention as a response to this challenge.

Primary prevention is critical to reducing morbidity, mortality, and economic costs associated with cardiovascular disease in diabetic women. Diabetes is the single most costly disease in America, totaling about \$105 billion a year. That is why the Women's Caucus submitted an appropriations re-

quest for fiscal year 2002 that would fully fund NIH programs and which will provide the resources necessary to address this issue.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to raise their voices, open their hearts, and enhance their commitment in educating our communities about diabetes and primary prevention. I also ask each one to join in the fight for adequate funding for research.

Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing legislation in the next few days to bring attention to this important public health issue. The legislation will address this disparity that exists among diabetic women. It will focus on research, increased representation of minority scientists, and education outreach. I hope that my colleagues will cosponsor this legislation with me.

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). 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, first of all, in regards to the gentlewoman from California, this diabetes is a horrible, horrible disease and there are lots of statistics that support exactly what the gentlewoman from California has said. If we could figure out a cure for diabetes, according to the statistical information that I have, it would be amazing how dramatically we could cut health care costs in this country. A huge portion of our Medicare and Medicaid budgets in this country are directly attributable to diabetes, juvenile diabetes, adult diabetes, et cetera, et cetera. So I encourage the gentlewoman from California to go on with her efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk about the energy crisis that we have in this country; and I want to talk about what is our future. What is the future for this country? I want to talk about conservation. I want to talk about realistic conservation. I want to talk about the solutions that start at home, not solutions that are dictated out of Washington, D.C.

However, before we do that, I just listened to an hour of rambling on about how bad the Republicans are here, how bad this is here and how bad that is there, and how California has innocently suffered the wrath of the United States, because California, after all, does not deserve this blame. I think we need to take just a couple of minutes of rebuttal.

The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), my colleague, says that the answer for this energy crisis in California lies in Washington, D.C. I say to the gentleman, with all due respect, the answer should not come out of Washington, D.C. The answer should

come at the local level and at the State level. Frankly, the State of California thought they would show all the other States how deregulation was done. They took the lead on deregulation, and they made a mistake. I say to the gentleman, with all due respect, the gentleman sounds like another gentleman from California. He sounds like defense attorneys. He blames everybody else: it is not my fault; it is their fault. It is not the fault of California; it is the fault of the Federal Government in Washington, D.C. It is not the fault of California and the State legislature and the Governor of California; it is the fault of the Western States. It is not the fault of the Governor of the State of California and the legislature of California; it is the fault of the oil companies or it is the fault of this and that.

Mr. Speaker, we want to help California. Let me say something about California. Despite the fact that a lot of people in this country think they have it coming because of the fact that they do not want it in their backyard and, although they will never admit it, that is the attitude in California, and frankly, that has been the attitude in California. Despite the fact that some people think they have it coming, I am telling my colleagues here today, California needs our help. California is the sixth most powerful economic factor in the world. In other words, if California were a State of its own, California would be the sixth most powerful economy in the world. The United States of America is very dependent upon the State of California. After all, they are a State. They are our neighbors. They are fellow citizens. We have an obligation to help California.

But, Mr. Speaker, before we go out to help somebody, especially somebody that got into that jam largely because of their own doing, we like to hear some kind of admission from the person that we are about to help: hey, I made a mistake. We would like to see a little humbleness come out of some of the people that have made this mistake, like the government and the legislature in California. But that is not what we are hearing. Instead, what we are seeing is the blame game. It is Washington, D.C.'s fault, it is Colorado's fault, it is Nevada's fault, it is everybody's fault but us here in California.

Come on, Governor. One does not need to be a defense attorney. We are not out to prosecute California. We should not be out to prosecute California. We are not putting California on trial. Do not act like a defense attorney, I say to the Governor of California, and say that it is everybody else's fault and you share none of the fault. Stand up to it. Take the blame. Do not play the blame game. Do not delay the pain game.

You think what you are trying to do out there in California is defer the

pain: we will freeze these prices. That does not bring conservation. The Governor of California and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), why do you not just for a moment say, all right, maybe in California we have to change some of the philosophy we have had; maybe we have to come up with the approach that maybe somewhere it is going to have to happen in our backyard; maybe we have to admit that there is a balance out there, a balance, a balance that can be reached with conservation as an element, with energy production as an element. I mean there is a balance. In California, frankly, the problem is they have gone to one side of the balance, that somehow all of the production should take place out of the State of California.

By the way, I heard one of the previous speakers talk about the power plants that are needing to be built in this country. Let me tell my colleagues, we have built three power plants a week, three power plants a week last year that came online in this country. Three a week. Multiply that times how many weeks we have in a year, and that is how many came online in this Nation. How many came online in the State of California? Zero. How many natural gas lines has the Governor of the State of California allowed? Zero. For 8 years their leadership out there has not had it come. Do not let California put the blame game on the rest of the United States.

As I said earlier, the United States has an obligation to California. They are important for our economy. They are good people out there. They are people that are working hard and want this resolved. But the politicians in California, specifically that governor who I heard last Sunday on Meet the Press talk about maybe the answer is to seize the power plants; a Governor of California who blames everybody but himself for this problem in California. Come on. One cannot blame everybody else when one has not had a natural gas line in 8 years. They have not had any power plants come online in California last year, although throughout the rest of the country, we had three a week come online. You place price gaps; all you are doing is artificially messing with the market.

Take a look. Every time the government gets involved, the consumer suffers. Tonight we hear some of my colleagues say, what we should do is go out and freeze the prices. Now, I know that sounds great. Who does not want to do that? But we do not get something for nothing. The best way to destroy conservation is to tell people the prices are not going to go up. I can tell my colleagues right now, the reason my wife and I are conserving, I think fairly extensively in our own personal life, is because our prices have gone up. If we let the market take its place, the market will produce. California has ar-

tificially tried to guide the market, first through deregulation, and then through their governor-led sponsorship of no price increase, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and look what has happened.

California, if you want help, let us help you; but you have to participate. You have to be willing to help the other States produce this power. You have to be willing to let transmission lines be built in your State. You have to be willing to let a natural gas transmission line come through your State and distribute in your State.

Anybody in these Chambers, anybody in these Chambers who does not want to help California ought to leave these Chambers. I mean that. Any one of my colleagues in here who does not want to help the State of California ought to leave these Chambers. That is a State in the Union. I think we have an obligation to help California. But by gosh, California has got to help pick itself up by its own bootstraps too. They have to help. And to the governor and the politicians out there in California, you have to help. The people of California deserve more, frankly, than I think you are giving them; and you do not help the situation in California by getting on the Sunday talk shows and blame it all on Washington, D.C. and blame it on all of the western States, blame it on everybody but your own regime out there in the government of California.

Now, let us talk about not just California, let us talk about our entire country. What can we do with this energy crisis? How bad is the energy crisis. First of all, let me say to my colleagues, I think it is going to work itself out. Now, that might be heresy around here. What do you mean it is going to work itself out? We have a crisis that is going to sink this country. I do not think it is going to sink this country.

In fact, I think the electrical power production will increase fairly dramatically in the next year or two. In fact, we may even have a glut out there of electricity. That is hard to believe. But if we take a look and go beyond the rhetoric, go beyond the emotion, we are going to see that this country, that the private marketplace out there, that the people of this country are an enterprising bunch of people, and we will be able to stand up to this. But one of the big factors, one of the most critical things we can do, every one of us, every one of us, I say to my colleagues, not only to help the State of California, but to help every one of our constituents out there is to take a serious look at what we can do for conservation.

I say to my colleagues, do we know what is neat about conservation? We do not have to go through a lot of pain to conserve. I will give a good example. I have the statistics on it. No pain. I am

going to give my colleagues some gain without any pain. My colleagues say, something for nothing? Let me tell my colleagues, take a look at this. How many people of America have read their owner's manual in their cars? I say to my colleagues, do it tonight. Take out the owner's manual and see what the manufacturer, the experts, the manufacturer, the engineers and the designers and the manufacturer of your car, take a look at what those experts say about how often you should change the oil in your car. My guess is, at a minimum, 5,000 miles, maybe 6,000 miles. Take a look at all of the advertising in the newspapers by the quick lubes and people like that. You should change your oil every 3,000 miles. I say to my colleagues, we could conserve lots of oil in this country without any pain, without any harm to our vehicles, without any harm to the motors that we operate, by simply taking the time, read the owner's manual and find out exactly when we do need to change the oil in that vehicle. If we could move people off the 3,000 mile oil change to the oil change recommended in the owner's manual, we would have a dramatic savings in petroleum products in this country.

Let us talk about some other things. I have thought a lot about conservation; and I can tell my colleagues, I am exercising it myself. In fact, in the mornings, when I usually go back to my office, when I go into my office in the mornings, I get to the office oh, 6:30, 7 o'clock in the morning, and the first thing I do is I turn on every light in my office. I turn on every light.

□ 2145

I started thinking about this a couple of months ago. I do not need every light. I probably have six or seven different lights in my office. What I do for the first 2 hours I am in the office is read or work on the phone. I have one light that provides enough light for that. So now in my office five lights stay off for an additional 2 hours. I just turn on the one light that I need to do my work.

We can do it. All of us can conserve without a lot of pain.

I have some other ideas here that I would like to go over, because they work. They work, again, without economic pain. We do not have to pay money to do it or go out and buy some fancy device or go out and buy a hybrid automobile in order to help us conserve, in order to help this country take a look at its consumption of energy and figure out how to get the same product with less energy.

Let us go through a few things. Obviously, turn off room lights in rooms not in use. Although obvious, this tip saves the most energy.

Take a look at a city. I was in Denver the other day. It was interesting to notice in Denver how many of those

tall buildings which had cleaning crews in them, how many of those tall buildings had lights on them from the bottom floor clear to the top. If we could just go, if all of us could accept the responsibility of conservation, by just shutting the light off after we leave the room, we would have a dramatic impact.

In the State of California alone, if the citizens in California, I say to Governor Davis, if his citizens in California would just simply change the oil when the owner's manual tells them to change the oil, not when their local quick-change outfit tells them to change the oil, if they would simply turn out the lights after they left the room and follow a few more of these tips, I can assure my colleagues from the State of California, their crisis would be much less than it is today.

I am here to help. Let me tell the Members, every State in the Union is dependent upon the State of California, and, frankly, California is dependent upon us. We are a union of States.

Let us go on. Set the thermostat to 69 degrees or less during the day, 60 degrees or less at night. Bundle up. Put on an extra sweater. Keep all exterior doors tightly shut and avoid frequent in-and-out traffic.

Lower the temperature of the hot water heater to low, or 120 degrees. That is really a pretty simple thing. If we lower our water heater to 120 degrees, that is plenty hot. We are not going to suffer at all. We are not going to get a chill. We are going to feel that water is as hot as we could possibly want it, but we save energy by simply going down into the basement tonight, go to the hot water heater, turn that little button.

We do not have to call the plumber in or call the electrician in. It is made for pretty simple adjustment by the homeowner. Go down and turn the switch from high, from medium to low. I assure the Members that tomorrow morning, tomorrow morning when we take a shower or bath or wash our hands in hot water, we will have to add cold water to hot water because that 120 degrees will be adequate, yet overnight we will have helped this country begin to work its way out of this energy crisis.

Again, I am optimistic that we are going to work out of this crisis. In fact, I am more optimistic than most people here that we will get out of it sooner than we will later, but it is good for us to accept long-term conservation.

We are not going to stop our conservation efforts once we work out of this crisis. What we are going to be able to do once we work out of this is we are going to be smarter. We are going to know how to use our energy better.

Let us continue on, here. Do not let the hot water run while washing hands, brushing teeth, or shaving. That

sounds pretty simple, but I was thinking about the comments I was going to make today. Believe it or not, this morning when I was at the gym I was shaving and I had the hot water running. Instead of just filling a bowl in the sink, I had the hot water running. Then I would go over and switch the TV channel and I would come back. I got to thinking, I probably had several gallons of hot water run down that drain.

I can do it better, and we can do it better.

Let us go on from there. Take shorter showers. Do not let the hot water run while washing hands, brushing teeth, or shaving. We went through that. Turn water on only when one is actually using it.

Use smaller appliances such as microwaves, toaster ovens, and crock pots to cook meals.

Use cold water to operate the garbage disposal. It is surprising how many people will turn on their garbage disposal and turn on the hot water in the sink. The garbage disposal does not require hot water, it will run with cold water.

By the way, do not let it just run and run, with the water continually flowing and flowing. We can dispose of the garbage much quicker than most people usually do. We do not need to run that garbage disposal for 2 or 3 minutes. We can run it probably for 15 or 20 seconds, run the water for 15 or 20 seconds instead of running it five times as long as that to accomplish the same results.

Let us just keep going.

Wash clothes in cold water. Schedule washings so we can do the laundry in as few loads as possible. Air dry the clothes when possible.

Close blinds, shades, and draperies. That is amazingly simple. When we leave during the day, if we want to maintain the coolness during the day in the summer coming up, close those blinds. It is amazing over a period of time how much energy and money, by the way, we will save for ourselves.

These are pretty easy conservation tips that can be followed. Let us go on.

Regular maintenance is important to the efficient operation of heating and air conditioning systems. Clean or replace air filters monthly. Vacuum and clean the condenser coils, fan blades, registers, and dampers frequently.

Again, this does not require an electrician, it does not require a master mechanic. A lot of these are simple methods that we ourselves can do, like turning down that hot water heater.

Shut off any unneeded lights, computers, motor-driven appliances and fans. If you use ceiling fans, blades should rotate.

This is very important. I did not know this until I read this tip. If we are using a ceiling fan, and most of us have ceiling fans in the home, run it

clockwise in the summer months because it pulls cool air up from the floor.

I never even looked at my fans at my house, my ceiling fans, to see which direction they are running. I do know that the fans run either direction. But in the summertime, run those fans clockwise. It pulls the cool air off the floor and will reduce the utility bill, and it is more money in our pockets while at the same time we are helping the Nation conserve its energy. That is a win-win deal. That is how we are going to get to the bottom of this energy problem.

Finally, before we move on, keep the doors closed as much as possible on refrigerated coolers. That makes a lot of sense.

Tomorrow morning when we get ready for breakfast, let us take a look at what happens when we get the milk. We will run over and still have the refrigerator door open because we are going to go back and get the butter. Shut the door.

Or many refrigerators have an outside door where one can open up a little door and keep the most frequently-used food products in that little box, and we will save ourselves some money. Over a period of time, that kind of money makes a lot of difference.

Let me pull up this next one. I thought this was a fabulous poster when I saw it. That is why I have reproduced it. I want to go over it.

"How does electricity power my home? The electricity in a home travels through the house wires." We know that. "The wires lead to light switches and outlets which power televisions, computers, lights, and most everything else in the home. Electricity makes our homes very comfortable to live in, but electricity is not free. Before electricity gets to our homes, some type of fuel must be used."

Again, before the electricity gets to our house, some type of fuel must be consumed to generate that electricity. It can be coal, it can be nuclear elements, or even a dam on a river. We give up certain parts of nature to enjoy electricity, so we must do our part to conserve electricity.

There is the balanced statement. We give up certain parts of nature. We do give up parts of our nature to enjoy the benefit of electricity, but while we do that, it is incumbent upon us to act in a responsible fashion. It is incumbent upon us to help conserve the utilization of that part of nature that we are bringing in so we have the convenience of electricity.

For example, if we leave a light on in the room after we leave it, we are using electricity that we do not need. To conserve electricity, simply shut off the lights in the rooms we are not using.

Other examples include: Shut off the TV when nobody is watching it. Keep the computer in sleep mode if we are

not using it, and shut off the monitor. Use fluorescent lights or use gas-filled lights, like halogen lights. These light bulbs use less energy than regular light bulbs.

Unplug appliances, like curling irons and irons, clothing irons, right away. Letting them sit while turned on wastes electricity, and on top of that, it is unsafe.

There are lots of different ways we can conserve. My purpose in starting my comments out this evening about conservation is this solution, number one should not be dictated out of Washington, D.C. As I said earlier, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) says, "Regulate. The solution rests in Washington, D.C."

I appreciate the compliments of the gentleman from California that he has given to this respectable body in Washington, D.C., but I am telling the Members, the best answers start at home. The best answers start at home with conservation. The best answers start in our own States, where, on an environmentally sensitive and an environmentally clean and a safe project, it can allow natural gas transmission lines, for example, or allow electrical transmission lines.

There is a balance out there that can be reached. What I have seen since we have gotten into this energy crisis is an extreme on this side and an extreme on this side. Some people say, drill wherever it is necessary to drill. Some people over here want us to live on the pretense that conservation alone will solve the problem or that we do not have to build any more electric plants in this country or that the oil and gas companies really somewhere in this world have a huge pool of gas that they are hiding because they do not want to sell it to us right now. It is interesting, when the price is the highest it has been in a long time, and they do not want to sell gasoline to us when they can make a lot of profit.

Let us go on from there. Let us talk about some of the facts. I think tonight my real focus in the balance of my time is to do a little research, to look into some of the facts, and then let my colleagues draw their own conclusions. But I think I have some interesting information to reflect on here.

Cleaner air. Energy consumption has risen while emissions have declined. Take a look at the emissions from a car or from a coal plant or from a nuclear plant or Florida hydro dam. Take a look at the pollution that was emitted 25 years ago. It is as dramatic a difference from 25 years ago to today as a car 25 years ago, its radiator system, heating system. Of course, it did not have the anti-lock brakes and things like that.

The technology today has moved that car to a point that is fairly dramatic. We have done the same thing. Despite what we are hearing from one

side, that we continue to generate electricity without any regard to the environment, that we continue to run our cars that are dirtier than ever, we hear misstatement after misstatement after misstatement.

Here are some of the facts. It is American technology at work. Technology is another critical piece of this puzzle to solve this energy problem. Cleaner air. Energy consumption has gone up while emissions have declined.

Here is our gross domestic product. That is recognized right here by the green line. It has gone up 147 percent. Our economy, our gross domestic product, has gone up 147 percent in the last 30 years.

Vehicle miles traveled, the amount of miles we put in our vehicles country-wide, and obviously the population has gone up, that has resulted in additional miles of 140 percent in the last 30 years.

U.S. coal consumption, the amount of coal that we are using every day for generation of power, that has gone up 100 percent. Energy consumption, the energy we are using in our country in the last 30 years, has gone up 42 percent.

But take a look at what has happened to the key air emissions. It has gone down 31 percent. So consumption is up, the economy is up, the miles driven is up, but the emissions going out are going down. Why? Because it is American technology. That is one of the key ingredients. We have to encourage technology.

Let us not be fooled, there are a lot of people that sell us the magic, like the old medicine man that drove around in a wagon and whatever sickness we had, he had a cure for it. We are going to see the same in this energy crisis. We are going to see all kinds of wild ideas they have the cure for.

The taxpayers of this country, by the way, have for some period of time funded research on technology, and it is not working. It has not worked. We have to have enough guts, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, to stand up to a technology that is not working and take that money from a technology that is not working and put it into a technology that has some promise.

President Bush has stepped forward and said, I have a number of programs out here that the American taxpayers have spent billions of dollars on and we have no real result, we need to use that money on other technology. It is not working. Do not just reject out of hand our proposition that all technology that is being studied out there is giving us promising results. It is not.

It was of interest that I heard I think again the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) talk about hybrid cars, and the Japanese are the only ones who really have it out. He is wrong on that

fact. In fact, Americans have a few out. But the Japanese in this article, it is in the newspaper today, the Japanese are having problems. They are not sure how much more production they can continue with that.

Take a look at that. Do Members know what the Japanese are saying? "We have to find a technology that conserves energy, that satisfies the consumer, and that operates in an economic manner such that the average consumer out there can afford it."

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, these are not graphs that I made up. These are graphs that are all sourced. It is information that if you listen to the emotional arguments that are going on out there, you would say this does not sound like what I just heard at coffee this morning. That is why I thought it would be important this evening to look at the facts.

Let us put the emotions aside. Let us put the political arguments aside and look at some of the facts. The U.S. economy is more energy efficient. Energy use has been constant since 1972. Right there, that is the energy use.

If we look at 1950, if we come back in 1950 and go to about 1972, the amount of energy use, we tracked the actual amount of projected energy use and the actual energy use. We recognized no savings, no efficiency, no real efficiency. But in 1972, because of the fact that the American people begin to demand from products more energy efficiency, we begin to see a dramatic gap.

Today, had we not exercised that energy efficiency, had American technology and, frankly, some foreign technology not been deployed in everything from our appliances to increased mileage in our cars, our actual energy consumption would be right here.

The American technology has that actual energy use right here. In a way, in a way, this energy crisis that we have today will actually be somewhat beneficial, because right now there are more Americans conserving every minute of the day today than there were just 1 year ago.

There are many, many more Americans that will be conserving next week than were conserving this week. This gap right here will continue to grow. That is positive. Efficiency is being realized. Conservation is being realized.

This next chart I think is very, very important. We cannot continue to ignore the fact. As I showed you on that earlier poster with electricity, having electricity come into your home means that somewhere, somewhere, fuel is being utilized to generate that electricity.

It is the same thing with refrigeration. It is the same thing with our petroleum products, everything from the making of clothes to driving vehicles, air-conditioning units which preserve

everything from medicine to our poultry, to our agricultural fields out there, all of these things require energy.

What has happened in this country is that there has been a fairly directed attack, saying that any kind of pursuit of energy, any kind of development of oil and gas products, any kind of development of a coal product, any kind of a development of a nuclear product, any kind of development of a dam on a river for a hydroproduct, for some reason is fundamentally wrong; that this country should not do it.

What has happened, unfortunately, is in some of those cases, including especially the nuclear generation case, these arguments have prevailed.

Now, maybe that is what the American people want. I do not think so. Because, you know what it does? It makes us more dependent on countries who are not exactly allies of the United States of America.

What happens when you become dependent on foreign energy resources? Then you are subject to their whims. Sixty percent, 60 percent, of our energy comes from overseas; 60 percent of it. If tomorrow OPEC, for example, decided they did not want to sell to the United States, can you imagine what that would do to us?

If, for example, air, let us take the air, every breath you breathe in, you are dependent on 60 percent of your air from one source, and all of a sudden that source is shut off, you are all of a sudden going to be gasping for air. You are going to be short of air; dramatically short.

That is exactly what happens if OPEC tomorrow decides to shut off the valve. That is not what we need, because that then brings on all kinds of panic. That is the kind of panic that brings on exploration that is not environmentally sensitive.

That is the kind of panic where people begin to do things they should not be doing. So what we need to do is have some kind of a logistical balanced plan for a clean energy product.

Take a look right here. This is our consumption since 1970, this blue line. These are net imports, that is the percentage. It is above 60 percent right now. That is a very dangerous line. That dependency on these countries puts our Nation at the whim of governments that may not have the best interests of the United States of America in their minds.

As we begin to explore a little further this evening, I thought it would probably be useful to take a look at where the energy consumption is by sectors. Take a look at it from 1970. In 1970, this is residential, the blue reflects residential use.

Compare residential use in 1970 with the jump that it is going to take by the year 2020, like we are talking about today, the year 2000. That is the blue line there. There is the blue line.

In 1970, take a look at where commercial is today, the increase in commercial. Take a look right here on industrial, and we come over here on industrial. I mean, these lines are going like this.

Finally, transportation. Transportation takes a huge leap, a huge leap, to move people, to move products. Remember that when you hear people talk about we need to reduce the number of cars we have and we need to get trucks off the road, remember that is what trucks provide.

There is lots of transportation that takes place, and it is not transportation of a person from point A to point B; it is transportation of products from point A to point B.

Most of the products that you have on right now, if I were to take a look at my own clothing, every piece of clothing I have on right now, my eyeglasses, my ring, all of this was dependent upon transportation. None of this was produced in the community in which I lived. I purchased it locally, but it was transported in.

Transportation is a critical energy consumer in our economy. But now that we have an idea, somewhat of a relation of what energy consumption is, let us go a little further.

As we continue in our society to provide, put more computers in rooms, to have more conveniences, even as we build bigger and better schools in our country, as we have more products that help us with different needs in this country, better machines in our hospitals, et cetera, et cetera, here is what is happening. Our energy consumption continues to go up, and this is our energy production at the 1990 to the 2000 growth rates. In other words, production is flat, consumption is going up.

A portion of this gap, this gap, somehow we have to provide for that gap. The more this goes up, the red line, the more the green line stays flat; then the more we become dependent on foreign oil supplies or foreign energy supplies like OPEC. Again, that is very dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, a portion of this red line, I think we can move this from an angle like this, perhaps down to an angle more like this, if all of us help conserve. That is where conservation comes in to help.

But do not be led down the straight path by some of the speakers, including some who preceded me this evening. Do not believe that this entire gap here, like this line will come down to energy production level simply through conservation alone. Conservation is a critical factor. It helps, but it is not the total solution.

The fact is we have to continue to build generation facilities in this country. And we are, by the way. Construction of generation facilities has not stopped in this country.

It has stopped in California, but it has not stopped throughout the rest of the United States. Obviously, now it is restarting in California. We need this production. We need it handled in a safe way. I do not want my workers, and my colleagues do not want your workers working out there in an industrial facility that is not safe.

We want safe facilities. We want clean facilities. My district has some of the cleanest water in the United States of America. My district, as you know, is the highest district in the Nation. It is the Rocky Mountains in the State of Colorado.

I happen to think all of us take a great deal of pride in our district, but I happen to think that my district has a lot of unique beauty. We do not want dirty water in our district. On the other hand, we think we have hydroelectric power plants in our district, which we have some right now. We can have hydropower in our district without dirtying the water.

We have hydroelectric plants that are safe, because we need them. We need the electricity. We need the energy. We need it done in an economic way that not just the wealthiest people of our society get the benefits of turning on a light switch anytime they want, the American people, regardless of their income level, have come to expect that when they turn on the light switch in the house, the lights come on. They have a right to that expectation, and we can provide that energy. We can provide that juice to them again in an efficient manner, in a safe manner and, most importantly of all, in a clean manner.

Now, we have heard lots of emotional arguments in the last few weeks. The evil oil, the word "oil." You would think if you heard the word "oil," it is almost like a cuss word. When you were a young child, the teacher would slap you on your wrist: Do not say the word "oil" around here.

Look, we need oil. There is a lot of our routine life that is fully dependent on oil: our health care, our medicines, our transportation, our air-cooling systems, our homes, construction; I mean, whatever you talk about, it is very interesting to hear people who speak very badly against oil. They think it is terrible that we have oil in our society. They come to the meeting, they drive up in a car, and they expect the room they are in to be at 68 degrees. They expect the light to go on when they flip the switch. And, by the way, you need oil to generate electricity.

Oil is not an evil word. It is a resource that the entire world is dependent upon. It is a resource that we cannot afford to ignore. It is a resource that we must conserve. It is a resource that is fair game for us to utilize to provide for the needs that we have in our society.

In the next 20 years, our demand for oil will increase by 33 percent. Yet, as

demand rises, domestic production drops. We now produce 39 percent less oil than we did in 1970; almost 40 percent. We produce less oil, 40 percent less oil than we did just 30 years ago. We are down nearly 4 million barrels a day. Unless our policies change, domestic production will continue to drop to 5 million barrels a day in 2020, down from 9 million barrels a day 30 years ago.

We are increasingly, and this is what frightens me, and I say to my colleagues take a very careful look, we are increasingly dependent on foreign governments for our oil. Back in 1973, we imported just 36 percent of our oil from overseas. Today we import 54 percent of our oil.

When you add the other energy that we import, almost 60 percent of the Nation's energy needs are imported from foreign governments. The number of U.S. refineries has been cut in half since 1980.

There has not been a new refinery built in this country, in the interior of this country, in more than 25 years. We have to come to some policy decisions.

As I said earlier, those policy decisions are best made at the State level, not at the level of this Congress in Washington, D.C. I keep hearing over and over, California, the Governor of California, again acting like a defense attorney, blaming it on everybody else and focusing his blame on D.C., and saying Washington, D.C. ought to come up with the remedy.

□ 2215

California, you need to help yourself, and you can begin by conserving. You can begin by forgetting these artificial price freezes out there. Face up to the music. The reality is you have got to allow electrical generation to be built in your State. The reality of it is, despite the fact that the Governor and some politicians may despise the oil production, it is sometimes necessary. Not sometimes, it is necessary.

It is necessary to my colleagues in California that you, like every other State in the Union, allow natural gas transmission lines. Look, we can do it in a clean manner, and we have a responsibility to do it in a clean and efficient manner.

I despise somebody coming into my district who thinks they want to explore for natural gas resources and leaves a scar on the land or damages the environment or, worse than that, dirties our water. Because back where I am, water is like blood. We can do it without that kind of destruction. We have a responsibility, one, to provide energy to our constituents, and, two, to do it in an efficient manner that is also a clean and safe manner.

Natural gas. Let us move to natural gas very quickly. Consumer prices for natural gas have increased twenty-fold in some parts of the country over the

past year. America's demand for natural gas is expected to rise even more dramatically than oil. According to the Department of Energy, by 2020, we will consume 62 percent more natural gas than we do today.

Now why am I talking about 2020? Look, part of our leadership role in Washington, D.C. is to provide for the young people and for the future of this country. We have an obligation in my opinion to make sure that the future generations to this country are not dependent on foreign governments, that the future generations of this country have fuel services, fuel energy resources that can be provided through the most modern technology we have.

We have an obligation for the people in 2020 that they are not going to have polluted air, that their water is clean, and when they turn on the switch, they can have electricity. We can do it.

Right now, an estimated 40 percent of potential gas supplies in the United States are on Federal lands that are either closed to exploration or limited by severe restrictions. Even if we find supplies of gas, moving to the market, it will require an additional 38,000 miles of pipeline and 225,000 miles of transmission lines.

The problem of inadequate supply lines is illustrated by Prudoe Bay in Alaska. The site produces enough gas a day to meet 13 percent of American's daily consumption. But because a pipeline has not been built, the gas is pumped back to the ground; and in some cases, the gas is simply burned off.

Let us take a look very quickly at what our problems are region by region in the United States. I think of all the charts that I have shown this evening, this one will probably be of the most interest.

We have heard a panic across the country about electricity. I really think the electrical shortage in California is going to be limited pretty much to California this summer. New York City is going to be hit with some of it, but New York City can have the utilization of generation, portable generators. So I think New York City will probably be able to get through the summer pretty well, too.

Now, California has got a problem. But I do not want, Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues to think that we need to panic, that the entire Nation is going to have the electrical crisis as is faced in California.

Let us take a look at what stands out in California. Dark days are ahead, an estimated 34 of them. Actually, I think they will probably have more than 34 days of blackouts as summer descends on the once Golden State. Rolling blackouts are inevitable if California uses as much electricity as it did last year.

Now, what are some of the problems of California? First of all, the Governor

of California blames it on everybody else. Second of all, I wanted the Governor of California to know that we in Congress feel an obligation to help California. And unlike what the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the previous speaker, said, that President Bush told California to drop dead, President Bush never said that. That is a highly inaccurate statement. It is charged with emotion. It is misleading. That statement was never made by President Bush.

We care about California. But, California, there are a couple of things we need to do to alleviate the problem. One is conservation. I have spent a lot of time this evening on conservation. Two, they need transmission lines.

Our transmission systems in this country can only handle so much of a load. It is as if you have lots of cars. For example, let us say you have a pickup and you need to go from one community to the other community. If you do not have a road to get you between them, it does not do you any good no matter how many pickups you have. You have got to have a path. You have got to have transmission lines.

California, you are going to have to build some transmission lines. California, you are going to have to build some gas transmission lines. California, you are going to have to do some things in your own backyard. You are going to have to bring electrical generation facilities on-line.

Now, let us look up to the Pacific Northwest. Now, the Pacific Northwest faces problems, not because of lack of generation, not because of lack of foresight, not because they attempted to deregulate, but because of nature. They have the second worst drought on record. The second worst drought on record has tamed the mighty Columbia River, a source of most of the Pacific Northwest electricity. Enough hydroelectric capacity has been lost to power four Seattles just because they have not had the rainfall. This cycle, too, will pass, but this is their problem this summer.

Texas. Texas has a very interesting situation. Texas has kind of been self-sufficient on its power generation, but its power grid is pretty well restricted to Texas. It does not have the continental transmission lines that most other States have. New power plants mean an ample supply for the Lone Star State, but its freestanding power grid does not allow it to share its electricity riches with others. So, in Texas, they are beginning to expand their transmission lines to help the rest of the United States.

It was nothing but political rhetoric in my opinion. When Governor Davis on Sunday, Gray Davis out there in California, every other sentence, he kept blaming the Texans for California's problem. Take a look at a replay of that Meet the Press or whatever it

was. Every other sentence, it was Texas' fault; and then the sentence in between, it was Bush's fault. Here is a State that pulled itself up by its bootstraps and is now running transmission lines to help other States.

Mid-Atlantic. Most mid-Atlantic States can rest easy this summer because largely of their sophisticated shared system to ensure electricity reliability. They know that they need that energy. They have planned for that. They have not pretended that some kind of magic fix was out there, that they did not have to have electrical generation, or they did not need transmission lines; but, yet, they still have low-priced power coming into their homes.

That is the dream that took place out here in Disney Land. It is not what took place in the mid-Atlantic. In the mid-Atlantic States, they knew they had to plan for it, and they have done it in an environmentally sensitive manner. They also are exercising conservation.

New York City is unable to generate enough electricity within its border to meet its demand. With the blackouts in 1995 and 1997, the officials are racing to install 10, actually more as I understand it today, more power plants as a hedge against these shortages.

Look, the United States is preparing for this. This energy crisis is not going to bring us to our knees. But it is going to bring to our attention the fact that conservation is important, that exploration is important, that there is a balance out there.

It will also continue to bring to our attention the fact that we all have to share in this. California, you can no longer enjoy the privilege of saying, no, not in my backyard. I say to the governor of California, you can no longer enjoy the privilege of saying no electrical generation in my State.

It is time for us to take a new look at whether or not hydropower, which is the cleanest power out there, or nuclear power, if we can do it in a safe and environmentally conscious way, why not look at it. We ought to put these things on the table.

That is exactly what President Bush has committed to do. He has assigned his Vice President DICK CHENEY to go out there and take a look at the different alternatives, which also include conservation, despite the liberal Democrats, this vision of emotional fear that they are trying to put out there that conservation is not a critical part of this puzzle. In fact, my colleagues will find out with the announcements tomorrow that it is a part of the puzzle.

But my colleagues also have to understand that conservation alone, while it is important, it alone will not meet the energy needs of this country. So we have to face up to these facts. I think the American people are willing to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have got about 7 minutes, and I want to take this last 7 minutes to kind of resummairize what we have visited with in the last 50 minutes.

I stand before my colleagues today saying that I do not think this energy crisis is going to bring down America. I do not think this energy crisis is going to bring down our economy.

Our economy is having some tough times. It is not solely because of the energy crisis that our economy is suffering. There are a number of different factors. There are a number of economies around the world that are suffering. Our economy, too, will recover.

But this is a good time for us to reflect as American people on what do we do about energy for the future of this country. Today we have plenty of power. Here in the House, I do not know, I probably have 100 lights lit up above us right here. All our TV cameras are powered. All my colleagues have watches on their hands that have batteries that are powered.

We are not suffering in this country, really suffering in this country. But we do have an obligation to look to the future. We have an obligation for some foresight. We have an obligation for this generation, not just this generation, the one we live in, to provide the energy needs that they have. But we have an obligation to move in some kind of direction that will prove positive for future generations of this country.

We have to face some realistic facts. Let us go through the facts. Conservation makes a difference. Every one of us can help conserve. I am doing it in my family. I can tell my colleagues what has driven most incentives to conserve in this country in the last few months is not government action by Governor Davis in California or by the government bureaucracy back in Washington or by those elected to Congress. We are not the ones who have driven people to conservation. Do my colleagues know what has driven them to conservation? It hit them in the wallet. It has cost a lot more money.

My wife and I are trying to conserve. We started several months ago. Why? Because we got a power bill we had not seen in a long time. That hurt. We began to conserve. Guess what? It works, and it has not hurt our lifestyle.

So conservation works. But conservation alone will not close the gap between energy consumption and energy production. Here is production. Here is consumption. That conservation will help close the gap, but it will not close the gap.

So I do not think we should stand up here and hold out as villains those leaders such as President Bush, the Vice President, who say we need to do exploration.

We need to lessen our dependency on foreign governments. That is a real

pickle we are getting future generations into. We are obligating future generations of this country to foreign governments who do not have the best interest of the United States of America in mind. In fact, many of those countries could care less about what happens to the United States of America.

We have got to look out for ourselves. We cannot just tell California to look out for themselves. We as a Nation, including California, need to look out for this Nation. We need to help protect future generations. So this energy problem that we have got today can help be resolved starting today.

Tomorrow, my colleagues are going to hear the President come out with some proposals. I gave my colleagues some proposals tonight. Let us look at those real quick.

Every one of my colleagues, my guess is most of them change the oil in their car every 3,000 miles. Certainly if they do not, they have heard the advertising that you need to change it every 3,000 miles. All of us could help conserve oil without any pain if we simply looked into the owners manual and changed our oil pursuant to the recommendation of the manufacturer and the engineers who put this product together.

My guess is most of my colleagues will find out they actually do not need to change their oil except every 5,000 or 6,000 miles, and they can cut their oil consumption in that car in half as far as their engine oil is concerned.

Turn out the lights when you leave the room. Help get together at a community level, not have policy dictated to you through regulation out of Washington, D.C., from forum and community level, to the community, to the County, to the State levels on ways that your State can help this Nation conserve on energy. At the same time, when you are having those conversations, have open and legitimate conversations about what do we do for energy production.

□ 2230

It is best that we come to the table with an open mind on conservation and it is best that we come to the table with an open mind on energy production. We cannot do one without the other.

The solution for the problem that we are now seeing in this country, that we are experiencing in our every day life in this country, can be resolved through a commonsense, clean, and safe solution of more energy production and more conservation. It works. It is a win-win for us today, and it is a win-win for the future of this country.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.